Additional File 2: Supplementary Tables

Table S1. Summary of findings for adiposity outcomes

Reference; Country; Larger Study/Cohort Name	Study Design	Sample	Exposure	Outcome	Main Findings	Covariates included in model (if applicable)
Study Design: RCT						
Study Design: RC1 Yilmaz et al. 2014 [1]; Turkey	Randomized Controlled Trial (RCT)	N = 412 Intervention, n = 211; Control, n = 201 Mean age: Intervention, 3.52 yr Control, 3.49 yr Pre-schoolers	Intervention: 3 printed materials and interactive CDs and one counselling call, intending to decrease screen time. Control: Usual care; unaware of counselling interventions. Screen time (min/day) was assessed by parent- report 1-week time-record diary (unpublished format). The intervention was 8 weeks in duration, with follow-up at 2, 6 and 9 months post-intervention.	BMI z-score calculated from "recorded" heights and weights (unclear if these were objectively measured or proxy- reported).	Screen time wassignificantly lower in theintervention vs controlgroup at 2, 6 and 9 monthfollow-up post-intervention (mean \pm SD:2 month: 39.48 \pm 16.36 vs86.64 \pm 21.63 min/day; 6month: 24.72 \pm 4.45 vs84.95 \pm 14.77 min/day; 9month: 21.15 \pm 6.12 vs93.96 \pm 18.84 min/day; allp < 0.001).BMI z-scores were notdifferent between theintervention and controlgroups at baseline (mean \pm SD: intervention, -0.19 \pm 1.12; control, -0.22 \pm 0.81, p = 0.375) or 9-month follow-up (mean \pm SD: intervention, -0.13 \pm 1.05; control, -0.15 \pm 0.95,p = 0.80).BMI z-scores increased inboth groups (no dataprovided).	N/A

Study Design:						
Longitudinal Sijtsma et al. 2013	Longitudinal	N = 1276	Time in baby seats	Weight-for-height (z-	Time in baby seats at age	N/A
[2]; Netherlands	[~15 mo (1.25	10 - 1270	(hr/day; e.g., car seat or	score) calculated from	~9 mo was not associated	
[2], itemeriands	yr) follow-up]	Approximate age:	child seat) assessed by	objectively measured	with weight-for-height	
Groningen Expert	yr) ionow upj	T1, 9 mo (0.75 yr);	parent-report	weight and height.	(Never, -0.02 , SD = 1.05;	
Center for Kids		Infants	questionnaire	worgint und norgint.	$<1 \text{ hr}, 0.02, \text{SD} = 0.98, \ge 1$	
with Obesity		manto	(unpublished).	Weight-for-age (z-score)	hr, -0.06, SD = 1.03 ; p >	
(GECKO) Drenthe		T2, 24 mo (2 yr);	(unpublished).	calculated using	0.05) or weight-for-age	
birth cohort		Toddlers		objectively measured	(Never, 0.12 , SD = 1.01;	
on the conoit		1 outliers		weight.	$<1 \text{ hr}, 0.04, \text{SD} = 1.00; \ge 1$	
				Worght.	hr, -0.11, SD = 0.92; p >	
				Waist circumference-	0.05) at ~24 mo.	
				for-age (z-score)		
				calculating using	Time in baby seats at age	
				objectively measured	~9 mo was favourably	
				waist circumference	associated with waist	
				(measured at the mid-	circumference-for-age at	
				point between the lower	24 mo (Never, 0.17, SD =	
				costal margin and the	0.91; <1 hr, 0.04, SD =	
				level of the anterior	1.00; ≥1 hr, -0.19, SD =	
				superior iliac spine).	0.90 ; p < 0.01 ; <1 hr vs ≥ 1	
					hr, $p < 0.05$), and with	
					change in waist	
					circumference-for-age	
					from 9 to 24 mo (Never,	
					0.00, SD = 1.26 ; <1 hr,	
					0.03 , SD = 1.15; ≥ 1 hr, -	
					0.22, SD = 1.04; p < 0.05;	
					<1 hr vs ≥ 1 hr, p < 0.05).	
					Time in baby seats at age	
					~9 mo was unfavourably	
					associated with change in	
					weight-for-height (Never,	
					-0.34, SD = 0.63; <1 hr, -	
					0.02 , SD = 0.77 ; ≥ 1 hr,	
					0.00, SD = 0.71; p < 0.05;	
					never vs <1 hr and never	

	1	1	1			
					vs ≥ 1 hr, p < 0.05) and	
					change in weight-for-age	
					(Never, -0.30 , SD = 0.82 ;	
					<1 hr, 0.00, SD = 0.78; ≥1	
					hr, -0.11, SD = 0.74, p <	
					0.05) from 9 mo to 24 mo.	
Gooze et al. 2011	Longitudinal	$N \approx 6650$ (rounded	Screen time (≤ or >2	Weight status (2000 US	The prevalence of obesity	N/A
[3]; USA; Early	(~3.5 yr	to the nearest 50)	hr/day; TV and videos)	growth reference cut-	at age ~5.5 yr was	
Childhood	follow-up)		assessed by parent-report	points [4]; categories:	significantly greater in	
Longitudinal	_	Approximate age:	questionnaire	BMI-for-age $\ge 95^{\text{th}}$	children with >2 hr/day	
Study, Birth		T1, 24 mo (2 yr)	(unpublished).	percentile, obese; <95 th	screen time (20.8%, 95%	
Cohort (ECLS-B)		Toddlers		percentile, non-obese)	CI: 18.3, 23.2) compared	
· · · · ·				determined from BMI	to those with ≤2 hr/day	
		T2, 5.5 yr		(calculated from	screen time (15.5%, 95%	
		School-age		objectively measured	CI: 14.1, 16.9) at age ~2	
		~		height and weight).	yr (p<0.001).	
Griffiths et al. 2010	Longitudinal	N = 11652	TV time (hr/day;	Weight gain rate from	TV time at age ~3 yr was	N/A
[5]; England,	(~2 yr follow-	11 - 11052	categories: <1 hr/day, ≥ 1	ages 3 to 5 yr (categories:	not associated with rapid	1 1/2 1
Wales, Scotland,	up)	Approximate age:	to $<3 \text{ hr/day}, \geq 3 \text{ hr/day}$	"rapid weight gain",	weight gain (compared to	
Northern Ireland;	up)	T1, 3 yr	assessed by parent-report	children in the top quarter	<1 hr/day: ≥ 1 to <3	
Millennium Cohort		Toddlers	questionnaire	of the weight gain z-score	hr/day, OR = 1.03, 95%	
Study		Toddiers	(unpublished).	distribution; "normal	CI: 0.92, 1.17 ; ≥ 3 hr/day,	
Study		T2 5	(unpublished).			
		T2, 5 yr		weight gain", children	OR = 1.17, 95% CI: 1.00,	
		School-age		below the top quarter of	1.38; $p = 0.10$) from ages	
				the weight gain z-score	~3 to 5 yr.	
				distribution) calculated		
				from objectively measured		
				height and weight.		
Schmidt et al. 2009	Longitudinal	N = 872	TV time (hr/day) assessed	BMI z-score (calculated	TV time from birth to 2 yr	N/A
[6]; USA	(~2.5 yr		by parent-report	from objectively measured	was unfavourably	
	follow-up)	T1, Age Range:	questionnaire	height and weight).	associated with BMI z-	
Project Viva		6 mo to 2 yr	(unpublished) at ages 6		score at age 3 yr (mean	
		Toddlers and	mo, 1 yr and 2 yr, and as		BMI z-score by TV time:	
		Pre-schoolers	the weighted average of		0 to 0.5 hr/day, mean = $\frac{1}{2}$	
			TV exposure from birth		0.20, SD = 1.04; 0.5 to < 1	
		T2, ~Age: 3 yr	and 2 yr [adapted from		hr/day, mean = 0.40, SD =	
		Pre-schoolers	questionnaire used in the		0.89; 1 to <2 hr/day, mean	
			National Longitudinal		$= 0.58$, SD $= 0.97$; ≥ 2	
			Survey of Children and		hr/day, mean = 0.58, SD =	
			sarrey of children and	1	m_{1} m_{2} , m_{2} , m_{2} = 0.50, $DD =$	

			Youth study (NLSY)].		1.14; p = 0.0001).	
Fuller-Tyszkiewicz et al. 2012 [7]; Australia Longitudinal Study of Australian Children (LSAC)	Longitudinal (~2 yr follow- up)	N = 4724 Mean age: T1, 2.29 yr Toddlers T2, 4.25 yr Pre-schoolers T3, 6.42 yr School-age	TV time (min/week) assessed by parent-report interview (unpublished format).	BMI (kg/m ²) calculated from objectively measured height and weight.	TV time at age 2.29 yr was unfavourably associated with BMI at age 4.25 yr ($r = 0.03$, p < 0.05) and age 6.42 yr ($r =$ 0.40, p < 0.05. TV time at age 4.25 yr was unfavourably associated with BMI at age 6.42 yr ($r = 0.04$, p < 0.05).	N/A
Fitzpatrick et al. 2012 [8]; Canada Quebec Longitudinal Study of Child Development (QLSCD)	Longitudinal (~8 yr follow- up)	N = 1314 T1, ~Age: 29 mo (2.4 yr) Toddlers T2, ~Age: 53 mo (4.4 yr) Pre-schoolers T3, Mean age: 121.8 mo (10.15 yr; Grade 4) School-age	TV time (hr/week) at age 29 mo assessed by parent report questionnaire (unpublished) Change in TV time (hr/week) between age 29 mo and age 53 mo.	Waist circumference (cm) measured objectively (at the midway points between the iliac crest and the lowest rib on children's left and right sides).	TV time at age ~29 mo was not associated with waist circumference at 121.8 mo (B = 0.009, 95% CI: -0.005, 0.073, p > 0.05). Change in TV time from ~29 to ~53 mo was unfavourably associated with waist circumference at 121.8 mo (B = 0.047, 95% CI: 0.001, 0.094, p < 0.05).	Maternal BMI, immigration status, level of education, child age in mo in Grade 2, weight status in Grade 2.
Pagani et al. 2010 [9]; Canada QLSCD	Longitudinal (~8 yr follow- up)	N = 1314 T1, ~Age: 29 mo (2.4 yr) Toddlers T2, ~Age: 53 mo (4.4 yr) Pre-schoolers T3, Grade 4 (in	TV time (hr/week) at age 29 mo assessed by parent- report questionnaire (unpublished). Change in TV time (hr/week) from age 29 mo to 53 mo.	BMI (kg/m ²) calculated from objectively measured height and weight.	TV time at age 29 months was unfavourably associated with BMI in Grade 4 (age ~9-10 yr; β = 0.05, SE = 0.02; B = 0.05, 95% CI: 0.01, 0.09; p < 0.01). The change in TV time from age 29 mo to 53 mo was unfavourably	TV time: Change in TV time, concurrent TV time, sex, temperament, cognitive ability, impulsivity, emotional distress, physical aggression, <i>hours of sleep</i> , maternal education, family makeup, family functioning.

		Grade 4 in Quebec, children are aged 9 to 10; School-age)			associated with BMI in Grade 4 (age ~9-10 yr; β = 0.03, SE = 0.01; B = 0.03, 95% CI: 0.01, 0.05; p < 0.01).	Change in TV time: Same as above, except inclusion of "baseline TV time" instead of "change in TV time".
Reilly et al. 2005 [10]; England Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC)	Longitudinal (~4 yr follow- up)	N = 5493 Approximate age at exposure measurement: 38 mo (3.2 yr) Pre-schoolers Median age at follow-up: 7.6 yr (range: 6.9 to 8.5 yr) School-age	TV time (hr/week) and time spent in the car on weekdays and weekend days (hr/day) assessed by parent-report questionnaire (unpublished).	Weight status (United Kingdom reference standards in 1990; categories: categories: obese, non-obese) determined from BMI (calculated from objectively measured height and weight).	There was a linear dose- response unfavourable relationship between TV time at age 38 mo and odds of obese weight status at age ~7 yr (<i>unadjusted:</i> compared to ≤ 4 hr/week: 4.1-8 hr/week: OR=1.66, 95% CI: 1.28, 2.17; >8 hr/week: OR=2.10, 95% CI: 1.60, 2.77; p < 0.001; <i>adjusted:</i> compared to ≤ 4 hr/week: 4.1-8 hr/week: OR=1.37, 95% CI: 1.02, 1.83; >8 hr/week: OR=1.55, 95% CI: 1.13, 2.12; p < 0.010). Time spent in the car on weekdays at age ~38 months was not associated with obese weight status at age ~7 yr (<i>unadjusted:</i> compared to none: <1 hr/week: OR = 1.19, 95% CI: 0.84, 1.69; ≥ 1 hr/week: OR = 1.37, 95% CI: 0.90, 2.07; p = 0.34). Time spent in the car on weekend days at age ~38 months was not associated	Birth weight, maternal smoking, infant feeding, parental obesity, <i>sleep</i> , dietary patterns, maternal education, energy intake at age 3 years, sex.

					with obese weight status	
					at age ~7 yr (<i>unadjusted</i> :	
					compared to none: <1	
					hr/week: OR = 0.62, 95%	
					CI: 0.40, 0.95; ≥ 1	
					hr/week: $OR = 0.64, 95\%$	
					CI: 0.41, 0.99; p = 0.090).	
Leary et al. 2015	Longitudinal	N = 4750	Time spent in the car	Total fat mass (SD score)	Time spent in the car at	Time spent in the car:
[11]; England	(~12 yr		(hr/week) and TV time	and lean mass (SD score)	age ~38 mo was not	Gender, age at time of 15-
1, 0,	follow-up)	Approximate ages:	(hr/week) at age 38 mo	measured objectively by	significantly associated	yr clinic visit, height,
ALSPAC	iono (r up)	T1, "38 month [3.2	assessed by parent-report	DXA.	with fat mass (compared	parental factors, social
TILDITIC		yr] clinic visit" (TV	questionnaire		to <4 hr/week: 4-5	factors, birthweight and
		and car measures) or	(unpublished).	BMI (SD score)	hr/week, $\beta = -0.02, 95\%$	gestation (plus energy
		"58 month [4.8 yr]	(unpublished).	calculated from	CI: -0.10, 0.06; >5	intake at 38 mo for dietary
		clinic visit"	Frequency of playing	objectively measured	hr/week, $\beta = 0.05, 95\%$	patterns), maternal
		(computer game	computer games	height and weight.	CI: $-0.06, 0.15, p = 0.50$),	smoking, paternal
		exposure)	(categories: rarely/not at	height and weight.	lean mass (compared to	smoking, breastfeeding,
		Pre-schoolers	all, once a month, once a		<pre><4 hr/week: 4-5 hr/week,</pre>	age at introduction to
		110-501001015	week, 2-7 times/week) at		$\beta = -0.005, 95\%$ CI: -0.05,	solids, time watching TV
		T2, 15.5 yr	age 57 mo assessed by		$\beta = -0.005, 95\%$ CI0.05, 0.04; >5 hr/week, $\beta =$	at 38 mo, frequency
		School-age			0.04, >3 m/week, $p = 0.02, 95%$ CI: -0.04, 0.08,	
		School-age	parent-report		p = 0.60, or BMI	playing computer games at 57 mo.
			questionnaire		- ·	at 57 mo.
			(unpublished)		(compared to <4 hr/week:	
					4-5 hr/week, $\beta = -0.04$,	TV time: Same as above,
					95% CI: -0.13, 0.05; >5	except instead of "time
					hr/week, $\beta = 0.09, 95\%$	watching TV at 38 mo"
					CI: -0.03, 0.20, p = 0.30)	inclusion of "time spent in
					at age ~15 yr.	the car at 38 mo".
					TV time at age ~38 mo	Frequency of playing
					was unfavourably	computer games: Same
					associated with fat mass	as for "time spent in the
					(compared to ≤ 4 hr/week:	car", except with the
					4.1-8 hr/week, $\beta = 0.04$,	addition of "time spent in
					95% CI: -0.04; >8	the car at 38 mo".
					$hr/week, \beta = 0.11, 95\%$	the cut at 50 mo .
					CI: $0.02, 0.21, p = 0.01),$	
					but not lean mass	
					out not ican mass	

$ \left \begin{array}{c} (compared to 24 hr/week; \\ 4.1-8 hr/week; \\ 0 = -0.01, 95\% \\ CI: -0.06, 0.03, 95\% \\ CI: -0.08, 0.02, p = 0.30) \\ cr BMT (compared to 54 \\ hr/week, B = 0.03, 95\% \\ CI: -0.08, 0.02, p = 0.30, \\ 0.10, 58 hr/week, B = 0.01, 95\% \\ CI: -0.08, 0.02, p = 0.10, start (-10, -10, -10, -10, -10, -10, -10, -10, $			
$ \begin{array}{c} 95\% C1: -0.06, 0.03; >8 \\ hr/week, \beta = .003, 95\% \\ C1: -0.08, 0.02, p = 0.30 \\ or BMI (compared to 24 \\ hr/week; 4, B = .004, 95\% C1: -0.08, 0.01; >8 hr/week, \beta = .003, 95\% C1: -0.08, 0.003; 95\% C1: -0.08, 0.01; >8 hr/week, \beta = .0.03; 95\% C1: -0.03, 0.18, p = 0.10, at age -15 yr. \\ \hline \\ $			(compared to ≤ 4 hr/week:
$ \begin{vmatrix} \mathbf{h}_{1}^{1} \mathbf{h}_{2}^{2} $			4.1-8 hr/week, $\beta = -0.01$,
$ \begin{bmatrix} CI: -0.08, 0.02, p = 0.30 \\ or BMI (compared to \leq 4 \\ hrweek; 4.1 \le hrweek; \beta = 0.01, 95\% (CI: -0.08, 0.10; \le Hrweek; \beta = 0.08, 95\% (CI: -0.03, 0.18, p = 0.10), at age ~15 yr. \\ \hline Frequency of playing computer games at age -57 mo was not significantly associated with fat funses (compared to rarely/not at all: once a month, \beta = -0.03, 95\% (CI: -0.03, 0.18, p = 0.10), 95\% (CI: -0.03, 0.18, p = 0.03, 95\% (CI: -0.03, 0.19, p = 0.03, 95% (CI: -0.03, 0.19, s = 0.03, 95\%$ (CI: -0.03, 0.19, s = 0.03, 95% (CI: -0.03, 0.19, s = 0.03, 95\% (CI: -0.03, 0.08, p = 0.70), lean mass (compared to rarely/not at all: once a month, $\beta = -0.05, 95\%$ (CI: -0.05, 0.06, once a week, $\beta = 0.05, 95\%$ (CI: -0.07, 0.07, cII, p = 0.05, 95% (CI: -0.02, 0.07, cII, p = 0.05, 95\% (CI: -0.02, 0.07, cII, p = 0.05, 95% (CI: -0.02, 0.07, cII, p = 0.05, 95\% (CI: -0.02, 0.07, cII, p = 0.05, 95% (CI: -0.02, 0.07, cII, p = 0.05, 95\% (CI: -0.005, 0.95% (CI: -0.02, 0.07, cII, p = 0.05, 95\% (CI: -0.005, 0.95% (CI: -0.005, 0.05), or BMI (compared to rarely/not at all: once a month, $\beta = -0.05, 95\%$ (CI: -0.002, 0.01, p = 0.05, 95% (CI: -0.002, 0.07, cII, p = 0.05, 95\% (CI: -0.002, 0.07, cII, p = 0.05, 95\% (CI: -0.003, 0.07, p = 0.05, 95% (CI: -0.002, 0.07, cII, p = 0.05, 95\% (CI: -0.002, 0.07, cII, p = 0.05, 95% (CI: -0.002, 0.07, cII, p = 0.05, 95\% (CI: -0.002, 0.07, cII, p = 0.05, 95% (CI: -0.002, 0.07, cII, p = 0.05, 95\% (CI: -0.002, 0.07, cIII, p = 0.05, 95\% (CI: -0.002, 0.07, cIII, p = 0.05, 95\% (CI: -0.002, 0.07, cIIII, p = 0.05, 95\% (CI: -0.002, 0.07, cIIIII), p = 0.05, 95\% (CI: -0.002, 0.07, cIIIIII), p = 0.05, 95\% (CI: -0.002, 0.07, cIIIII), p = 0.05, 95\% (CI: -0.002, 0.07, cIIIIII), p = 0.05, 95\% (CI: 0.002, 0.07, cIIIIII), p = 0.05, 0.05, 0.05 (CIIIII), p = 0.05,			95% CI: -0.06, 0.03; >8
or BMT (compared to ≤ 4 hr/week; $\beta = 0.01, 95\%$ CI: -0.08, $0.08, 95\%$ CI: -0.08, $0.08, 95\%$ CI: -0.03, 0.18, $p = 0.10$, at age -15 yr.Frequency of playing computer games at age -57 mo was not significantly associated with fat mass (compared to rarely/not at all: once a month, $\beta = -0.03, 95\%$ CI: -0.03, $0.13, 2-7$ times/week, $\beta =$ $0.005, 95\%$ CI: -0.03, $0.03, 05\%$ CI: -0.03, $0.03, 95\%$ CI: -0.03, $0.03, 95\%$ CI: -0.03, $0.03, 95\%$ CI: -0.03, $0.05, 95\%$ CI: -0.04, $0.005, 95\%$ CI: -0.05, $0.005, 95\%$ CI: -0.05, 95\% CI: -0.05, $0.005, 95\%$ CI: -0.05, 95\% CI: -0.005, 95\% CI: -0.005, 95\% CI: -0.005, 95\% CI: -0.005, 95\% CI: -0.005, 95\% CI: -0.005, 95\% CI: -0.005, 95\% CI: -0.005, 95\% CI: -0.005, 95\% CI: -0.005, 95\% <td></td> <td></td> <td>hr/week, $\beta = -0.03, 95\%$</td>			hr/week, $\beta = -0.03, 95\%$
$ \begin{vmatrix} h^{1} week; 4.1.8 h^{1} week; \beta = 0.01, 95\% C1: -0.03, 0.18, \\ = 0.01, 95\% C1: -0.03, 0.18, \\ p = 0.10, at age ~15 yr. \\ P = 0.10, at age ~15 yr. \\ P = 0.10, at age ~15 yr. \\ Frequency of playing computer games at age ~57 mo was not significantly associated with fat mass (compared to rarely/not at all: once a month, \beta = -0.03, 95\% C1: -0.03, 0.13, 27 - 100\% C1: -0.01, 0.05, 95\% C1: -0.03, 0.13, 27 - 100\% C1: -0.05, 0$			CI: -0.08, 0.02, p = 0.30)
$ \begin{vmatrix} = 0.01, 95\% \ Ct: -0.08, \\ 0.10; > 8 hr/week, \beta = \\ 0.08, 95\% \ Ct: -0.03, 0.18, \\ p = 0.10), at age ~15 yr. \\ \hline Frequency of playing computer games at age -57 mo was not significantly associated with fat mass (compared to rarely/not at all: once a month, \beta = -0.03, 95\% \ Ct: -0.03, 0.$			or BMI (compared to ≤ 4
$\begin{bmatrix} 0, 10; > 8 \text{ hr/week}, \beta = \\ 0.08, 95\% \text{ CI: } -0.03, 0.18, \\ p = 0.10), at age - 15 \text{ yr.} \\ \hline \text{Frequency of playing} \\ \text{computer games at age} \\ -57 \text{ mo was not} \\ \text{significantly associated} \\ with fart mass (compared to rarely/not at all: once a month, \beta = -0.03, 95\% CI: -0.03, 05\% CI: -0.03, 00\% CI: -0.012, 0.06; once a week, \beta = -0.05, 95\% CI: -0.03, 00\% CI: -0.012, 0.05; once a week, \beta = -0.010, 95\% CI: -0.03, 00\% CI: -0.010, 0.008, p = 0.700, lean mass (compared to rarely/not at all: once do to rarely/not at all: once a month, \beta = -0.010, 95\% CI: -0.02, 0.07; 0.03; 0.05; 0.05; 0.05; 0.05; 0.0$			hr/week: 4.1-8 hr/week, β
$ \begin{bmatrix} 0.08, 95\% CI: -0.03, 0.18, \\ p = 0.10, at age -15 yr. \\ \hline Frequency of playing computer games at age -57 mo was not significantly associated with fat mass (compared to rarely/not at all: once a month, \beta = -0.03, 95\% CI: -0.03, 05% CI: -0.01, 2, 0.06; once a week, \beta = -0.05, 95\% CI: -0.03, 0.13; 2-7 times/week, \beta = -0.01, 95\% CI: -0.01, -0.01, 95% CI: -0.01, -0.01, 95% CI: -0.01, -0.01, 95% CI: -0.02, 0.07; -0.03, 95% CI: -0.02, 0.07; -0.7, -$			= 0.01, 95% CI: -0.08,
p = 0.10, at age ~15 yr. Frequency of playing computer games at age ~57 mo was not significantly associated with fat mass (compared to rarely/not at all: once a month, $\beta = -0.03$, 95% CI: -0.12, 0.06; once a week, $\beta = 0.05$, 95% CI: -0.03, 0.13; 2-7 times/week, $\beta =$ -0.00, 95% CI: -0.10, 0.08, $p = 0.70$, lean mass (compared to rarely/not at all: once a month, $\beta =$ 0.03, 95% CI: -0.05, 0.06; once a week, $\beta =$ 0.03, 95% CI: -0.02, 0.07; 2-7 times/week, $\beta = 0.05$, 95% CI: -0.02, 0.11, $p =$ 0.03, 05, 95% CI: -0.02, 0.11, $p =$ 0.05, or BMI (compared to rarely/not at all: once a month, $\beta = -0.05$, 95% CI: -0.00, 0.95, 95% CI: -0.10, 0.09; once a week, $\beta = 0.10$, 95% CI: 0.003, 0.19; 2-7 times/week, $\beta = 0.07$,			$0.10; > 8 \text{ hr/week}, \beta =$
Frequency of playing computer games at age -57 mo was not significantly associated with fat mass (compared to rarely/not at all: once a month, $\beta = -0.03$, 95% CI: -0.12, 0.06; once a week, $\beta = 0.05$, 95% CI: -0.03 , 0.13 ; 2-7 times/week, $\beta =$ -0.01, 95% CI: -0.03 , 0.08, $p = 0.70$, leam mass (compared to rarely/not at all: once a month, $\beta =$ 0.005, 95% CI: -0.05 , 0.06 ; once a week, $\beta =$ 0.03, 95% CI: -0.05 , 0.05, 95% CI: -0.05 , 0.05, 95% CI: -0.02 , 0.07; 2-7 times/week, $\beta = 0.05$, 95% CI: -0.002 , 0.11, $p =$ 0.05, or BMI (compared to rarely/not at all: once a month, $\beta = -0.005$, 95% CI: -0.10 , 0.09; once a week, $\beta = 0.10$, 95% CI: 0.030, 0.19; 2-7 times/week, $\beta = 0.07$,			0.08, 95% CI: -0.03, 0.18,
Frequency of playing computer games at age -57 mo was not significantly associated with fat mass (compared to rarely/not at all: once a month, $\beta = -0.03$, 95% CI: -0.12 , 0.06; once a week, $\beta = 0.05$, 95% CI: -0.03, 0.13 ; 2-7 times/week, $\beta =$ -0.01 , 95% CI: -0.03, 0.08 , $p = 0.70$, lean mass (compared to rarely/not at all: once a month, $\beta =$ 0.005 , 95% CI: -0.05, 0.005 , 95% CI: -0.05, 0.005 , 95% CI: -0.05, 0.005 , 95% CI: -0.05, 0.005 , 95% CI: -0.07, 1.2 -7 times/week, $\beta = 0.05$, 95% CI: -0.02, 0.07; 2 -7 times/week, $\beta = 0.05$, 95% CI: -0.02, 0.07; 2 -7 times/week, $\beta = 0.05$, 95% CI: -0.02, 0.07; 2 -7 times/week, $\beta = 0.05$, 95% CI: -0.02, 0.07; 2 -7 times/week, $\beta = 0.05$, 95% CI: -0.02, 0.07; 2 -7 times/week, $\beta = 0.05$, 95% CI: -0.03, 0.03, 95% CI: -0.03, 95% CI: -0.02, 0.07; 2 -7 times/week, $\beta = 0.07$, 16% 2 -7 times/week, $\beta = 0.07$, 16% 			p = 0.10), at age ~15 yr.
computer games at age -57 mo was not significantly associated with fat mass (compared 			
computer games at age -57 mo was not significantly associated with fat mass (compared to rarely/not at all: once a month, $\beta = -0.03$, 95% CI: -0.12 , 0.06; once a week, $\beta = 0.05$, 95% CI: -0.03 , -0.13 ; 2-7 times/week, $\beta =$ -0.01 , 95% CI: -0.03 , -0.01 , 95% CI: -0.03 , -0.08 , 95% CI: -0.05 , -0.08 , 95% CI: -0.05 , -0.05 , -0.05 , 95% CI: -0.05 , -0.05 , -0.05 , 95% CI: -0.05 , -0.05 , -0.05 , 95% CI: -0.05 , -0.05 , -0.06 ; once a week, $\beta =$ -0.03 , 95% CI: -0.05 , -0.05 , -0.06 ; once a week, $\beta =$ -0.05 , 95% CI: -0.02 , 0.01; -2.7 times/week, $\beta = 0.05$, 95% -10.002 , 0.11, $p =$ -0.05 , 95% CI: -0.002 , 0.11, $p =$ -0.05 , 95% CI: -0.002 , 0.12, $p =$ $-$			Frequency of playing
-57 mo was not significantly associated with fat mass (compared to rarely/not at all: once a month, $\beta = .0.3$, 95% CI: -0.12, 0.06; once a week, $\beta = 0.05$, 95% CI: -0.03, 0.13; 2-7 times/week, $\beta =$ -0.01, 95% CI: -0.03, 0.08, $p = 0.70$, lean mass (compared to rarely/not at all: once a month, $\beta =$ 0.005, 95% CI: -0.05, 0.06; once a week, $\beta =$ 0.003, 95% CI: -0.05, 0.06; once a week, $\beta =$ 0.03, 95% CI: -0.02, 0.07; 2-7 times/week, $\beta = 0.05$, 95% CI: -0.002, 0.11, $p =$ 0.05), or BMI (compared to rarely/not at all: once a month, $\beta = -0.05$, 95% CI: -0.10, 0.09; once a week, $\beta = 0.10$, 95% CI: 0.003, 0.19; 2-7 times/week, $\beta = 0.07$,			
with fat mass (compared to rarely/not at all: once a month, $\beta = -0.03$, 95% CI: -0.12, 0.06; once a week, $\beta = 0.05$, 95% CI: -0.03, 0.13; 2-7 times/week, $\beta =$ -0.01, 95% CI: -0.10, 0.08, p = 0.70), lean mass (compared to rarely/not at all: once a month, $\beta =$ 0.005, 95% CI: -0.05, 0.06; once a week, $\beta =$ 0.005, 95% CI: -0.02, 0.07; 2-7 times/week, $\beta = 0.05$, 95% CI: -0.02, 0.01; 2-7 times/week, $\beta = 0.05$, 95% CI: -0.02, 0.11, p = 0.05, 95% CI: -0.02, 0.11, p = 0.05, 95% CI: -0.02, 0.11, p = 0.05, 95% CI: -0.02, 95% CI: 0.003, 0.19; 2-7 times/week, $\beta = 0.07$,			
with fat mass (compared to rarely/not at all: once a month, $\beta = -0.03$, 95% CI: -0.12, 0.06; once a week, $\beta = 0.05$, 95% CI: -0.03, 0.13; 2-7 times/week, $\beta =$ -0.01, 95% CI: -0.10, 0.08, p = 0.70), lean mass (compared to rarely/not at all: once a month, $\beta =$ 0.005, 95% CI: -0.05, 0.06; once a week, $\beta =$ 0.005, 95% CI: -0.02, 0.07; 2-7 times/week, $\beta = 0.05$, 95% CI: -0.02, 0.01; 2-7 times/week, $\beta = 0.05$, 95% CI: -0.02, 0.11, p = 0.05, 95% CI: -0.02, 0.11, p = 0.05, 95% CI: -0.02, 0.11, p = 0.05, 95% CI: -0.02, 95% CI: 0.003, 0.19; 2-7 times/week, $\beta = 0.07$,			significantly associated
$\begin{array}{c} \text{month, } \beta = -0.03, 95\% \text{ CI:} \\ -0.12, 0.06; \text{ once a week,} \\ \beta = 0.05, 95\% \text{ CI:} -0.03, \\ 0.13; 2-7 \text{ times/week, } \beta = \\ -0.01, 95\% \text{ CI:} -0.10, \\ 0.08, p = 0.70), \text{ lean mass} \\ (\text{compared to rarely/not at} \\ all: \text{ once a month, } \beta = \\ 0.005, 95\% \text{ CI:} -0.05, \\ 0.06; \text{ once a week, } \beta = \\ 0.03, 95\% \text{ CI:} -0.02, 0.07; \\ 2-7 \text{ times/week, } \beta = 0.05, \\ 95\% \text{ CI:} -0.002, 0.11, p = \\ 0.05, \text{ or BMI} \text{ (compared} to rarely/not at all: once a \\ \text{ month, } \beta = -0.005, 95\% \\ \text{ CI:} -0.10, 0.09; \text{ once a } \\ \text{ week, } \beta = 0.05, 95\% \\ \text{ CI:} -0.10, 0.09; \text{ once a } \\ \text{ week, } \beta = 0.07, \\ \end{array}$			with fat mass (compared
$\begin{array}{c} -0.12, 0.06; \text{ once a week}, \\ \beta = 0.05, 95\% \text{ CI: } -0.03, \\ 0.13; 2-7 \text{ times/week}, \beta = \\ -0.01, 95\% \text{ CI: } -0.10, \\ 0.08, p = 0.70, \text{ lean mass} \\ (\text{compared to rarely/not at all: once a month, } \beta = \\ 0.005, 95\% \text{ CI: } -0.05, \\ 0.06; \text{ once a week}, \beta = \\ 0.03, 95\% \text{ CI: } -0.02, 0.07; \\ 2-7 \text{ times/week}, \beta = 0.05, \\ 95\% \text{ CI: } -0.02, 0.11, p = \\ 0.05), \text{ or BMI (compared to rarely/not at all: once a month, } \beta = \\ 0.05, 95\% \text{ CI: } -0.002, 0.11, p = \\ 0.05), \text{ or BMI (compared to rarely/not at all: once a month, } \beta = -0.005, 95\% \text{ CI: } -0.002, 0.11, p = \\ 0.05), \text{ or BMI (compared to rarely/not at all: once a month, } \beta = -0.005, 95\% \text{ CI: } -0.002, 0.11, p = \\ 0.003, 0.19; 2-7 \text{ times/week}, \beta = 0.07, \\ \end{array}$			to rarely/not at all: once a
$\begin{array}{c} -0.12, 0.06; \text{ once a week}, \\ \beta = 0.05, 95\% \text{ CI: } -0.03, \\ 0.13; 2-7 \text{ times/week}, \beta = \\ -0.01, 95\% \text{ CI: } -0.10, \\ 0.08, p = 0.70, \text{ lean mass} \\ (\text{compared to rarely/not at all: once a month, } \beta = \\ 0.005, 95\% \text{ CI: } -0.05, \\ 0.06; \text{ once a week}, \beta = \\ 0.03, 95\% \text{ CI: } -0.02, 0.07; \\ 2-7 \text{ times/week}, \beta = 0.05, \\ 95\% \text{ CI: } -0.02, 0.11, p = \\ 0.05), \text{ or BMI (compared to rarely/not at all: once a month, } \beta = \\ 0.05, 95\% \text{ CI: } -0.002, 0.11, p = \\ 0.05), \text{ or BMI (compared to rarely/not at all: once a month, } \beta = -0.005, 95\% \text{ CI: } -0.002, 0.11, p = \\ 0.05), \text{ or BMI (compared to rarely/not at all: once a month, } \beta = -0.005, 95\% \text{ CI: } -0.002, 0.11, p = \\ 0.003, 0.19; 2-7 \text{ times/week}, \beta = 0.07, \\ \end{array}$			month, β = -0.03, 95% CI:
$\begin{array}{c} 0.13; 2-7 \text{ times/week, } \beta = \\ -0.01, 95\% \text{ CI: } -0.10, \\ 0.08, p = 0.70), \text{ lean mass} \\ (compared to rarely/not at all: once a month, \beta = \\ 0.005, 95\% \text{ CI: } -0.05, \\ 0.06; once a week, \beta = \\ 0.03, 95\% \text{ CI: } -0.02, 0.07; \\ 2-7 \text{ times/week, } \beta = 0.05, \\ 95\% \text{ CI: } -0.002, 0.11, p = \\ 0.05), \text{ or BMI (compared to rarely/not at all: once a month, } \beta = -0.005, 95\% \\ \text{ CI: } -0.10, 0.09; once a \\ \text{ week, } \beta = 0.10, 95\% \\ \text{ CI: } -0.005, 95\% \\ \text{ CI: } $			
$\begin{array}{c c} -0.01, 95\% \text{ CI: } -0.10, \\ 0.08, p = 0.70), \textbf{lean mass} \\ (compared to rarely/not at all: once a month, \beta = \\ 0.005, 95\% \text{ CI: } -0.05, \\ 0.06; once a week, \beta = \\ 0.03, 95\% \text{ CI: } -0.02, 0.07; \\ 2-7 \text{ times/week}, \beta = 0.05, \\ 95\% \text{ CI: } -0.002, 0.11, p = \\ 0.05), or BMI (compared to rarely/not at all: once a \\ month, \beta = -0.005, 95\% \\ \text{ CI: } -0.10, 0.09; once a \\ week, \beta = 0.10, 95\% \\ \text{ CI: } -0.10, 95\% \\ \text{ CI: } -0.19, 95\% \\ \text{ CI: } -0.10, 95\% \\ \text{ CI: } -0.07, \\ \text{ times/week, } \beta = 0.07, \\ \end{array}$			$\beta = 0.05, 95\%$ CI: -0.03,
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c } 0.08, p = 0.70), \textbf{lean mass} \\ (compared to rarely/not at all: once a month, \beta = \\ 0.005, 95\% \text{ CI: } -0.05, \\ 0.06; once a week, \beta = \\ 0.03, 95\% \text{ CI: } -0.02, 0.07; \\ 2-7 \text{ times/week}, \beta = 0.05, \\ 95\% \text{ CI: } -0.002, 0.11, p = \\ 0.05), or BMI (compared to rarely/not at all: once a month, \beta = -0.005, 95\% \text{ CI: } -0.005, 95\% \text{ CI: } -0.02, 0.95\% \text{ CI: } -0.005, 95\% \text{ CI: } -0.01, 0.09; once a week, \beta = 0.10, 95\% \text{ CI: } -0.10, 0.09; once a week, \beta = 0.10, 95\% \text{ CI: } -0.10, 0.95\% \text{ CI: } -0.003, 0.19; 2-7 \text{ times/week, } \beta = 0.07, \\ \end{array}$			0.13; 2-7 times/week, $\beta =$
(compared to rarely/not at all: once a month, β = 0.005, 95% CI: -0.05, 0.06; once a week, β = 0.03, 95% CI: -0.02, 0.07; 2-7 times/week, β = 0.05, 95% CI: -0.002, 0.11, p = 0.05), or BMI (compared to rarely/not at all: once a month, β = -0.005, 95% CI: -0.10, 0.09; once a week, β = 0.10, 95% CI: 0.003, 0.19; 2-7 times/week, β = 0.07,			-0.01, 95% CI: -0.10,
all: once a month, $\beta = 0.005, 95\%$ CI: -0.05, 0.06; once a week, $\beta = 0.03, 95\%$ CI: -0.02, 0.07; 2-7 times/week, $\beta = 0.05$, 95% CI: -0.002, 0.11, p = 0.05), or BMI (compared to rarely/not at all: once a month, $\beta = -0.005, 95\%$ CI: -0.10, 0.09; once a week, $\beta = 0.10, 95\%$ CI: 0.003, 0.19; 2-7 times/week, $\beta = 0.07$,			0.08, p = 0.70), lean mass
$\begin{array}{c} 0.005, 95\% \text{ CI: } -0.05, \\ 0.06; \text{ once a week, } \beta = \\ 0.03, 95\% \text{ CI: } -0.02, 0.07; \\ 2-7 \text{ times/week, } \beta = 0.05, \\ 95\% \text{ CI: } -0.002, 0.11, p = \\ 0.05), \text{ or } \textbf{BMI} \text{ (compared} \\ \text{ to rarely/not at all: once a} \\ \text{ month, } \beta = -0.005, 95\% \\ \text{ CI: } -0.10, 0.09; \text{ once a} \\ \text{ week, } \beta = 0.10, 95\% \text{ CI:} \\ 0.003, 0.19; 2-7 \\ \text{ times/week, } \beta = 0.07, \end{array}$			(compared to rarely/not at
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c } 0.06; \text{ once a week, } \beta = \\ 0.03, 95\% \text{ CI: } -0.02, 0.07; \\ 2-7 \text{ times/week, } \beta = 0.05, \\ 95\% \text{ CI: } -0.002, 0.11, p = \\ 0.05), \text{ or } \textbf{BMI} \text{ (compared} \\ \text{ to rarely/not at all: once a} \\ \text{ month, } \beta = -0.005, 95\% \\ \text{ CI: } -0.10, 0.09; \text{ once a} \\ \text{ week, } \beta = 0.10, 95\% \text{ CI:} \\ 0.003, 0.19; 2-7 \\ \text{ times/week, } \beta = 0.07, \end{array}$			all: once a month, $\beta =$
$\begin{array}{c} 0.03, 95\% \text{ CI: } -0.02, 0.07;\\ 2-7 \text{ times/week, } \beta = 0.05,\\ 95\% \text{ CI: } -0.002, 0.11, p =\\ 0.05), \text{ or } \textbf{BMI} \text{ (compared}\\ \text{ to rarely/not at all: once a}\\ \text{ month, } \beta = -0.005, 95\%\\ \text{ CI: } -0.10, 0.09; \text{ once a}\\ \text{ week, } \beta = 0.10, 95\% \text{ CI:}\\ 0.003, 0.19; 2-7\\ \text{ times/week, } \beta = 0.07, \end{array}$			0.005, 95% CI: -0.05,
2-7 times/week, $\beta = 0.05$, 95% CI: -0.002, 0.11, p = 0.05), or BMI (compared to rarely/not at all: once a month, $\beta = -0.005$, 95% CI: -0.10, 0.09; once a week, $\beta = 0.10$, 95% CI: 0.003, 0.19; 2-7 times/week, $\beta = 0.07$,			0.06; once a week, $\beta =$
95% CI: -0.002, 0.11, p = 0.05), or BMI (compared to rarely/not at all: once a month, β = -0.005, 95% CI: -0.10, 0.09; once a week, β = 0.10, 95% CI: 0.003, 0.19; 2-7 times/week, β = 0.07,			0.03, 95% CI: -0.02, 0.07;
$\begin{array}{c} 0.05), \text{ or } \mathbf{BMI} \text{ (compared} \\ \text{to rarely/not at all: once a} \\ \text{month, } \beta = -0.005, 95\% \\ \text{CI: } -0.10, 0.09; \text{ once a} \\ \text{week, } \beta = 0.10, 95\% \text{ CI:} \\ 0.003, 0.19; 2-7 \\ \text{times/week, } \beta = 0.07, \end{array}$			2-7 times/week, $\beta = 0.05$,
to rarely/not at all: once a month, $\beta = -0.005$, 95% CI: -0.10, 0.09; once a week, $\beta = 0.10$, 95% CI: 0.003, 0.19; 2-7 times/week, $\beta = 0.07$,			95% CI: -0.002, 0.11, p =
$\begin{array}{l} \text{month, } \beta = -0.005, 95\%\\ \text{CI: } -0.10, 0.09; \text{ once a}\\ \text{week, } \beta = 0.10, 95\% \text{ CI:}\\ 0.003, 0.19; 2-7\\ \text{times/week, } \beta = 0.07, \end{array}$			0.05), or BMI (compared
CI: -0.10, 0.09; once a week, $\beta = 0.10$, 95% CI: 0.003, 0.19; 2-7 times/week, $\beta = 0.07$,			to rarely/not at all: once a
week, $\beta = 0.10, 95\%$ CI: 0.003, 0.19; 2-7 times/week, $\beta = 0.07$,			month, $\beta = -0.005, 95\%$
0.003, 0.19; 2-7 times/week, $\beta = 0.07$,			CI: -0.10, 0.09; once a
times/week, $\beta = 0.07$,			
times/week, $\beta = 0.07$,			-
			times/week, $\beta = 0.07$,

[0.06) at age ~15 yr.	
Flores and Lin	Longitudinal	N = 6800	TV time (hr/dev) and	Weight status (Centers	Children with overweight	Pacific islander
	Longitudinal	1N = 0800	TV time (hr/day) and time wetching DVD s	for Disease Control and	•	
2013[12]; USA	$(\sim 1 \text{ to } 2 \text{ yr})$	A	time watching DVDs		status had greater TV	race/ethnicity, non-
	follow-up)	Approximate ages:	(hr/day) on weekdays	Prevention (CDC) cut-	time (2.5 hr/day) at	English primary language
Early Childhood		Baseline, "preschool	assessed by parent-report	points; categories: not	preschool age than	spoken at home, and
Longitudinal		age" (3 to 4 yr)	questionnaire	overweight, overweight)	children without	number of children in the
Study-Birth Cohort		Pre-schoolers	(unpublished).	determined from BMI	overweight status (2.2	household.
(ECLS-B)		F 11		(calculated from	hr/day) at entry to	
		Follow-up, "kindergarten entry"		objectively measured height and weight).	kindergarten (p = 0.03).	
		School-age			Time watching DVDs on	
					weekdays at preschool age	
					was unfavourably	
					associated with	
					overweight status at entry	
					to kindergarten (compared	
					to not overweight, for	
					each additional hour of	
					time watching DVDs, OR	
					= 1.1, 95% CI: 1.01,	
					1.14).	
Olafsdottir et al.	Longitudinal	N = unclear (only the	TV time (hr/day; TV,	BMI (kg/m ²) calculated	TV time at baseline was	Age, sex, parental
2014 [13]; Estonia,	(2 yr follow-	total study sample is	video, DVD) and screen	from objectively measured	unfavourably associated	education, intervention
Sweden, Germany,	up)	reported, but this	time (hr/day; TV, video,	height and weight.	with % change in BMI	and study centre.
Belgium, Hungary,		includes other age	DVD, computer) assessed		from baseline to 2-yr	
Italy, Spain and		groups that are not of	by parent-report	Waist-to-height ratio	follow-up (odds of being	
Cyprus		interest)	questionnaire	(WHtR; no units, ratio)	in highest quintile of %	
			(unpublished).	calculated from	change in BMI for each	
Identification and		Age range at		objectively measured	hr/day of TV: OR = 1.23,	
prevention of		baseline: $2 \text{ to} < 6 \text{ yr}$		height and waist	95% CI: 1.08, 1.40, p <	
dietary and		Toddlers and Pre-		circumference (measured	0.01).	
lifestyle-induced		schoolers		at the midpoint between		
health effects in				the iliac crest and the	TV time at baseline was	
children and				lower costal border or 10 th	unfavourably associated	
infants (IDEFICS)				rib).	with % change in WHtR	
					from baseline to 2-yr	
				Weight status (IOTF cut-	follow-up (odds of being	
				points [14]; categories:	in highest quintile of %	
				normal weight or	change in WHtR for each	

	1	1			1	
				underweight, overweight	hr/day of TV: OR = 1.32,	
				or obese) determined from	95% CI: 1.14, 1.52, p <	
				BMI (calculated from	0.001).	
				objectively measured		
				height and weight).	Screen time at baseline	
					was unfavourably	
					associated with % change	
					in BMI from baseline to	
					2-yr follow-up (odds of	
					being in highest quintile	
					of % change in BMI for	
					each hr/day of screen	
					time: $OR = 1.15, 95\%$ CI:	
					1.04, 1.28, p < 0.01).	
					1.0 1, 1.20, p < 0.01 <i>)</i> .	
					Screen time at baseline	
					was unfavourably	
					associated with % change	
					in WHtR from baseline to	
					2-yr follow-up (odds of	
					being in highest quintile	
					of % change in WHtR for	
					each hr/day of screen	
					time: OR = 1.22, 95% CI:	
					1.09, 1.36, p < 0.01).	
Wheaton et al.	Longitudinal	N = 4169	TV time (hr/day) and	Change in weight status	Weekday TV time at age	Weekday TV time: Fruit
2015 [15];	(~ 6 yr follow-		computer time (hr/day)	[World Health	~5 yr was not associated	and vegetable intake,
Australia	up)	Mean age:	on weekdays and weekend	Organization (WHO) cut-	with change in weight	high-fat foods, sugar-
		T1, 4.80 yr;	days assessed by parent-	points; overweight (OW;	status from 5 to ~7 yr	sweetened beverages;
LSAC		Pre-schoolers	report questionnaire	>+1 SD), obese (OB; >+2	(compared to remained	computer use week and
			(unpublished).	SD); categories: normal	NW: NW to OW/OB,	weekend day; TV use
		T2, 6.87 yr;		(NW) to OW/OB,	RRR = 0.84, SE = 0.19, p	weekend day; sex;
		T3, 8.85 yr;		OW/OB to NW, remained	= 0.45; remained OW/OB,	ethnicity; socioeconomic
		T4, 10.89 yr		NW, OW/OB] determined	RRR = 1.02, SE = 0.15, p	position; mother and
		School-age		from BMI z-score	= 0.91; OW/OB to NW,	father BMI.
				(calculated from	RRR = 0.99, SE = 0.21, p	
				objectively measured	= 0.34), 5 to ~9 yr	Weekend TV time: Same
				height and weight).	(compared to remained	as above, except "TV use
				neight and weight).	(compared to remained	as above, except 1 v use

		NW: NW to OW/OB,	weekday" instead of "TV
			-
		RRR = 1.01, SE = 0.18, p	use weekend day".
		= 0.95; remained OW/OB,	
		RRR = 1.18, SE = 0.18, p	Weekday computer
		= 0.26; OW/OB to NW,	time: Same as for
		RRR = 0.97, SE = 0.17, p	"weekday TV time",
		= 0.87), or 5 to ~11 yr	except "TV use weekday"
		(compared to remained	instead of "computer use
		NW: NW to OW/OB,	weekday".
		RRR = 0.96, SE = 0.18, p	
		= 0.82; remained OW/OB,	Weekend computer
		RRR = 1.10, SE = 0.18, p	time: Same as for
		= 0.54; OW/OB to NW,	"weekday TV time",
		RRR = 1.08, SE = 0.17, p	except "TV use weekday"
		= 0.65).	instead of "computer use
			weekend day".
		Weekend TV time at age	
		~5 yr was not associated	
		with change in weight	
		status from 5 to \sim 7 yr	
		(compared to remained	
		NW: NW to OW/OB,	
		RRR = 1.27, SE = 0.26, p	
		= 0.24; remained OW/OB,	
		RRR = 1.21, SE = 0.15, p	
		= 0.14; OW/OB to NW,	
		RRR = 1.05, SE = 0.15, p	
		= 0.76), or 5 to ~11 yr	
		(compared to remained	
		NW: NW to OW/OB,	
		RRR = 1.17, SE = 0.17, p	
		= 0.28; remained OW/OB,	
		RRR = 1.12, SE = 0.15, p	
		= 0.39; OW/OB to NW,	
		RRR = 1.19, SE = 0.18, p	
		= 0.25), but was	
		unfavourably associated	
		with likelihood of	
		changing from normal	
L		00	1

weight to
overweight/obese status
at age ~9 yr (compared to
remained NW: NW to
OW/OB, RRR = 1.39, SE
= 0.23, p < 0.05 ; remained
OW/OB, RRR = 1.24, SE
= 0.16, p = 0.87; OW/OB
to NW, RRR = 1.11, SE =
0.17, p = 0.47).
Weekday computer time
at age ~5 yr was not
associated with change in
weight status from 5 to ~
7 yr (compared to
remained NW: NW to
OW/OB, RRR = 1.17, SE
= 0.21, p = 0.38; remained
OW/OB, RRR = 1.04, SE
= 0.12, p = 0.74; OW/OB
to NW, RRR = 0.83, SE =
0.12, p = 0.19), 5 to ~9 yr
(compared to remained
NW: NW to OW/OB,
RRR = 0.94, SE = 0.13, p
= 0.66; remained OW/OB,
RRR = 1.00, SE = 0.12, p
= 0.98; OW/OB to NW,
RRR = 0.78, SE = 0.12, p
= 0.10), or 5 to ~11 yr
(compared to remained
NW: NW to OW/OB,
RRR = 0.95, SE = 0.13, p
= 0.87; remained OW/OB,
RRR = 1.06, SE = 0.13, p
= 0.70; OW/OB to NW,
RRR = 0.78, SE = 0.11, p
= 0.09).

						12
					Weekend computer time at age ~ 5 yr was not associated with change in weight status from 5 to ~7 yr (compared to remained NW: NW to OW/OB, RRR = 0.87, SE = 0.15, p = 0.43; remained OW/OB, RRR = 1.07, SE = 0.11, p = 0.53; OW/OB to NW, RRR = 0.99, SE = 0.13, p = 0.96), 5 to ~9 yr (compared to remained NW: NW to OW/OB, RRR = 0.94, SE = 0.12, p = 0.63; remained OW/OB, RRR = 1.09, SE = 0.11, p = 0.40; OW/OB to NW, RRR = 1.01, SE = 0.14, p = 0.97), or 5 to ~11 yr (compared to remained NW: NW to OW/OB, RRR = 0.93, SE = 0.11, p = 0.56; remained OW/OB, RRR = 1.04, SE = 0.12, p = 0.73; OW/OB to NW, RRR = 1.01, SE = 0.13, p = 0.92).	
De Coen et al. 2013[16]; Belgium	Longitudinal [~30 mo (2.5 yr) follow-up]	N = 538 Mean age, baseline: 4.95 yr Pre-schoolers Follow-up at "18 mo" or "30 mo" after baseline (mean age	Screen time (hr/day; TV, computer, DVD, etc.) on weekdays and weekend days assessed by parent- report questionnaire (unpublished).	Weight status [Flemish reference data; categories: normal weight, overweight (>+1 SD)] determined from BMI z- scores (calculated from objectively measured height and weight).	Weekday screen time at age ~5 yr was not associated with having overweight weight status at ~18 mo follow-up (compared to ≤ 1 hr/day, OR = 1.91, 95% CI: 0.91, 3.06, p = 0.08) or ~30 mo (compared to ≤ 1 hr/day,	Weight status at baseline, living situation, number of children in the family, maternal education level, paternal education level, language spoken at home, maternal professional status, paternal professional status, soft

		not reported) School-age			OR = 2.07, 95% CI: 0.98, 4.25, p = 0.06). Weekend screen time at age ~5 yr was not associated with having overweight weight status at ~18 mo follow-up (compared to ≤ 2 hr/day, OR = 1.07, 95% CI: 0.49, 2.34, p > 0.10) or ~30 mo (compared to ≤ 2 hr/day, OR = 1.00, 95% CI: 0.39, 2.56, p > 0.10).	drinks consumption, water consumption, milk products consumption, fruit consumption, vegetable consumption, sweet and savory snacks consumption, <i>physical</i> <i>activity at home</i> , <i>structured physical</i> <i>activity</i> , screen time on weekends <i>or</i> weekdays.
Study Design:						
Case-Control		N				
Koleilat et al. 2012 [17]; USA	Case-Control	N = 556 Cases (overweight),	TV time (hr/day) assessed by parent-report interview	Weight status (CDC cut- points; categories:	The proportion of children with <1 hr/day or ≥1	Gender, race, maternal BMI, maternal education,
		n = 260 Controls (healthy weight), n = 263 Age Range: 3-4 yr Pre-schoolers	(unpublished format).	overweight >95th percentile, healthy weight 25-75th percentile) determined from BMI (calculated from objectively measured height and weight).	hr/day TV time was not different between the healthy weight and overweight groups (<1 hr/day: healthy weight, 20.27%; overweight, 14.23% ; ≥ 1 hr/day: healthy weight, 79.73% ; overweight, 85.77% ; p > 0.05). Watching TV for ≥ 1 hr/day was unfavourably associated with having overweight status (OR = 1.71, 95% CI: $1.07, 2.75$, p = 0.02).	maternal occupation, number of hours in child care, number of days in child care, quality of the home environment.
					p = 0.02).	
Kain and Andrade	Case-Control	N=686	TV time (hr/day) and	Weight status (WHO cut-	TV time was not different	N/A

		n=237 Control, n=449 Approximate age: 4 yr Pre-schoolers	energy expenditure < 1.2- 1.4 METs using previously published reference values for activities) assessed by one-day parent-recall of usual activities during a week day (unpublished format).	obese, weight/height -1 to 1 SD) determined from the ratio of objectively measured height to weight.	(boys: 3.2 hr/day; girls: 3.3 hr/day) and non-obese weight status (boys: 3.4 hr/day; girls: 3.2 hr/day) (both p > 0.05). Total sedentary time was not different between children with obese weight status (boys: 7.8 hr/day; girls: 8.0 hr/day) and non-obese weight status (boys: 7.9 hr/day; girls: 8.1 hr/day) (both p > 0.05).	
Study Design:	1					
Cross-sectional						
Sijtsma et al.	Cross-	N = 1722	Time in baby seats	Weight-for-height (z-	Time in baby seats was	N/A
2013[2];	sectional		(hr/day; categories: never,	score) calculated from	not associated with	
Netherlands		Approximate age:	<1 hr/day; ≥1 hr/day; e.g.,	objectively measured	weight-for-height (Never,	
		9 mo (0.75 yr)	car seat or child seat)	weight and height.	0.28, SD = 1.06; <1 hr,	
Groningen Expert		Infants	assessed by parent-report		0.04 , SD = 0.98 ; ≥ 1 hr,	
Center for Kids			questionnaire	Weight-for-age (z-score)	0.02, SD = 1.01; p >	
with Obesity			(unpublished).	calculated using	0.05), weight-for age	
(GECKO) Drenthe				objectively measured	(Never, 0.31 , SD = 1.05 ;	
birth cohort				weight.	<1 hr, 0.03, SD = 0.98; ≥ 1	
					hr, 0.07, SD = 0.98; p >	
				Waist circumference-	0.05) or waist	
				for-age (z-score)	circumference-for-age	
				calculating using	(Never, 0.10 , SD = 1.09 ;	
				objectively measured waist circumference	<1 hr, -0.02, SD = 1.00; ≥1 hr, 0.07, SD = 0.97; p	
				(measured at the mid-	≥ 1 nr, 0.07, SD = 0.97, p > 0.05).	
				point between the lower	<i>~</i> 0.0 <i>3J</i> .	
				costal margin and the		
				level of the anterior		
				superior iliac spine).		
				superior nue spine).		

Wen et al. 2014	Cross-	N = 242	TV time (hr/week)	BMI (kg/m ²) calculated	TV time was	Breastfeeding, birth
[19]; Australia	sectional		assessed by parent-report	from objectively measured	unfavourably associated	weight, mothers' weight
		Approximate age:	questionnaire [20].	height and weight.	with BMI (unadjusted: β	status, mothers' country of
Healthy		2 yr			= 0.08, 95% CI: 0.02,	birth, marital status,
Beginnings Trial		Toddlers		Weight status	0.14; adjusted: $\beta = 0.09$,	education level.
				(categories: normal	95% CI: 0.03, 0.15, p =	
				weight, overweight,	0.003) and having	
				obese) determined from	overweight/obese weight	
				BMI and IOTF cut-points	status in unadjusted (OR	
				from [14].	= 1.1, 95% CI: 1.01, 1.21)	
					but not adjusted (data not	
					reported) analyses.	
Johansson et al.	Cross-	N = 123	Total sedentary time	Weight status (IOTF cut-	Total sedentary time was	
2015 [21]; Sweden	sectional		min/day; ≤89 counts/5 sec	[14]; categories: normal	not different between	
		Mean age: 2.03 yr	epoch) measured	weight, overweight/obese)	children with normal	
Early Stockholm		Toddlers	objectively by	determined from BMI	(432, SD = 48 min/day)	
Obesity Prevention			accelerometer (Actigraph,	(calculated from	and overweight (422, SD	
Project (Early			GT3X+ worn on the	objectively measured	= 40 min/day) weight	
STOPP)			wrist).	height and weight).	status (p = 0.42).	
			Number of 30 min bouts		The number of 30 min	
			of sedentary behaviour		bouts of sedentary	
			and total time in 30 min		behaviour was not	
			bouts of sedentary		different between children	
			behaviour (number and		with normal $(2.2, SD =$	
			min/day; 30 min of \leq 89		1.3 bouts) and overweight	
			counts/5 sec with a 1 min		(2.4, SD = 0.8 bouts)	
			interruption of >89		weight status $(p = 0.73)$,	
			counts/5 sec allowed).		nor was the total time in	
					30 min bouts of	
					sedentary behaviour	
					(normal weight: 155, SE =	
					83 min; overweight: 146,	
					SD = 51 min; p = 0.63).	
Wijtzes et al. 2013	Cross-	N = 347	Total sedentary time (%	BMI z-score (no units)	Total sedentary time was	N/A
[22]; Netherlands	sectional		of monitored time;	calculated from	not associated with BMI	
		Approximate age: 25	measured on 1 weekday	objectively measured	z-score ($\beta = 0.10, 95\%$	
Generation R		mo (2.1 yr)	and 1 weekend day; ≤301	height and weight.	CI: -0.4 - 0.6, p > 0.05).	
Study		Toddlers	counts/15 sec epoch)			

		•				
			measured objectively by			
			accelerometer (Actigraph,			
			AM-7164).			
Fuller-Tyszkiewicz	Cross-	N = 4724	TV time (min/week)	BMI (kg/m ²) calculated	TV time was not cross-	N/A
et al. 2012 [7];	sectional		assessed by parent-report	from objectively measured	sectionally associated with	
Australia		Mean age:	interview (unpublished	height and weight.	BMI at age 2.29 yr ($r =$	
		T1, 2.29 yr	format).		0.01, p > 0.05, but was	
LSAC		Toddlers	Torrinac).		unfavourably associated	
Lone		rodulers			with BMI at age 4.25 yr (r	
		T2, 4.25 yr			= 0.03, p < 0.05).	
		Pre-schoolers			= 0.03, p < 0.05).	
XX7'11'	Const		Tatal as loss to sure these a			NT/A
Williams et al.	Cross-	N = 198	Total sedentary time	BMI z-score (no units)	Total sedentary time was	N/A
2008 [23]; USA	sectional		(hr/day; <37.5 counts/15	calculated from	not associated with BMI	
		Approximate age:	sec epoch) measured	objectively measured	z-score (<i>r</i> = -0.09, p >	
Children's Activity		3 yr and 4 yr	objectively by	height and weight	0.05).	
and Movement in		Pre-schoolers	accelerometer (Actigraph,			
Preschool Study			7164).			
(CHAMPS)						
Chiasson et al.	Cross-	N = 47,287	Screen time (hr/day; TV	Weight status (CDC cut-	Screen time was	Race, residence,
2016 [24]; USA	sectional		videos, DVDs, using the	points; categories: not	unfavourably associated	birthweight, breastfeeding
		Approximate age:	computer, computer	obese, <85 th percentile;	with obese weight status	package, exposure to new
		3 yr	games) assessed by	obese, $\geq 95^{\text{th}}$ percentile)	(unadjusted: compared to	"Women Infants and
		Toddlers	parent-report interview	determined from BMI	>2 hr/day, ≤2 hr/day: OR	Children" food package,
			(unpublished format).	(calculated from	= 0.85, 95% CI: 0.77,	healthy food daily.
				objectively measured	0.93, p < 0.001; <i>adjusted</i> :	
				height and weight).	OR = 0.87, 95% CI: 0.79,	
					0.95, p < 0.001).	
Dennison et al.	Cross-	N = 1182	Screen time (hr/day; TV,	Weight status	Screen time was not	Child age, child sex,
2002 [25]; USA	sectional		video) assessed by parent-	(categories: overweight, >	associated with weight	parental educational
2002 [20], 0011	sectional	Age range: 1 to 4 yr	report questionnaire	85 th percentile; non-	status (OR = 0.99, 95%	attainment, race/ethnicity,
		Toddlers and Pre-	(unpublished).	overweight, ≤85 th	CI: 0.91 , 1.08 , $p = 0.80$).	maternal BMI, TV set in
		schoolers	(unpublished).	percentile) determined	C1. 0.91 , 1.08 , $p = 0.80$).	bedroom.
		501100101515		from BMI (calculated		
				,		
				from objectively measured		
				height and weight).		
Twarog et al. 2015	Cross-	N = 1282	Screen time (hr/day; TV	Weight status (CDC cut-	Screen time was	Age, race/ethnicity,
[26] ; USA	sectional		and videos) assessed by	points; categories: not	unfavourably associated	gender, poverty status.

		Age range: 2 to 4 yr	parent-report using the	obese, <95 th percentile;	with obese weight status	
National Health		Toddlers and Pre-	Physical Activity section	obese, $\geq 95^{\text{th}}$ percentile)	(compared to not obese	
and Nutrition		schoolers	of the Family	determined from BMI	weight status, odds for	
Examination			Questionnaire used in	(calculated from	screen time >2 hr/day with	
Survey (NHANES)			NHANES.	objectively measured	obese weight status, OR =	
(2009 to 2012)				height and weight).	1.58, 95% Wald	
, , ,					Confidence Interval: 1.03,	
					2.44, p < 0.05).	
Manios et al. 2009	Cross-	N = 2374	TV time (hr/day) assessed	Weight status (CDC cut-	Children with $\geq 2 hr/day$	Child's gender,
[27]; Greece	sectional		by parent-report	points; categories:	TV time had a higher	birthweight for gestational
		Age Range: 1 to 5 yr	questionnaire	underweight/normal	prevalence of overweight	age, weight gain in the
The Growth,		Toddlers and Pre-	(unpublished).	weight, overweight,	(18.6% vs 16.8%) and	first 6 months, place of
Exercise and		schoolers		obese) determined from	obesity (21.7% vs. 16.1%)	living, mother's
Nutrition				BMI (calculated from	than children with <2	educational status,
Epidemiological				"recorded" height and	hr/day (p = 0.003).	mother's TV viewing time,
Study in				weight).		father's TV viewing time,
preSchoolers				_	In those aged 3-5 yr , but	mother's smoking during
(GENESIS)					not those <3 yr (data not	pregnancy, parental
					reported), ≥2 hr/day TV	weight status, child's
					time was unfavourably	physical activity, child's
					associated with obesity in	total energy intake.
					unadjusted (compared to	
					<2 hr/day, unadjusted: OR	
					= 1.3, 95% CI: 1.01, 1.70,	
					p = 0.049), but not	
					adjusted analyses	
					(adjusted: $OR = 1.26$,	
					95% CI: 0.89, 1.79, p >	
					0.05).	
					In those aged 3-5 yr, each	
					additional hour of TV per	
					day was associated with	
					12% higher probability of	
					having obese weight	
					<pre>status (unadjusted: OR =</pre>	
					1.12, 95% CI: 1.03, 1.26;	
					p = 0.042).	

Asplund et al. 2015 [28]; USA	Cross- sectional	N = 302 Age range: 0 to 5 yr Also grouped into those <2 yr and ≥2 yr Infants, Toddlers, Pre-schoolers	Total screen time (hr/day; TV, video games, computers, cell phones and other electronic devices) assessed by parent-report questionnaire (unpublished). Children were grouped into categories based on "screen time guideline adherence": for those aged <2 yr, "no screen time", or "greater than no screen time"; for those aged "≥2 yr", <2 hr/day, or "≥2 hr/day".	Weight status (WHO cut- points, categories: underweight, healthy weight, overweight, obese) determined from BMI percentile (calculated from objectively measured height and weight).	Total screen time did not differ by weight status category (obese, 1.6 hr/day, SD = 1.1; overweight, 1.8 hr/day, SD = 1.7; healthy weight, 1.6 hr/day, SD = 1.7; p = 0.51). There was no association between "guideline adherence" and weight status in children < 2 yr of age (% in each category with no screen time: obese, 28; overweight, 37; healthy weight, 56; p = 0.06) or ≥ 2 yr of age (% in each category with <2hr/day screen time: obese, 65; overweight, 59; healthy weight, 54; p = 0.50). Children who were overweight/obese were not more or less likely to meet the screen time guidelines than children who were normal weight (healthy weight, reference; ages <2 yr: overweight/obese, OR = 0.35, 95% CI: 0.12, 1.05; ages ≥ 2 yr, overweight/obese, OR =	Age, parent age, ethnicity, survey language, parent- weighted daily screen time, TV on during dinner, and number of TVs in home.
					0.35, 95% CI: 0.12, 1.05;	

Nelson et al. 2006 [29]; USA	Cross- sectional	N = 375 Age range: 2 to 4 yr Toddlers and Pre- schoolers	Screen time (min/day; TV and computer) assessed by parent-report questionnaire (modified NHANES 1999-2003 questionnaire).	Weight status (CDC cut- points; categories: at risk of overweight/overweight, ≥85th percentile; healthy weight, <85th percentile) determined from BMI (calculated from objectively measured height and weight).	Screen time was not associated with weight status (compared to <2 hr: OR = 1.54, 95% CI: 0.99, 2.38, p = 0.07) in <i>unadjusted analysis</i> , but was unfavourably associated with at risk of overweight/overweight status (compared to <2 hr: OR = 1.74, 95% CI = 1.00, 3.04, p = 0.05) in <i>adjusted analysis</i> .	Race, ethnicity, asthma, non-juice fruit drink, <i>physical activity</i> .
LaRowe et al. 2010 [30]; USA Healthy Children Strong Families (HCSF)	Cross- sectional	N = 135 Age range: 2 to 5 yr Toddlers and Pre- schoolers	TV time (hr/day) assessed by parent-report questionnaire (unpublished). Sedentary time (hr/day; Pfeiffer et al. 2006 or Evenson et al. 2008 cut- points) measured objectively by accelerometer (Actical).	Weight status (CDC cut- points; categories: normal weight, <85th percentile; overweight, ≥85th percentile) determined from BMI (unclear if calculated from objectively measured or proxy-reported height and weight).	TV time was not different between children with overweight and normal weight status (mean TV time: overweight, 2.17, SD = 0.18 hr/day; normal weight, 1.83, SD = 0.14 hr/day; p < 0.23). Sedentary time was not different between children with overweight and normal weight status (mean sedentary time: overweight, 9.4, SD = 0.61 hr/day; normal weight, 8.5, SD = 0.40 hr/day, p = 0.44).	
Fulton et al. 2009; USA [31]; National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES; 1999 to 2006)	Cross- sectional	N = 2861 Girls, n = 1423 Boys, n = 1438 Age range: 2 to 5 yr Toddlers to Pre- schoolers	Screen time (hr/day; TV, video, computer) assessed by interviewer- administered parent-report questionnaire (unpublished).	Weight status (CDC cut- points; categories: normal weight, BMI <85 th percentile; overweight/obese, BMI ≥85 th percentile) determined from BMI (calculated from	Screen time was not associated with overweight/obese weight status in <i>boys</i> (compared to 0 to 2 hr/day: <i>unadjusted:</i> 2.5 to 4 hr/day, OR = 1.2, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.7; \geq 4.5 hr/day, OR	Race/ethnicity

				lower costal border or 10 th	unfavourably associated	
		schoolers		the iliac crest and the	Screen time was	
		Toddlers and Pre-		at the midpoint between		
		yr		circumference (measured	1.07, 1.27, p < 0.01).	
IDEFICS		Age range: 2 to < 6	(height and waist	>5 (OR = 1.17, 95% CI:	
-) P			(unpublished).	from objectively measured	and with having a WHtR	
Cyprus		interest)	questionnaire	units; ratio) calculated	CI: 1.11, 1.35, p < 0.01)	
Italy, Spain and		groups that are not of	by parent-report	Waist-to-height ratio (no	status (OR = 1.23, 95%	
Belgium, Hungary,		includes other age	DVD, computer) assessed	norgin und worgin.	overweight/obese weight	una stady contro.
Sweden, Germany,	Sectional	reported, but this	time (hr/day; TV, video,	height and weight.	with having	and study centre.
2014 [13]; Estonia,	sectional	total study sample is	video, DVD) and screen	from objectively measured	unfavourably associated	education, intervention
Olafsdottir et al.	Cross-	N = unclear (only the	TV time (hr/day; TV,	BMI (kg/m ²) calculated	TV time was	Age, sex, parental
					95% CI: 0.46, 0.98, p = 0.039).	
					$\leq 2 \text{ hr/day: OR} = 0.67,$	
					(compared to $3 + hr/day$,	
				height and weight).	with obese weight status	
				from objectively measured	unfavourably associated	
				from BMI (calculated	0.599) but was	
		schoolers		percentile) determined	95% CI: 0.66, 1.27, p =	
		Toddlers and Pre-		percentile; obese, ≥95th	$\leq 2 \text{ hr/day: OR} = 0.91,$	
		yr Traddlana ar d Dra	(unpublished).	overweight, \geq 85th to 90th	(compared to $3 + hr/day$,	fast food, chips.
		Age range: 2 to 5.99	questionnaire	weight, <85th percentile;	overweight status	vegetables, sweet drinks,
[32]; USA	sectional		assessed by parent-report	points; categories: normal	associated with	physical activity, fruit and
Chen et al. 2011	Cross-	N = 2036	Screen time (hr/day)	Weight status (CDC cut-	Screen time was not	Gender, age, ethnicity,
<u></u>		N. 2026			= 1.4, 95% CI: 0.8, 2.3).	
					0.7, 1.4; ≥4.5 hr/day, OR	
					hr/day, OR = 1.0, 95% CI:	
					2.3; <i>adjusted</i> : 2.5 to 4	
					OR = 1.4, 95% CI: 0.9,	
					CI: 0.7, 1.4; ≥4.5 hr/day,	
					4 hr/day, OR = 1.0, 95%	
					hr/day: unadjusted: 2.5 to	
					girls (compared to 0 to 2	
					1.5, 95% CI: 0.9, 2.6) or	
					1.7; ≥4.5 hr/day, OR =	
					OR = 1.2, 95% CI: 0.8,	
				height and weight).	adjusted: 2.5 to 4 hr/day,	
				objectively measured	= 1.4, 95% CI: 0.8, 2.3;	

Kourlaba et al.	Cross-	N = 2374	TV time (hr/day) assessed	rib). Weight status (IOTF cut- points [14]; categories: normal weight or underweight, overweight or obese) determined from BMI (calculated from objectively measured height and weight). Weight status (CDC cut-	with having overweight/obese weight status (OR = 1.19, 95% CI: 1.10-1.29, p < 0.001) and with having a WHtR > 5 (OR = 1.13, 95% CI: 1.05, 1.21, p < 0.001). TV time was not different	
2009 [33]; Greece	sectional	11-23/7	by parent-report	points; categories:	between those who were	
		Age range: 1 to 2 yr	questionnaire	underweight/normal	normal weight (1-2 yr,	
The GENESIS		(Toddlers) and 3-5	(unpublished).	weight, overweight,	0.73, SD = 0.88 hr/day; 3-	
Study		yr (Pre-schoolers)		obese) determined from	5 yr, 1.52, $SD = 1.09$	
				BMI (calculated from "recorded" height and	hr/day), overweight (1-2 yr, 0.97, SD = 1.02; 3-5	
				weight).	$y_{1}, 0.57, SD = 1.02, 5-5$ yr, 1.48, $SD = 1.06$), and	
				weight).	obese (1-2 yr, 0.85, SD =	
					0.99 hr/day; 3-5 yr, 1.66,	
					SD = 1.16 hr/day) (p >	
					0.05).	
Burdette and	Cross-	N = 2291	TV time (min/day)	BMI (kg/m ²) calculated	TV time was not	N/A
Whitaker 2005	sectional		assessed by parent-report	from objectively measured	correlated with BMI ($r = -$	
[34]; USA; Fragile Families and Child		Mean age: 39 mo (2.25 cm)	interview (unpublished	height and weight.	0.001, p = 0.952; values from author	
Wellbeing Study		(~3.25 yr) Pre-schoolers	format).		correspondence).	
Wendering Study		Tre-senoorers			correspondence).	
Dolinsky et al.	Cross-	N = 329	Total sedentary time	Weight status (cut-points	Total sedentary time was	Study site, child's mean
2011 [35]; USA;	sectional	M	hr/day; <12 counts/15 sec	from American Academy	not associated with weight	hours per day of
KAN-DO Study		Mean age: 3.5 yr Pre-schoolers	epoch) measured	of Pediatrics 2007 [36]; categories: underweight,	status (Reference, underweight; Healthy	accelerometry monitoring.
		FIE-schoolers	objectively by accelerometer (Actical;	<5 th percentile; healthy	weight: % difference =	
			Mini Mitter Co, Inc.).	weight, $\geq 5^{\text{th}}$ to $< 85^{\text{th}}$	0.9, 95% CI: -6.5, 8.9;	
				percentile; overweight,	Overweight: % difference	
				$\geq 85^{\text{th}}$ to $< 95^{\text{th}}$ percentile;	= -2.4, 95% CI: -10.1, 5.9;	
				obese, $\geq 95^{\text{th}}$ percentile)	Obese: % difference = 0.2 ,	
				determined from	95% CI: -8.1, 9.2; p =	

				objectively measured height and weight.	0.32).	
Minh Do et al.	Cross-	N = 2,677;	Screen time (hr/day; TV	Weight status (WHO cut-	The odds of	Sex, age, amount of food,
2015 [37]; Vietnam	sectional	Urban, n = 1,364;	time and time spent	points; categories:	overweight/obesity were	fatty food, fried food,
		Rural, n = 1,313	playing computer games)	overweight/obese, other)	not different between	irregular snack, eating
			assessed by parent-report	determined from BMI z-	those with <2 or ≥ 2	speed, outdoor activity,
		Mean age:	questionnaire	scores (calculated from	hr/day screen time in an	indoor activity, mother's
		Urban, 4.3 yr	(unpublished).	objectively measured	urban (unadjusted: <2	education, household size,
		Rural, 4.0 yr		height and weight).	hr/day, reference;	watching food
		Pre-schoolers			$\geq 2hr/day, OR = 0.79, 95\%$	advertisements on TV by
					CI: 0.56, 1.11, p = 0.16;	mother, watching food
					adjusted: OR = 0.75, 95%	advertisements on TV by
					CI: 0.50, 1.12) or rural	father, snack availability.
					(unadjusted: <2 hr/day,	
					reference; $\geq 2 \text{ hr/day, OR}$	
					= 0.38, 95% CI: 0.12,	
					1.23, p = 0.06; adjusted:	
					OR = 0.74, 95% CI: 0.21,	
					2.57) sample of children.	
Hajian-Tilaki and	Cross-	N = 760	TV time (hr/day) and	Weight status (CDC cut-	TV time of ≥ 2 hr/day did	N/A
Heidari 2013 [38];	sectional		time spent playing	points; categories:	not elevate odds of	
Iran		Age range: 2-5 yr	computer games (hr/day)	overweight/obese, ≥85th	overweight/obesity	
		Mean age:	assessed by parent-report	percentile;	compared to <2 hr/day	
		Boys, 4.23 yr;	questionnaire	normal/underweight,	(OR = 1.31, 95% CI: 0.92,	
		Girls, 4.24 yr	(unpublished).	<85th percentile)	1.82, p = 0.13).	
		Pre-schoolers		determined from BMI		
				(calculated from	Playing computer games	
				objectively measured	for ≥ 1 hr/day did not	
				height and weight).	elevate the odds of	
					overweight/obesity	
					compared to <1 hr/day	
					(OR = 1.46, 95% CI: 0.97,	
	~				2.19, p = 0.06).	
Mendoza et al.	Cross-	N = 1340	TV/video time (hr/day),	Weight status (WHO cut-	TV time (>2 hr/day vs ≤ 2	Age, gender,
2007 [39]; USA	sectional		computer time (hr/day),	points; categories:	hr/day) was unfavourably	race/ethnicity, income.
		Mean age: 3.5 yr	and screen time (hr/day;	overweight/at risk for	associated with being	
NHANES; 1999-		Pre-schoolers	TV/video and computer	overweight, ≥85th	overweight or at risk for	
2002			time) assessed by parent-	percentile; normal weight,	overweight (PR = 1.34,	
			report questionnaire	\geq 5th and <85th percentile;	95% CI: 1.07, 1.66, p =	

			(unpublished).	underweight excluded)	0.01) and with skinfold	
				determined from BMI	thickness ($\beta = 1.08, 95\%$	
				(calculated from	CI: 0.19, 1.96, p = 0.02).	
				objectively measured		
				height and weight).	Computer use (>0 hr/day	
					vs 0 hr/day) was not	
				Sum of skinfolds (triceps	associated with weight	
				and subscapular; mm)	status (PR = 1.16, 95%	
				measured using	CI: 0.89, 1.51, p > 0.05)	
				standardized techniques	but was unfavourably	
				and equipment.	associated with skinfold	
					thickness ($\beta = 0.56, 95\%$	
					CI: 0.04, 1.07, p = 0.04).	
					-	
					Screen time (>2 hr/day vs	
					≤2 hr/day) was not	
					associated with weight	
					status (PR = 1.21, 95%	
					CI: 0.96, 1.54, p > 0.05)	
					or skinfold thickness (β =	
					0.85, 95% CI: -0.04, 1.75,	
					p = 0.061).	
Sijtsma et al. 2015	Cross-	N = 759	Screen time (min/day; TV	BMI (kg/m ²) calculated	Screen time was	Gender; sleep duration is
[40]; The	sectional		and computer) assessed by	from objectively measured	unfavourably associated	a mediator.
Netherlands;		Age range: 3 to 4 yr	parent-report	height and weight.	with BMI (<i>r</i> = 0.101, p =	
Groningen Expert		Pre-schoolers	questionnaire	6 6	0.006).	
Center for Kids			(unpublished).			
with Obesity					In path analysis, screen	
(GECKO) Drenthe					time was directly	
birth cohort					unfavourably associated	
					with BMI (screen time \rightarrow	
					BMI: B = 0.0027, 95%	
					CI: 0.0004, 0.0050, p =	
					0.024) and indirectly	
					unfavourably associated	
					with BMI via reduced	
					sleep duration (screen	
					time \rightarrow sleep duration \rightarrow	
					BMI: $B = 0.0004, 95\%$	
	1			l	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	

					CI: 0.0001, 0.0010, p < 0.05). Therefore 1 hr (60 min) of screen time is directly associated with a higher BMI of $0.0027*60=0.16 \text{ kg/m}^2$, and $60*0.1153=7 \text{ min less}$ sleep (i.e., screen time \rightarrow sleep), which is associated with 7*0.0038=0.03 higher BMI (sleep \rightarrow BMI), for a total effect of $0.16+0.03=0.19 \text{ kg/m}^2$.	
Proctor et al. 2003 [41]; USA; Framingham Children's Study	Cross- sectional	N = 103 Mean age: 4.0 yr Pre-schoolers	TV time (hr/day) assessed by parent-report questionnaire (unpublished).	BMI (kg/m ²) calculated from objectively measured height and weight. Triceps skinfold thickness (mm), and sum of skinfolds (mm; triceps, subscapular, suprailiac, abdominal, thigh), measured using Lange calipers and a standard protocol.	TV time was not associated with BMI (BMI by tertile of TV time: Lowest, 16.3 kg/m ² , SD = 1.1; Middle, 16.1 kg/m ² , SD = 1.2; Highest, 16.2 kg/m ² , SD = 1.1; p > 0.05), triceps skinfold (triceps skinfold by tertile of TV time: Lowest, 11.5 mm, SD = 2.5; Middle, 10.9 mm, SD = 2.4; Highest, 11.5 mm, SD = 2.1; p > 0.05) or sum of skinfolds (sum of skinfolds by tertile of TV time: Lowest, 41.6 mm, SD = 10.8; Middle, 41.5 mm, SD = 10.4; Highest, 43.0 mm, 11.0; p > 0.05). Tertiles of TV time : Lowest, 1.1 hr/day, SD = 0.5; Middle, 1.6 hr/day, SD = 0.7; Highest, 2.4 hr/day, SD = 1.6.	N/A

Byun et al. 2013	Cross-	CHAMPS sample:	Total sedentary time	BMI z-score (no units)	In both samples, there was	Age, gender, race, parent
[42] ; USA	sectional	N = 263	(min/hr; measured	calculated from	no association between	education, preschool,
		Mean age, 4.2 yr	throughout the whole day	objectively measured	sedentary time and BMI	moderate-to-vigorous
CHAMPS		Pre-schoolers	in the CHAMPS sample	height and weight.	z-score , regardless of the	intensity physical activity.
			and the school day in the		accelerometer cut-points	
and		EDPAPC sample:	EDPAPC sample, over a		used.	
		N = 155	2-week period) measured			
Environmental		Mean age, 4.0 yr	objectively by		CHAMPS sample:	
Determinants of		Pre-schoolers	accelerometer (Actigraph,		- <37.5 counts/15 sec:	
Physical Activity			7164).		$\beta = -0.019, 95\%$ CI: -	
in Preschool					0.078, 0.039, p = 0.53	
Children			Different accelerometry		$-$ <200 counts/15 sec: β	
(EDPAPC) study			cut-points were applied to		= -0.076, 95% CI: -	
			determine whether the		0.235, 0.083, p = 0.35	
			association was dependent		$-$ <373 counts/15 sec: β	
			on the cut-points used:		= -0.333, 95% CI: -	
			- <37.5 counts/15 sec;		1.342, 0.676, p = 0.52	
			Pate et al. 2006 [43]		, , , ,	
			- <200 counts/15 sec;		EDPAPC sample:	
			Pate et al. 2006 [43]		- <37.5 counts/15 sec:	
			- <373 counts/15 sec van		$\beta = -0.041, 95\%$ CI: -	
			Cauwenberghe et al.		0.275, 0.192, p = 0.73	
			2011 [44]		$-$ <200 counts/15 sec: β	
					= -0.247, 95% CI: -	
					0.581, 0.086, p = 0.14	
					$-$ <373 counts/15 sec: β	
					= -0.417, 95% CI: -	
					0.991, 0.156, p =	
					0.15.	
					0.10.	
Brown et al. 2010	Cross-	N = 4965	TV time (hr/day; TV,	Weight status (IOTF cut-	TV time was	N/A
[45]; Australia;	sectional		video, DVD, or movie)	points; categories: non-	unfavourably associated	
Longitudinal Study		Age range:	assessed by parent-report	overweight,	with overweight/obese	
of Australian		T1: 4 to 5 yr	time-use diary	overweight/obese)	weight status (for every	
Children (LSAC)		Pre-schoolers	(unpublished).	determined from BMI	additional hour of TV, OR	
× -/				(calculated from	= 1.06, 95% CI: 1.01,	
				objectively measured	1.11; $B = 0.056$, $p < 0.05$).	
				height and weight).	. , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	

Taverno Ross et al. 2013 [46]; USA Study of Health and Activity in Preschool Environments (SHAPES)	Cross- sectional	N = 339 Mean age: 4.5 yr Pre-schoolers	TV time (categories: high TV and low TV, based on combined scores for TV time at home and TV exposure at preschool) assessed by parent-report and preschool director- report questionnaires (unpublished). At home: High TV, ≥2 hr/day; Low TV, <2 hr/day. At preschool: High TV, above the mean questionnaire score; Low	 BMI (kg/m² and z-score) calculated from objectively measured height and weight. Waist circumference (cm) measured objectively (with the child in the standing position; landmarks not specified). 	BMI was not different between the low TV and high TV groups (<i>unadjusted:</i> low TV vs high TV; absolute: 16.3, SD = $1.7 \text{ kg/m}^2 \text{ vs } 16.4$, SD = 2.3 kg/m^2 , p = 0.59 ; z-scores: 0.5 , SD = 1.0 vs 0.5, SD = 1.2 , p = 0.80 ; <i>adjusted:</i> low TV vs high TV; absolute: 16.4, SD = $0.2 \text{ kg/m}^2 \text{ vs } 16.2$, SD = 0.3 kg/m^2 , p = 0.65 ; z- scores: 0.6 , SD = 0.1 vs 0.3 SD = 0.2, p = 0.14). Waist circumference was	Gender, race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status ((SES) (parental education)), length of school day.
			TV, below the mean questionnaire score Combined: High TV, in the "high" group both at home and preschool; Low TV, all other TV exposure combinations.		low TV and high TV groups (<i>unadjusted:</i> 52.8, SD = 0.3 cm, vs 52.4, SD = 0.7, p = 0.68; <i>adjusted:</i> 53.0, SD = 0.4 cm, vs 52.7, SD = 0.7, p = 0.61).	
Boling Turer et al. 2013 [47]; USA Kids and Adults Now: Defeat Obesity! (KAN- DO)	Cross- sectional	N = 400 Mean age: 42 mo (3.5 yr) Pre-schoolers	Screen time (hr/day; TV, videos, computer, computer games) assessed by parent-report questionnaire (unpublished).	Weight status (CDC cut- points; categories: not overweight; overweight, ≥85 th percentile) determined from objectively measured weight and length.	Screen time was not associated with weight status (compared to ≤ 2 hr/day: <i>unadjusted:</i> OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.6; <i>adjusted:</i> OR = 1.2, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.9).	Age (in months), gender, race/ethnicity, and maternal weight status.
Collings et al. 2013 [48]; England Southampton	Cross- sectional	N = 398 Median age: 4.1 yr Pre-schoolers	Total sedentary time min/day; <30 counts/60 sec epoch) measured objectively by	Percentage body fat (% BF; (%) measured objectively using DXA.	In <i>unadjusted analyses</i> , sedentary time was unfavourably associated with %BF (<i>r</i> = 0.08, p <	Age, sex, birth weight, maternal education, maternal BMI, smoking during pregnancy, <i>sleep</i>

Women's Survey	1		accelerometer (Actiheart).	Fat mass index (FMI;	0.001), FMI (<i>r</i> = 0.058, p	duration, moderate-to-
women's Survey			acceleronneter (Actilieart).	kg/m ²), lean mass index	< 0.01), FMI ($r = -0.084$, $r = -0.084$,	vigorous intensity physical
				(LMI; $kg/m^{2.5}$) and trunk	p < 0.001), Livit ($r = -0.084$, p < 0.001) and TFMI ($r = -0.084$)	
						activity.
				fat mass index (TFMI; $1 + (x^2) = 1 + 1 + (x^2)$	0.062, p < 0.01).	
				kg/m^2) calculated from	T D D D	
				objectively measured	In adjusted analyses,	
				height and fat mass, lean	sedentary time was not	
				mass, and trunk fat mass	associated with % BF (β	
				respectively.	= 0.013, 95% CI: -0.54,	
					0.57, p = 0.96), FMI , (β =	
					-0.7, 95% CI: -3.30, 1.97,	
					$p = 0.60$), LMI ($\beta = -$	
					0.058, 95% CI: -0.16,	
					0.040, p = 0.25), or TFMI	
					$(\beta = -0.26, 95\% \text{ CI: } -3.67,$	
					3.26, p = 0.88).	
					Note: β 's are interpreted	
					as the % change in	
					outcome variable for a	
					120 min/day change in	
					total sedentary time.	
Espana-Romero et	Cross-	N = 357	Total sedentary time	BMI z-score percentile	Total sedentary time was	Total sedentary time and
al. 2013 [49];	sectional	Boys, n = 183	$(\min/hr; \leq 200 \text{ counts}/15)$	(no units) calculated from	not associated with BMI	BMI z-score percentile
USA; Study of		Girls, $n = 174$	sec epoch; Pate et al. 2006	objectively measured	z-score percentile in boys	or waist circumference:
Health and Activity			[43]) measured	height and weight.	$(\beta = -0.050, SE = 0.028, p$	Race/ethnicity, parental
in Preschool		Mean age:	objectively by		$= 0.07$) or girls ($\beta = 0.014$,	education, preschool.
Environments		Boys, 4.5 yr	accelerometer (ActiGraph	Waist circumference (cm	SE = 0.023, p = 0.51).	-
(SHAPES)		Girls, 4.6 yr	models GT1M and	and percentile; measured		Total sedentary time and
		Pre-schoolers	GT3X).	to the nearest 0.1 cm	Total sedentary time was	waist circumference
				midway between the	not associated with waist	percentile:
				inferior edge of the lowest	circumference in <i>boys</i> (β	Race/ethnicity, parental
				rib and the superior border	= -0.152, SE $= 0.113$, p $=$	education.
				of the iliac crest).	0.18) or girls ($\beta = 0.154$,	
					SE = 0.117, p = 0.19).	
					~,p	
					Using quantile regression,	
					total sedentary	
					behaviour was not	
					associated with BMI z-	
				1	associated with Divil Z-	

			20
		score percentile in boys	
		$(10^{\text{th}}: \beta = -0.017, \text{SE} =$	
		0.045; 25^{th} : $\beta = -0.033$, SE	
		$= 0.034; 50^{\text{th}}: \beta = -0.054,$	
		$SE = 0.034; 75^{th}: \beta = -$	
		0.072, SE = 0.039; 90 th : β	
		= -0.092, SE = 0.074; all p	
		> 0.05) or <i>girls</i> (10 th : β =	
		0.007, SE = 0.036; 25^{th} : β	
		= -0.010, SE $= 0.035$; 50 th :	
		β = -0.003, SE = 0.024;	
		75 th : β = -0.024, SE =	
		0.03; 90 th : $\beta = 0.038$, SE =	
		0.039; all p > 0.05).	
		Using quantile regression,	
		total sedentary	
		behaviour was not	
		associated with the 0^{th} ,	
		25 th , 50 th , 75 th or 90 th	
		waist circumference	
		percentiles in <i>boys</i> (10 th :	
		$\beta = -0.022$, SE = 0.156;	
		25 th : β = -0.195, SE =	
		0.108; 50 th : β = -0.039, SE	
		$= 0.143; 75^{\text{th}}: \beta = -0.094,$	
		SE = 0.158; 90 th : β = -	
		0.247, SE = 0.314; all p >	
		0.05), but in <i>girls</i> there	
		was an unfavourable	
		association between total	
		sedentary time and the	
		90 th waist circumference	
		percentile $(10^{\text{th}}: \beta = -$	
		0.060, SE = 0.146; 25^{th} : β	
		= -0.079, SE $= 0.147$; 50 th :	
		$\beta = 0.071$, SE = 0.102;	
		$75^{\text{th}}: \beta = 0.005, \text{ SE} =$	
		$0.128; 90^{\text{th}}: \beta = 0.441, \text{SE}$	

Lioret et al. 2007 [50]; France; French INCA food consumption survey	Cross- sectional	N = 234 Age range: 3 to 5 yr Pre-schoolers	Screen time (hr/day and categories: "low", 20 th percentile; "intermediate" 20-80 th percentile; "high", 80 th percentile; TV and video games) assessed by self-report questionnaire (unpublished).	Weight status (IOTF cut- points; categories: normal weight, overweight/obese) determined from BMI (calculated from self- reported height and weight).	= 0.191 ; 90 th percentile p < 0.05, all others p > 0.05). Screen time was not associated with overweight/obese weight status (compared to "low" screen time: "intermediate", OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.3, 2.5; "high", OR = 2.1, 95% CI: 0.7, 6.6).	SES, sex, age, <i>leisure time physical activity</i> , total energy intake.
Koubaa et al. 2012 [51]; Tunesia	Cross- sectional	N = 121 Median age: 4.8 yr Pre-schoolers	Screen time (hr/day; TV and playing video games) assessed by parent-report questionnaire (unpublished).	Weight status (Rolland Cachera reference curves; categories: healthy weight, ≤97 th percentile; overweight, >97 th percentile) determined from BMI calculated from objectively measured height and weight.	The prevalence of >1hr/day screen time was not different between the healthy weight (69%) and overweight (84%) groups (p = 0.09).	N/A
Bonvin et al. 2012 [52]; Switzerland Youp'la bouge study	Cross- sectional	N = 251 Mean age: 3.4 yr Pre-schoolers	Total sedentary time epochs/hr <37.5 counts; <37.5 counts/15 sec epoch) measured objectively by accelerometer (ActiGraph GT1M).	Weight status (IOTF cut- points; categories: healthy weight, excess weight) determined from BMI (calculated from objectively measured height and weight).	Sedentary time was not different between children classified as having healthy weight (130, SD = 22 epochs/hr <37.5 counts) or excess weight (132, SD = 24 epochs/hr <37.5 counts). Sedentary time was not associated with weight status (β = 1.6, 95% CI: - 5.4, 8.5, p ≥ 0.6).	Age, sex, child care center.
van Stralen et al. 2012 [53]; Germany and Greece	Cross- sectional	N = 3664 Germany, n = 2956; Greece, n = 708	TV time (hr/day) and screen time (hr/day) assessed by parent-report questionnaire	BMI (kg/m ²) calculated from objectively measured height and weight.	Germany: Screen time was unfavourably associated with BMI (B = $0.14, 95\%$	<i>Germany:</i> Sex, age. <i>Greece:</i>

		Mean age:	(unpublished).	Waist circumference	CI: 0.08, 0.12; $\beta = 0.10$, p	Sex, age, maternal
TigerKids		Germany, 4.5 yr		(cm) measured objectively	< 0.05).	education.
U		Greece, 4.4 yr		(landmarks not specified).	,	
and		Pre-schoolers			Greece:	
					TV time was not	
GENESIS					associated with BMI ($B =$	
					0.003, 95% CI: -0.003,	
					$0.009, \beta = 0.039, R^2 =$	
					0.006, p > 0.05) or waist	
					circumference (B =	
					0.001, 95% CI: -0.003,	
					$0.006, \beta = 0.026, R^2 =$	
					0.015, p > 0.05).	
Byun et al. 2011	Cross-	N = 331	Total sedentary time	BMI z-score (no units;	Unadjusted analysis:	Gender, adult job, birth
[54]; USA	sectional		(min/hr; <37.5 counts/15	calculated as the deviation	Sedentary time was	weight, , family support
		Mean age: 4.3 yr	sec epoch) measured	of each participant's value	favourably associated with	for physical activity,
CHAMPS		Pre-schoolers	objectively by	from the mean values	BMI z-scores ($r = -0.16$,	perceived enough physical
			accelerometer (ActiGraph	reported in CDC growth	p ≤0.05).	activity, perceived level of
			7164).	charts) calculated from		physical activity, athletic
				objectively measured	Adjusted analysis:	coordination, weekday
				height and weight.	Sedentary time was not	TV/video game, physical
					associated with BMI z-	activity equipment.
					scores (β = -0.30, SE =	
					0.1, p ≤0.10).	
Tremblay and	Cross-	N = 1192	TV time (hr/day) on	BMI (kg/m ²) calculated	TV time on weekdays	
Rinaldi 2010 [55];	sectional	Girls, $n = 581$	weekdays and weekend	from objectively measured	was not associated with	
Canada		Boys, n = 611	days assessed by parent-	height and weight.	BMI (<i>boys</i> : <i>r</i> = -0.005, p	
			report questionnaire		> 0.05; girls: $r = 0.059$, p	
QLSCD		Approximate age: 4	(unpublished).	Skinfold ratio (no units;	> 0.05).	
		yr		ratio of triceps skinfold		
		Pre-schoolers		thickness to subscapular	TV time on weekdays	
				skinfold thickness – i.e.,	was not associated with	
				limb to trunk) calculated	skinfold ratio in boys (r	
				from objectively measured	= -0.072, p > 0.05), but	
				skinfold thicknesses.	was favourably associated	
					with skinfold ratio in	
					girls ($r = -0.09$, p < 0.05).	
					TV time on weekend	

Sasaki et al. 2010	Cross-	N = 449	Screen time (hr/day; TV	Weight status	days was not associated with BMI (<i>boys:</i> $r = -$ 0.046, p > 0.05; <i>girls:</i> $r =$ 0.001, p > 0.05) or skinfold ratio (<i>boys:</i> $r =$ 0.013, p > 0.05; <i>girls:</i> $r =$ -0.068, p > 0.05).	Sleep duration,
[56]; Japan	sectional	N = 449 Mean age: 4.5 yr Pre-schoolers	and computer games) assessed by parent-report questionnaire (unpublished).	(categories: normal, BMI $<25 \text{ kg/m}^2$; obese, BMI $\geq 25 \text{ kg/m}^2$) determined from BMI (calculated from parent-report height and weight).	The prevalence of obesity was not associated with screen time (prevalence of obesity: $<2hr/day$ screen time, 8.2% ; ≥ 2 hr/day screen time, 8.3% ; p = 0.56). Screen time was not	steep auration, breastfeeding status, maternal obesity, maternal education, maternal smoking.
					associated with obese weight status (<i>unadjusted:</i> compared to $<2hr/day$ screen time, ≥ 2 hr/day: OR = 1.11, 95% CI: 0.50, 2.49, p > 0.05; <i>adjusted:</i> compared to $<2hr/day$ screen time, ≥ 2 hr/day: OR = 1.08, 95% CI: 0.58, 2.44, p > 0.05).	
Anderson and Whitaker. 2010 [57]; USA ECLS-B	Cross- sectional	N ≈ 8550 Mean age: 52.3 mo (~4.4 yr) Pre-schoolers	Screen time (hr/weekday; TV, videos, DVDs) on weekdays assessed by parent-report questionnaire (unpublished).	Weight status (categories: normal, $<95^{th}$ percentile; obese, $\ge 95^{th}$ percentile) determined from BMI (calculated from objectively measured height and weight).	Screen time was unfavourably associated with obese weight status in <i>unadjusted</i> analysis (compared to >2 hr/weekday, ≤ 2 hr/weekday: OR = 0.77, 95% CI: 0.64, 0.91), but was not associated after adjustments (compared to >2 hr/weekday, ≤ 2 hr/weekday: OR = 0.85,	≥10.5 hr of sleep per weekday night, eating dinner as a family >5 evenings/week, child age, gender, racial/ethnic group, household income- to-poverty ratio, single- parent household, maternal education, maternal BMI, maternal age.

Dubois et al. 2008 [58]; Canada Longitudinal Study of Child Development in Quebec (LSCDQ; 2002)	Cross- sectional	N = 1540 Mean age: 49 mo (~4.1 yr) Pre-schoolers	TV time (hr/day) assessed by parent-report interview (unpublished format).	BMI (kg/m ²) calculated from objectively measured height and weight.	95% CI: 0.71, 1.03). The prevalence of obesity was greater in those with >2 hr/day screen time (20.0%) than those with \leq 2 hr/day screen time (16.1%) on weekdays (p = 0.002). BMI was not different between children with <3 hr/day TV time (15.7 kg/m ²) and \geq 3 hr/day TV time (15.7 kg/m ²) (p > 0.05).	N/A
Jouret et al. 2007 [59]; France	Cross- sectional	N = 593; Boys, n = 298; Girls, n = 295 Mean age: 4.6 yr Pre-schoolers	TV time (hr/day) assessed by parent-report questionnaire (unpublished).	Weight status (French reference standards; ≥90th percentile or z-score ≥1.28 considered overweight/obese; categories: overweight/obese, non- overweight) determined from BMI (calculated from objectively measured height and weight).	In <i>unadjusted analysis</i> , TV time was unfavourably associated with overweight status in <i>boys</i> (compared to ≤ 1 hr/day, >1 hr/day: OR = 3.80, 95% CI: 1.54, 9.38, p = 0.0042) but not <i>girls</i> (compared to ≤ 1 hr/day, >1 hr/day: OR = 2.02, 95% CI: 0.89, 4.57, p = 0.0911). In <i>adjusted analysis</i> , TV time was unfavourably associated with overweight status in <i>boys</i> (compared to ≤ 1 hr/day, >1 hr/day: OR = 3.76, 95% CI: 1.52, 9.31, p = 0.004) and <i>girls</i>	Participation in organized <i>physical activity</i> .

Jiang et al. 2006 [60]; China	Cross- sectional	N = 930 Mean age: 4.6 yr Pre-schoolers	TV time (hr/day) and time playing computer games (hr/day) assessed by parent-report questionnaire (unpublished).	Weight status (IOTF cut- points; categories: categories: overweight/obese, non- overweight) determined from BMI (calculated from objectively measured height and weight).	(compared to ≤ 1 hr/day, >1 hr/day: OR = 2.43, 95% CI: 1.04, 5.66, p = 0.0401). TV time was unfavourably associated with overweight status (<i>unadjusted</i> : no values reported; <i>adjusted</i> : compared to <2 hr/day, ≥ 2 hr/day, OR = 1.56, 95% CI: 1.17, 2.09, p = 0.012). Time playing computer	Sex, age, family income, kindergarten class.
					games was not associated with weight status (no values reported)	
Jago et al. 2005	Cross-	N = 149	TV time (min/hr) assessed	BMI (kg/m ²) calculated	TV time was not	N/A
[61]; USA	sectional		by direct observation	from objectively measured	associated with BMI ($r =$	
		Mean age: 4.4 yr	(each child was observed	height and weight.	-0.027, p > 0.05).	
Studies of Child		Pre-schoolers	for $\sim 6-12$ hr/day for a		T. 4. 1	
Activity and			mean of 2.15 days;		Total sedentary time was	
Nutrition (SCAN)			observers noted whether		not associated with BMI	
Program (Texas			the child was paying		(r = 0.121, p > 0.05).	
site)			attention to the TV during each minute).			
			Total sedentary time (min/hr) assessed by direct observation using the Children's Activity Rating Scale (CARS).			
Levin et al. 2004	Crass	N. 149	TV time (but with)			
Levin et al. 2004 [62]; USA	Cross- sectional	N = 148 Approximate age:	TV time (hr/week) assessed by parent-report questionnaire	BMI (kg/m ²) calculated from objectively measured height and weight.	TV time was not significantly different across quartiles of BMI	N/A
		4 yr	(unpublished).		(25th percentile: 2.5	
		Pre-schoolers		Weight status	hr/day; 25-75th percentile:	

		1				I
				(categories: obese, BMI	3.3 hr/day; 75th	
				≥95th percentile; non-	percentile: 3.6 hr/day; p-	
				obese) determined from	value not reported).	
				BMI.		
					A greater proportion of	
					children who had non-	
					obese weight status	
					(43.9%) had ≤2 hr/day TV	
					time than those who had	
					obese weight status	
					(19.4%) (p = 0.01).	
					TV time was	
					unfavourably associated	
					with obese weight status	
					(compared to <1 hr/day:	
					>5 hr/day, OR = 5.0, 95%	
					CI: 0.5, 49.3).	
DuRant et al. 1994	Cross-	N = 110	TV time (% min/day)	BMI (kg/m ²) calculated	TV time was not	N/A
[63]; USA	sectional		assessed by direct	from objectively measured	associated with BMI ($r =$	
		Mean age: 4.23 yr	observation using the	height and weight.	0.07, p = 0.450), sum of	
Family Health		Pre-schoolers	CARS. Children were		skinfolds ($r = 0.13$, p =	
Project (Texas site			observed up to 4 times	Sum of skinfolds (mm;	0.168), or waist-to-hip	
of the Studies of			over 3 years and	biceps, triceps,	ratio (<i>r</i> = 0.06, p =	
Child Activity and			observations were	substcapular, suprailiac,	0.560).	
Nutrition program)			averaged.	abdomen, thigh, calf).		
r (annon program)			a erageai			
				Waist-to-hip ratio (no		
				units) calculated from		
				objectively measured		
				circumferences.		
Cardon et al. 2016	Cross-	N = 3301	TV time (min/day),	Weight status	TV time on weekdays	Country, age, educational
[64]; Belgium,	sectional		computer time (min/day),	(International Obesity	was not associated with	level of the mother.
Bulgaria,		Boys, n = 1716	and screen time (min/day;	Task Force (IOTF) cut-	weight status in boys	
Germany, Greece,		Girls, $n = 1585$	TV and computer time)	points; categories: normal	(β=0.024, 95% CI: -0.001,	
Poland, Spain		1000	assessed by parent-report	weight, overweight/obese)	(p = 0.021, y = 0.001, 0.000	
- orania, opani		Mean age: 4.7 yr	questionnaire (Primary	determined from BMI	= -0.032, 95% CI: $-0.003,$	
ToyBox-study		Pre-schoolers	Caregivers' Questionnaire	(calculated from	0.001, p = 0.421).	
(baseline data;			(PCQ); www.toybox-	objectively measured		
(ousernie data,		I		objectively measured	1	

2012)	study.eu).	height and weight).	TV time on weekend	
			days was not associated	
	Sedentary quiet play		with weight status in boys	
	(min/day; e.g., looking		(β=0.038, 95% CI: 0.000,	
	into books, playing with		0.002. p = 0.31) but was	
	blocks, playing with dolls,		unfavourably associated	
	drawing, construction) on		with weight status in <i>girls</i>	
	weekdays and weekend		$(\beta = 0.145, 95\% \text{ CI})$	
	days assessed by parent-		0.001, 0.004; p < 0.001).	
	report questionnaire			
	(PCQ; www.toybox-		Computer time on	
	study.eu).		weekdays or weekend	
			days was not associated	
			with weight status in boys	
			(weekdays: β=0.025, 95%	
			CI: -0.004, 0.004, p =	
			0.53; weekend days:	
			β=0.018, 95% CI: -0.001,	
			0.003, p = 0.65) or <i>girls</i>	
			(weekdays: β=0.032, 95%	
			CI: -0.004, 0.008, p =	
			0.53; weekend days: β =-	
			0.072, 95% CI: -0.006,	
			0.001, p = 0.65).	
			Screen time was not	
			associated with	
			overweight/obese weight	
			status in boys (compared	
			with <1 hr/day, ≥ 1 hr/day:	
			weekdays: $OR = 1.099$,	
			95% CI: 0.754, 1.601, p =	
			0.63; weekend days: OR =	
			1.054, 95% CI: 0.636,	
			1.748, p = 0.84) or <i>girls</i>	
			(compared with <1 hr/day,	
			≥ 1 hr/day: weekdays: OR	
			= 1.152, 95% CI: 0.806,	
			1.647, p = 0.44; weekend	

				50
			days: OR = 1.024, 95%	
			CI: 0.639, 1.640, p =	
			0.92).	
			Sedentary quiet play was	
			not associated with	
			overweight/obese weight	
			status in <i>boys</i> (weekday:	
			β=-0.001, 95% CI: -0.001,	
			0.001, p = 0.99; weekend:	
			β =-0.040, 95% CI: -0.002,	
			0.000, p = 0.26) or girls	
			(weekday: β =-0.007, 95%	
			CI: $-0.002, 0.001, p =$	
			0.99; weekend: β =0.014,	
			95% CI: -0.001, 0.001, p	
			= 0.26).	
			- 0.20).	
			Compared with boys who	
			had <90 min sedentary	
			•	
			quiet play per weekday	
			or weekend day, boys	
			with $\geq 90 \text{ min/day}$ were	
			not more likely to have	
			overweight/obese weight	
			status (weekday: $OR =$	
			1.073, 95% CI: 0.727,	
			1.584, p = 0.72; weekend	
			day: OR = 0.993, 95% CI:	
			0.638, 1.547, p = 0.98).	
			Girls who engaged in	
			sedentary quiet play for	
			≥90 min/day on weekend	
			days (but not weekdays)	
			were more likely to have	
			overweight/obese weight	
			status than those who	
			engaged in <90 min/day	
•		•	•	

					(weekday: OR = 0.790, 95% CI: 0.557, 1.122, p = 0.19; weekend day: OR = 1.715, 95% CI: 1.047, 2.810, p = 0.03).	
Harrison et al. 2012 [65]; USA	Cross- sectional	N = 354 Mean age: 37.37 mo (~3.1 yr) Pre-schoolers	TV time (hr/day), time watching videos/DVDs (hr/day), time playing video games (hr/day), time using the internet (hr/day), and time using books (hr/day) assessed by parent-report questionnaire (unpublished).	BMI percentile (percentile) calculated from objectively measured height and weight.	TV time was not associated with BMI percentile ($r = 0.09$, p > 0.05; $\beta = -0.01$, p > 0.05). Time watching videos/DVDs was not associated with BMI percentile ($r = 0.11$, p > 0.05; $\beta = 0.03$, p > 0.05).	Child race/ethnicity, parent BMI, parent education, household income, child gender, TV time, time watching videos/DVDs, time playing video games, time using the internet, and time using books (where applicable).
					Time playing video games was unfavourably associated with BMI percentile ($r = 0.12$, p < 0.05; $\beta = 0.10$, p < 0.05).	
					Time using the internet was not associated with BMI percentile ($r = -$ 0.03, p > 0.05; $\beta = -0.01$, p > 0.05).	
					Time using books was not associated with BMI percentile ($r = 0.07$, p > 0.05; $\beta = 0.08$, p > 0.05).	
Vandebosch and van Cleemput 2007 [66]; Belgium	Cross- sectional	N = 608 Mean age: 56.3 mo (~4.7 yr) Pre-schoolers	TV time (min/week) assessed by parent-report questionnaire (unpublished).	 BMI z-score (no units) calculated from parent- reported height and weight. Weight status (Flemish growth charts [67]; 	In the <i>full sample</i> , in <i>unadjusted analysis</i> , TV time was not associated with BMI z-score ($r =$ 0.063, p = 0.174). In <i>adjusted analyses</i> , TV	Age father, age mother, educational level father, educational level mother, percentage employment of the family, BMI father, BMI mother, parent's amount of TV viewing,

		categories: underweight/normal weight; overweight, <i>boys</i> , BMI-SD \geq 1.214, <i>girls</i> , BMI-SD \geq 1.012; obese, <i>boys</i> , BMI-SD \geq 2.13, <i>girls</i> , BMI-SD $>$ 1.90) determined from parent- reported height and weight.	time was favourably associated with BMI z- score in <i>boys</i> (β = -0.434, p < 0.01) but not <i>girls</i> (β = -0.030, p > 0.05). Children with obese weight status had greater TV time (918.9, SD = 390.5 min/week) than those with underweight/normal weight status (608.1, SD	media as a cause of childhood obesity, parental mediation of physical activity, parental mediation of food intake, restrictive parental TV mediation, watching TV because of parent time limitations, watching TV because of parent tiredness, age child, TV dependency, child eating meal while watching TV,
				•
			0	
			= 391.2 min/week (p =	child snacking while
			0.001), but those with	watching TV, TV in
			overweight weight status	child's bedroom.
			did not (683.5, SD = 388.8	
			min/week).	

ALSPAC, Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children; B, unstandardized beta; β, standardized beta; BMI, body mass index; CARS, Children's Activity Rating Scale; CD, compact disk; CDC, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; CHAMPS, Children's Activity and Movement in Preschool Study; CI, confidence interval; DXA, Duel-energy X-ray absorptiometry; Early STOPP, Early Stockholm Obesity Prevention Project; ECLS-B, Early Childhood Longitudinal Study-Birth Cohort; EDPAPC, Environmental Determinants of Physical Activity in Preschool Children; FMI, fat mass index; GECKO, Groningen Expert Center for Kids with Obesity; GENESIS, Growth, Exercise and Nutrition Epidemiological Study in preSchoolers; HCSF, Healthy Children Strong Families; IDEFICS, Identification and prevention of dietary and lifestyle-induced health effects in children and infants; IOTF, International Obesity Task Force; KAN-DO, Kids and Adults Now: Defeat Obesity!; LMI, lean mass index; LSAC, Longitudinal Study of Australian Children; LSCDQ, Longitudinal Study of Child Development in Quebec; MET, metabolic equivalent of task; NHANES, National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey; NLSY, National Longitudinal Survey for Children and Youth study; NW, normal weight; OB, obese; OR, odds ratio; OW, overweight; PCQ, Primary Caregivers' Questionnaire; PR, prevalence ratio; QLSCD, Quebec Longitudinal Study of Child Development; RRR, relative risk ratio; SCAN; Studies of Child Activity and Nutrition; SE, standard error; SES, socioeconomic status; SD, standard deviation; SHAPES, Study of Health and Activity in Preschool Environments; T1-T4, Time 1 to Time 4; TFMI, trunk fat mass index; TV, television; WHO, World Health Organization; WHtR, Waist-to-height ratio; WIC, Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children; %BF, percentage body fat.

Reference; Country; Larger Study/Cohort Name	Study Design	Sample	Exposure	Outcome	Main Findings	Covariates included in model (if applicable)
Study Design: Longitudinal						
Hesketh et al. 2015 [68]; Australia; Melbourne Infant Feeding, Activity and Nutrition Trial Program (INFANT)	Longitudinal [~16 mo (1.3 yr) follow-up]	N = 542 T1, 3.9 mo (0.3 yr) Infants T2, 9.1 mo (0.76 yr) Infants T3, 19.9 mo (1.7 yr) Toddlers	TV time (hr/day), time spent in a stroller/pram (hr/day), time spent in a car seat/capsule (hr/day), time spent in a high chair or other chair (hr/day), time spent in a playpen (hr/day), time spent in a baby carrier/sling (hr/day) assessed by parent-report questionnaire (unpublished).	Age at first sitting (months), age at first crawling (months), and age at first walking (months), assessed by parent-report questionnaire (unpublished).	TV time at age ~4 mo was not associated with age at first sitting (β = - 0.02, p = 0.629), age at first crawling (β = 0.02, p = 0.645), or age at first walking (β = -0.02, p = 0.661). Time spent in a stroller/pram at age ~4 mo was not associated with age at first sitting (β = 0.02, p = 0.670), age at first crawling (β = 0.03, p = 0.631), or age at first walking (β = 0.00, p = 0.941). Time spent in a car seat/capsule at age ~4 mo was not associated with age at first sitting (β = - 0.01, p = 0.788), age at first crawling (β = -0.07, p = 0.185), or age at first walking (β = -0.06, p = 0.096). Time spent in a high chair or other chair at age ~4 mo was not	Exact age, intervention arm.

	associated with age at	
	first sitting (β = -0.02, p =	:
	0.775), age at first	
	crawling ($\beta = 0.01$, p =	
	0.753), or age at first	
	walking (β = -0.05, p =	
	0.373).	
	Time spent in a playpen	
	at age ~4 mo was not	
	associated with age at	
	first sitting (β = -0.06, p =	:
	0.203), age at first	
	crawling (β = -0.05, p =	
	0.187), or age at first	
	walking (β = -0.06, p =	
	0.106).	
	Time spent in a baby	
	carrier/sling at age ~4 mo	
	was not associated with	
	age at first sitting ($\beta = -$	
	0.07, p = 0.179), age at	
	first crawling ($\beta = -0.07$,	
	p = 0.194), or age at first	
	walking (β = -0.06, p =	
	0.243).	
	TV time at age ~9 mo	
	was not associated with	
	age at first sitting ($\beta =$	
	0.00, p = 0.957), age at	
	first crawling ($\beta = 0.03$, p	
	= 0.443), or age at first	
	walking (β = -0.02, p =	
	0.692).	
	Time spent in a	
1 1	stroller/pram at age ~9	1

$ \begin{array}{c} \textbf{mo was not associated} \\ with age at first stifting ($$$$$$$$$$$$$$$=-0.07$), age at first crawing ($$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$			
$= .000, p = 0.079, age at first erawling (\beta = .0.07, p = 0.243), or age at first walking (\beta = 0.00, p = 0.995).$ $Time spent in a car scat/capsule at age -9 mo was favourably associated with age at first stitung (β = .0.11, p = .0.12), but was not associated with age at first reavling (β = .0.04, p = .0.472). Time spent in a high ethair or other chair at age -9 mo was not associated with age at first walking (β = .0.04, p = .0.472).$ $Time spent in a high ethair or other chair at age -9 mo was not associated with age at first straige (β = .0.04, p = .0.472). Time spent in a high ethair or other chair at age -9 mo was not associated with age at first straige (β = .0.04, p = .0.751), age at first erawling (β = .0.04, p =$			mo was not associated
Image: spectrum is a second			with age at first sitting (β
$\begin{bmatrix} p = 0.243, \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{walking } (\beta = 0.00, p = 0.095), \\ 0.095), \\ \text{Time spent in a car} \\ \text{seat/capsule at age -9 mo} \\ \text{was favourably associated} \\ \text{with age at first sitting } (\beta = -0.11, p = 0.017), \text{and} \\ \text{age at first crawling } (\beta = -0.11, p = 0.012), \text{hat was} \\ \text{not associated with age at } \\ \text{first walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = -0.472), \\ \text{Time spent in a bigh} \\ \text{chair or other chair at } \\ \text{age of first sitting } (\beta = -0.04, p = -0.472), \\ \text{Time spent in a bigh} \\ \text{chair or other chair at } \\ \text{age of mov as not} \\ \text{associated with age at } \\ \text{first sitting } (\beta = -0.04, p = -0.472), \\ \text{Time spent in a bigh} \\ \text{chair or other chair at } \\ \text{age of moves not} \\ \text{associated with age at } \\ \text{first sitting } (\beta = -0.04, p = -0.472), \\ \text{Time spent in a bigh} \\ \text{chair or other chair at } \\ \text{age of moves not} \\ \text{associated with age at } \\ \text{first sitting } (\beta = -0.04, p = -0.372), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{walking } (\beta = -0.04, p = -0.372), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{walking } \\ \text{walking } (\beta = -0.04, p = -0.372), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{walking } \\ \text{the spent in a playpen} \\ \text{at age -9 moves not} \\ \text{associated with age at } \\ \text{first sitting } (\beta = -0.04, p = -0.372), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{crawling } (\beta = -0.04, p = -0.372), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{crawling } (\beta = -0.04, p = -0.372), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{crawling } (\beta = -0.04, p = -0.372), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{crawling } (\beta = -0.04, p = -0.372), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{crawling } (\beta = -0.04, p = -0.372), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{crawling } (\beta = -0.04, p = -0.372), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{crawling } (\beta = -0.04, p = -0.372), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{crawling } (\beta = -0.04, p = -0.372), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{crawling } (\beta = -0.04, p = -0.372), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{crawling } (\beta = -0.04, p = -0.372), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{crawling } (\beta = -0.04, p = -0.372), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{crawling } (\beta = -0.04, p = -0.372), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{ crawling } (\beta = -0.04, p = -0.372), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{ crawling }$			= -0.09, p = 0.079), age at
Image: Second			first crawling ($\beta = -0.07$,
0.995).Time spent in a car seat/capsule at age -9 mo was favourably associated with age at first sitting (β = -0.11, p = 0.017), and age at first crawling (β = -0.11, p = 0.012), but was not associated with age at first walking (β = 0.04, p = 0.472).Time spent in a high chair or other chair at age age at first sitting (β = 0.02, p = 0.751), age at first walking (β = -0.04, p = 0.322), or age at first walking (β = -0.04, p = 0.363).Time spent in a playpen at age -0 mo was not associated with age at first sitting (β = -0.04, p = 0.363).Time spent in a playpen at age -0 mo was not associated with age at first sitting (β = -0.04, p = 0.363).Time spent in a playpen at age -0 mo was not associated with age at first sitting (β = -0.04, p = 0.363).Time spent in a playpen at age -0 mo was not associated with age at first walking (β = -0.04, p = 0.363).Time spent in a playpen at age -0 mo was not associated with age at first sitting (β = -0.02, p = 0.783), or age at first walking (β = -0.02, p = 0.783), or age at first walking (β = -0.02, p = 0.783), or age at first walking (β = -0.02, p = 0.783), or age at first walking (β = -0.02, p = 0.783), or age at first walking (β = -0.02, p = 0.783), or age at first			p = 0.243), or age at first
Time spent in a car seat/capsule at age -9 mo was favourably associated with age at first stiling (β = -0.11, p = 0.017), and age at first crawling (β = -0.11, p = 0.012), but was not associated with age at first walking (β = 0.04, p = 0.472). Time spent in a high chair or other chair at age -9 mo was not associated with age at first sitting (β = 0.02, p = 0.751), age at first walking (β = -0.00, p = 0.322), or age at first walking (β = -0.00, p = 0.963). Time spent in a playpen at age -9 mo was not associated with age at first sitting (β = -0.04, p = 0.753), or age at first walking (β = -0.04, p = 0.730, or age at first walking (β = -0.04, p = 0.730, or age at first walking (β = -0.04, p =			walking (β = 0.00, p =
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c } \hline & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & $			0.995).
$ \begin{array}{ c c c } \hline & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & $			
was favourably associated with age at first sitting (β = -0.11, p = -0.017), and age at first crawling (β = -0.11, p = -0.012), but was not associated with age at first walking (β = 0.04, p = -0.472). Time spent in a high chair or other chair at age -9 mo was not associated with age at first sitting (β = -0.02, p = 0.751), age at first walking (β = -0.00, p = 0.963). Time spent in a playpen at age -9 mo was not associated with age at first sitting (β = -0.00, p = 0.963).			Time spent in a car
with age at first sitting (β = -0.11, p = 0.017), and age af first crawing (β = -0.11, p = 0.012), but was not associated with age at first walking (β = 0.04, p = 0.472).Time spent in a high chair or other chair at age -9 mo was not associated with age at first sitting (β = 0.02, p = 0.751), age at first erawing (β = -0.04, p = 0.322), or age at first walking (β = -0.00, p = 0.963).Time spent in a playpen at age -9 mo was not associated with age at first sitting (β = -0.01, p = 0.750, age at first erawing (β = -0.02, p = 0.753), or age at first erawing (β = -0.04, p = 0.963).			seat/capsule at age ~9 mo
$= -0.11, p = 0.017), and age at first crawling (\beta = 0.04, p = 0.012), but was not associated with age at first walking (\beta = 0.04, p = 0.472).Time spent in a high chair or other chair at age -9 mo was not associated with age at first sitting (\beta = 0.02, p = 0.751), age at first crawling (\beta = -0.04, p = 0.751), age at first erawling (\beta = -0.04, p = 0.322), or age at first walking (\beta = -0.00, p = 0.322), or age at first maximum (\beta = -0.00, p = 0.963).Time spent in a playpen at age -9 mo was not associated with age at first sitting (\beta = -0.00, p = 0.963).Time spent in a playpen at age -9 mo was not associated with age at first sitting (\beta = -0.00, p = 0.963).$			was favourably associated
age at first crawling ($\beta = -0.11$, $p = 0.012$), but was not associated with age at first walking ($\beta = 0.04$, $p = 0.472$).Time spent in a high chair or other chair at age -9 mo was not associated with age at first sitting ($\beta = 0.02$, $p = 0.751$), age at first crawling ($\beta = -0.04$, $p = 0.751$), age at first walking ($\beta = -0.00$, $p = 0.751$), age at first walking ($\beta = -0.00$, $p = 0.963$).Time spent in a playpen at age -9 mo was not associated with age at first sitting ($\beta = -0.00$, $p = 0.963$).Time spent in a playpen at age -9 mo was not associated with age at first sitting ($\beta = -0.00$, $p = 0.730$), age at first crawling ($\beta = -0.04$, $p = 0.730$), age at first crawling ($\beta = -0.04$, $p = 0.730$), age at first crawling ($\beta = -0.04$, $p = 0.730$), age at first crawling ($\beta = -0.04$, $p = 0.730$), age at first crawling ($\beta = -0.04$, $p = 0.730$), age at first crawling ($\beta = -0.04$, $p = 0.730$), age at first crawling ($\beta = -0.04$, $p = 0.730$), age at first crawling ($\beta = -0.04$, $p = 0.730$), age at first crawling ($\beta = -0.04$, $p = 0.730$), age at first crawling ($\beta = -0.04$, $p = 0.730$), age at first crawling ($\beta = -0.04$, $p = 0.730$), age at first crawling ($\beta = -0.04$, $p = 0.730$), age at first crawling ($\beta = -0.04$, $p = 0.730$), age at first crawling ($\beta = -0.04$, $p = 0.730$), age at first crawling ($\beta = -0.04$, $p = 0.730$), age at first crawling ($\beta = 0.04$, $p = 0.730$), age at first crawling ($\beta = 0.04$, $p = 0.730$), age at first crawling ($\beta = 0.04$, $p = 0.730$), age at first crawling ($\beta = 0.04$, $p = 0.730$), age at first crawling ($\beta = 0.04$, $p = 0.730$), age at first crawling ($\beta = 0.04$, $p = 0.730$), age at first crawling ($\beta = 0.04$, $p = 0.730$), age at first crawling ($\beta = 0.04$, $p = 0.730$), age at first crawling ($\beta = 0.04$, $p = 0.730$), age at fir			with age at first sitting (β
$\begin{array}{c} -0.11, \mathbf{p} = 0.012), \text{ but was} \\ \text{not associated with age at} \\ \textbf{first walking } (\beta = 0.04, \mathbf{p} = 0.472). \\ \textbf{Time spent in a high} \\ \textbf{chair or other chair at} \\ \textbf{age} \sim 9 \text{ mo was not} \\ \textbf{associated with age at} \\ \textbf{first sitting } (\beta = 0.02, \mathbf{p} = 0.751), \textbf{age at first} \\ \textbf{crawling } (\beta = -0.04, \mathbf{p} = 0.322), \text{ or age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = -0.00, \mathbf{p} = 0.322), \text{ or age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = -0.00, \mathbf{p} = 0.963). \\ \textbf{Time spent in a playpen} \\ \textbf{at age} \sim 9 \text{ mo was not} \\ \textbf{associated with age at} \\ \textbf{first sitting } (\beta = 0.04, \mathbf{p} = 0.730), \textbf{age at first} \\ \textbf{crawling } (\beta = -0.02, \mathbf{p} = 0.730), \textbf{age at first} \\ \textbf{crawling } (\beta = -0.02, \mathbf{p} = 0.730), \textbf{age at first} \\ \textbf{crawling } (\beta = -0.02, \mathbf{p} = 0.730), \textbf{age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = -0.04, \mathbf{p} = 0.730), \textbf{or age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = -0.04, \mathbf{p} = 0.730), \textbf{age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = -0.04, \mathbf{p} = 0.730), \textbf{age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = -0.04, \mathbf{p} = 0.730), \textbf{age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = -0.04, \mathbf{p} = 0.730), \textbf{age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = -0.04, \mathbf{p} = 0.730), \textbf{age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = -0.04, \mathbf{p} = 0.730), \textbf{age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = -0.04, \mathbf{p} = 0.730), \textbf{age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = -0.04, \mathbf{p} = 0.730), \textbf{age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = -0.04, \mathbf{p} = 0.730), \textbf{age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.04, \mathbf{p} = 0.730), \textbf{age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.04, \mathbf{p} = 0.730), \textbf{age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.04, \mathbf{p} = 0.730), \textbf{age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.04, \mathbf{p} = 0.730), \textbf{age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.04, \mathbf{p} = 0.730), \textbf{age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.04, \mathbf{p} = 0.730), \textbf{age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.04, \mathbf{p} = 0.730), \textbf{age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.04, \mathbf{p} = 0.730), \textbf{age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.04, \mathbf{p} = 0.730), \textbf{age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.04, \mathbf{p} = 0.730), \textbf{age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.04, \mathbf{p} = 0.730), \textbf{age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.04, \mathbf{p} = 0.730), \textbf{age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.$			= -0.11, p = 0.017), and
Image: constraint of the second state of the seco			
first walking ($\beta = 0.04$, p = 0.472).Time spent in a high chair or other chair at age ~9 mo was not associated with age at first sitting ($\beta = 0.02$, p = 0.751), age at first crawling ($\beta = -0.04$, p = 0.322), or age at first walking ($\beta = -0.00$, p = 0.963).Time spent in a playpen at age ~9 mo was not associated with age at first sitting ($\beta = 0.04$, p = 0.730), age at first walking ($\beta = -0.00$, p = 0.963).Time spent in a playpen at age ~9 mo was not associated with age at first sitting ($\beta = 0.04$, p = 0.963).O.730), age at first walking ($\beta = -0.02$, p = 0.730), age at first walking ($\beta = -0.02$, p = 0.730), age at first walking ($\beta = -0.02$, p = 0.730), age at first walking ($\beta = -0.02$, p = 0.783), or age at first walking ($\beta = -0.02$, p = 0.783), or age at first walking ($\beta = -0.02$, p = 0.783), or age at first walking ($\beta = -0.02$, p = 0.783), or age at first walking ($\beta = -0.02$, p = 0.783), or age at first walking ($\beta = -0.02$, p = 0.783), or age at first walking ($\beta = -0.02$, p = 0.783), or age at first walking ($\beta = -0.02$, p = 0.783), or age at first walking ($\beta = -0.02$, p = 0.783), or age at first walking ($\beta = -0.02$, p = 0.783), or age at first walking ($\beta = -0.04$, p =			
= 0.472). Time spent in a high chair or other chair at age -9 mo was not associated with age at first sitting ($\beta = 0.02$, p = 0.751), age at first crawling ($\beta = -0.04$, p = 0.322), or age at first walking ($\beta = -0.00$, p = 0.963). Time spent in a playpen at age -9 mo was not associated with age at first sitting ($\beta = 0.04$, p = 0.963). Time spent in a playpen at age -9 mo was not associated with age at first sitting ($\beta = 0.04$, p = 0.730), age at first crawling ($\beta = -0.02$, p = 0.730), arge at first walking ($\beta = -0.02$, p = 0.730, or age at first walking ($\beta = 0.04$, p =			
Time spent in a high chair or other chair at age ~9 mo was not associated with age at first sitting ($\beta = 0.02$, $p =$ 0.751), age at first crawling ($\beta = -0.04$, $p =$ 0.322), or age at first walking ($\beta = -0.00$, $p =$ 0.963).Time spent in a playpen at age ~9 mo was not associated with age at first sitting ($\beta = 0.04$, $p =$ 0.963).Time spent in a playpen at age ~9 mo was not associated with age at first sitting ($\beta = 0.04$, $p =$ 0.730), age at first crawling ($\beta = -0.02$, $p =$ 0.730), or age at first walking ($\beta = 0.04$, $p =$ 0.783), or age at first walking ($\beta = 0.04$, $p =$			first walking ($\beta = 0.04$, p
chair or other chair at age ~9 mo was not associated with age at first sitting ($\beta = 0.02$, p = 0.751), age at first crawling ($\beta = -0.04$, p = 0.322), or age at first 			= 0.472).
chair or other chair at age ~9 mo was not associated with age at first sitting ($\beta = 0.02$, p = 0.751), age at first crawling ($\beta = -0.04$, p = 0.322), or age at first walking ($\beta = -0.00$, p = 0.963).Time spent in a playpen at age ~9 mo was not associated with age at first sitting ($\beta = 0.04$, p = 0.963).Time spent in a playpen at age ~9 mo was not associated with age at first sitting ($\beta = 0.04$, p = 0.963).Time spent in a playpen at age ~9 mo was not associated with age at first sitting ($\beta = 0.04$, p = 0.730), age at first walking ($\beta = 0.02$, p = 0.730), or age at first walking ($\beta = 0.04$, p =			
age ~9 mo was not associated with age at first sitting ($\beta = 0.02$, $p =$ 0.751), age at first crawling ($\beta = -0.04$, $p =$ 0.322), or age at first walking ($\beta = -0.00$, $p =$ 0.963).Time spent in a playpen at age ~9 mo was not associated with age at first sitting ($\beta = -0.04$, $p =$ 0.763), age at first crawling ($\beta = -0.04$, $p =$ 0.763), or age at first crawling ($\beta = -0.02$, $p =$ 0.730), or age at first walking ($\beta = -0.02$, $p =$ 0.783), or age at first walking ($\beta = 0.04$, $p =$ 0.783), or age at first walking ($\beta = 0.04$, $p =$			
associated with age at first sitting ($\beta = 0.02$, p = 0.751), age at first crawling ($\beta = -0.04$, p = 0.322), or age at first walking ($\beta = -0.00$, p = 0.963). Time spent in a playpen at age ~9 mo was not associated with age at first sitting ($\beta = 0.04$, p = 0.730), age at first crawling ($\beta = -0.02$, p = 0.733), or age at first walking ($\beta = -0.02$, p = 0.783), or age at first walking ($\beta = 0.04$, p =			chair or other chair at
first sitting $(\beta = 0.02, p = 0.751)$, age at first crawling $(\beta = -0.04, p = 0.322)$, or age at first walking $(\beta = -0.00, p = 0.322)$, or age at first walking $(\beta = -0.00, p = 0.963)$.Time spent in a playpen at age ~9 mo was not associated with age at first sitting $(\beta = 0.04, p = 0.730)$, age at first crawling $(\beta = -0.02, p = 0.730)$, age at first crawling $(\beta = -0.02, p = 0.730)$, age at first walking $(\beta = -0.02, p = 0.730)$, are at first walking $(\beta = -0.02, p = 0.783)$, or age at first walking $(\beta = 0.04, p = 0.783)$, or age at first			age ~9 mo was not
$\begin{array}{c} 0.751), \text{ age at first} \\ \text{crawling } (\beta = -0.04, p = \\ 0.322), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{walking } (\beta = -0.00, p = \\ 0.963). \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{c} \text{Time spent in a playpen} \\ \text{at age } \sim 9 \text{ mo was not} \\ \text{associated with age at} \\ \text{first sitting } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.730), \text{ age at first} \\ \text{crawling } (\beta = -0.02, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \text{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), $			associated with age at
crawling ($\beta = -0.04$, p = 0.322), or age at first walking ($\beta = -0.00$, p = 0.963).Time spent in a playpen at age ~9 mo was not associated with age at first sitting ($\beta = 0.04$, p = 0.730), age at first crawling ($\beta = -0.02$, p = 0.783), or age at first walking ($\beta = 0.04$, p =			first sitting (β = 0.02, p =
$\begin{array}{c} 0.322), \text{ or age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = -0.00, p = \\ 0.963). \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{Time spent in a playpen} \\ \text{at age } \sim 9 \text{ mo was not} \\ \text{associated with age at} \\ \textbf{first sitting } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.730), \textbf{age at first} \\ \textbf{crawling } (\beta = -0.02, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), \text{ or age at first} \\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \\ 0.783), $			0.751), age at first
walking (β = -0.00, p = 0.963).Time spent in a playpen at age ~9 mo was not associated with age at first sitting (β = 0.04, p = 0.730), age at first crawling (β = -0.02, p = 0.783), or age at first walking (β = 0.04, p =			crawling (β = -0.04, p =
0.963). Time spent in a playpen at age ~9 mo was not associated with age at first sitting ($\beta = 0.04$, p = 0.730), age at first crawling ($\beta = -0.02$, p = 0.783), or age at first walking ($\beta = 0.04$, p =			-
Time spent in a playpen at age ~9 mo was not associated with age at first sitting ($\beta = 0.04$, $p =$ 0.730), age at first crawling ($\beta = -0.02$, $p =$ 0.783), or age at first walking ($\beta = 0.04$, $p =$			
at age ~9 mo was not associated with age at first sitting ($\beta = 0.04$, p = 0.730), age at first crawling ($\beta = -0.02$, p = 0.783), or age at first walking ($\beta = 0.04$, p =			0.963).
at age ~9 mo was not associated with age at first sitting ($\beta = 0.04$, p = 0.730), age at first crawling ($\beta = -0.02$, p = 0.783), or age at first walking ($\beta = 0.04$, p =			
associated with age at first sitting ($\beta = 0.04$, p = 0.730), age at first crawling ($\beta = -0.02$, p = 0.783), or age at first walking ($\beta = 0.04$, p =			
first sitting ($\beta = 0.04$, p = 0.730), age at first crawling ($\beta = -0.02$, p = 0.783), or age at first walking ($\beta = 0.04$, p =			
$\begin{array}{c} 0.730\text{), age at first}\\ \textbf{crawling } (\beta = -0.02, p = \\ 0.783\text{), or age at first}\\ \textbf{walking } (\beta = 0.04, p = \end{array}$			•
$\begin{array}{l} \textbf{crawling} \ (\beta = -0.02, \ p = \\ 0.783), \ \textbf{or age at first} \\ \textbf{walking} \ (\beta = 0.04, \ p = \end{array}$			
0.783), or age at first walking ($\beta = 0.04$, p =			
walking ($\beta = 0.04$, p =			
0.540).			
			0.540).

	Time spent in a baby carrier/sling at age ~9 mo was not associated with age at first sitting (β = - 0.02, p = 0.615), age at first crawling (β = -0.06, p = 0.226), or age at first walking (β = -0.02, p = 0.672).	
	TV time at age ~20 mo was not associated with age at first sitting (β = - 0.01, p = 0.857), age at first crawling (β = 0.03, p = 0.538), or age at first walking (β = 0.04, p = 0.352).	
	Time spent in a stroller/pram at age ~20 mo was not associated with age at first sitting (β = 0.10, p = 0.070), age at first crawling (β = 0.04, p = 0.433), or age at first walking (β = 0.05, p = 0.281).	
	Time spent in a car seat/capsule at age ~20 mo was not associated with age at first sitting (β = 0.01, p = 0.815), age at first crawling (β = -0.02, p = 0.632), or age at first walking (β = 0.06, p = 0.212).	

					Time spent in a high chair or other chair at age ~20 mo was not associated with age at first sitting ($\beta = 0.05$, p = 0.435), age at first crawling ($\beta = 0.03$, p = 0.596), or age at first walking ($\beta = 0.04$, p = 0.379).	
					Time spent in a playpen at age ~20 mo was not associated with age at first sitting ($\beta = 0.10$, p = 0.225), age at first crawling ($\beta = -0.01$, p = 0.848), or age at first walking ($\beta = 0.09$, p = 0.164).	
Schmidt et al. 2009	Longitudinal	N = 872	TV time (hr/day) assessed	Visual-motor abilities	TV time from birth to 2 yr	TV time from age birth
[6]; USA; Project	(2.5 yr follow-	N = 072	by parent-report	(standardized to a mean	was not related to visual -	to 2 yr: Age, gender,
Viva	up)	T1, Age Range:	questionnaire	and SD of 15) assessed by	motor abilities at age 3 yr	maternal age, education,
, i tu	up)	6 mo to 2 yr	(unpublished) at ages 6	trained research assistants	(mean WRAVMA score	marital status, parity,
		Toddlers to	mo, 1 yr and 2 yr, and as	using the Wide-Range	by TV time: 0 to 0.5	Peabody Picture
		Pre-schoolers	the weighted average of	Assessment of Visual	hr/day, mean = 103.4, SD	Vocabulary Test III
			TV exposure from birth	Motor Ability	= 11.5; 0.5 to < 1 hr/day,	(PPVT-III) score,
		T2, ~Age: 3 yr	and 2 yr [adapted from	(WRAVMA) test.	mean = 103.1 , SD = 11.1 ;	household income, child
		Pre-schoolers	questionnaire used in the		1 to <2 hr/day, mean =	birth weight for
			National Longitudinal		102.1, SD = $10.8; \ge 2$	gestational age z score,
			Survey of Children and		hr/day, mean = 102.2, SD	breastfeeding duration,
			Youth study (NLSY)].		= 11.9; p = 0.57).	race/ethnicity, English
						language, average daily
					TV time from birth to 2 yr	sleep duration from 6 mo
					was not associated with	to 2 yr.
					visual-motor abilities at	
					age 3 yr (B = $-0.24, 95\%$	TV time at ages 6 mo, 1

Pagani et al. 2013 [69]; Canada; QLSCD (Quebec Longitudinal Study of Child Development)	Longitudinal (3 yr follow- up)	N = 1999 Approximate Age: T1, 29 mo (~2.4 yr) Toddlers T2, 65 mo (~5.4 yr) School-Age	TV time (hr/day) at age 29 mo assessed by parent- report questionnaire (unpublished).	Locomotion skills (no units; higher scores are better) and object control (no units; higher scores are better) assessed by the "test of gross motor development".	CI: -1.15, 0.66, p > 0.05). TV time at 6 mo, 1 yr and 2 yr of age was not associated with visual- motor abilities at age 3 yr (6 mo: B = 0.01, 95% CI: -0.65, 0.66; 1 yr: B = - 0.02, 95% CI: -0.55, 0.52; 2yr: B = -0.29, 95% CI: - 1.06, 0.48). TV time at age ~29 mo was unfavourably associated with locomotion skills (B = - 0.024, 95% CI: -0.034, - 0.014, p < 0.000), but was not associated with object control (values not reported; p > 0.05), at age ~65 mo.	yr and 2 yr: Maternal age, education, marital status, parity, PPVT-III score, household income, child birth weight for gestational age z score, breastfeeding duration, race/ethnicity, English language, <i>average daily</i> <i>sleep duration</i> . Maternal education, early stimulation of literacy, early childhood temperament, family functioning.
Study Design: Cross-sectional			L	I	L	
De Kegel et al. 2012 [70]; Belgium	Cross- sectional	N = 210 Age range: 4 to 18 mo (~0.33 to 1.5 yr) Infants to Toddlers	Amount of play time in the supine position (categories: often to frequently, >30 min/day; sometimes to never, <30 min/day) assessed by parent-report questionnaire (unpublished).	Gross motor performance (no units; age-corrected score; greater scores indicate better gross motor performance) assessed using the Alberta Infant Motor Scale (AIMS) tool.	Infants who played in the supine position often or frequently <i>before the age</i> <i>of 6 mo</i> did not have different gross motor performance compared to those who played in the supine position sometimes to never (motor performance, means \pm SD: often or frequently, -0.38 \pm 5.63; sometimes to never, 0.94 \pm 8.11; p = 0.355; Cohen's	N/A

		1	Γ	1	1	,
					d = -0.19).	
					Infants/toddlers who	
					played in the supine	
					position often or	
					frequently after the age	
					of 6 mo had significantly	
					lower gross motor	
					performance compared to	
					those who played in the	
					supine position	
					sometimes to never	
					(motor performance,	
					means \pm SD: often or	
					frequently, -2.28 ± 6.10 ;	
					sometimes to never, 1.84	
					\pm 7.48; p = 0.001; Cohen's	
					d = -0.60).	
Lin et al. 2015	Cross-	N = 150	TV time (min/day)	Motor skill development	Children with delayed	Analyses were
[71]; Taiwan	sectional	TV exposure, $n = 75$;	assessed by parent-report	[gross and fine;	motor skill development	multivariate, but
		Control, $n = 75$	interview.	categorized as "typical"	spent more time watching	covariates were not
				$(>15^{\text{th}} \text{ percentile}) \text{ or}$	TV compared to children	specified.
		Mean age: 24.8 mo	Children were divided into	"delayed" (≤15 th	with typical motor skill	-
		(~2.1 yr)	categories based on their	percentile)] assessed by	development (116.9 vs	
		Toddlers	average TV time:	the Peabody	64.4 min/day; t = 2.3, p <	
			frequently exposed (>0	Developmental Motor	0.05).	
			hr/day TV for children <2	Scales-second edition		
			yr, and >2 hr/day TV for	(PDMS-2; 6 subtests:	Children who were	
			children ≥ 2 yr), or	reflexes, stationary,	frequently exposed to TV	
			infrequently exposed (no	locomotion, object	were more likely to have	
			TV for children <2 yr, and	manipulation, grasping,	delayed motor skill	
			$\leq 2 \text{ hr/day for children} \geq 2$	and visual-motor	development than those	
			yr).	integration).	who were infrequently	
				6	exposed (OR = 3.7, 95%	
					CI: 1.5, 9.3).	
					% of sample with typical	
					and delayed motor skill	
					development in those	

					frequently vs infrequently exposed respectively: typical (69.3 vs 84.0%), delayed (30.7 vs 16.0%) ($X^2 = 4.5$, p < 0.05).	
Johansson et al. 2015 [21]; Sweden; Early Stockholm Obesity Prevention Project (Early STOPP)	Cross- sectional	N = 123 Mean age: 2.03 yr Toddlers	Total sedentary timemin/day; \leq 89 counts/5 secepoch) measuredobjectively byaccelerometer (Actigraph,GT3X+ worn on thewrist).Number of 30 min boutsof sedentary behaviourand total time in 30 minbouts of sedentarybehaviour (number andmin/day; 30 min of \leq 89counts/5 sec with a 1 mininterruption of >89counts/5 sec allowed).	Motor skills ["neurological optimality score"; scores range from 0 to 58; higher scores are better; categories: "low" (scores of <53) and "normal" (scores of ≥53)].	Total sedentary time was not different between children with low (416, SD = 48 min/day) and normal (434, SD = 47 min/day) motor skills (p = 0.09). The number of 30 min bouts of sedentary behaviour was not different between children with low (2.4, SD = 1.3 bouts) and normal (2.5, SD = 1.2 bouts) motor skills (p = 0.67), nor was the total time in 30 min bouts of sedentary behaviour (low: 143, SE = 67 min; normal: 157, SD = 83 min; p = 0.44).	N/A
Williams et al. 2008 [23]; USA; Children's Activity and Movement in Preschool Study (CHAMPS)	Cross- sectional	N = 198 Approximate age: 3 yr and 4 yr Pre-schoolers	Total sedentary time hr/day and % time; <37.5 counts/15 sec epoch) measured objectively by accelerometer (Actigraph, 7164).	Locomotor skills (score out of 73) and object control skills (score out of 80), and total motor skills (score out of 153) assessed by observers using the CHAMPS Motor Skill Protocol (CMSP).	Total sedentary time was not associated with locomotor skills ($r = -$ 0.10), object control skills ($r = -0.09$), or total motor skills ($r = -0.11$) (all p > 0.05). Total % sedentary time did not vary by tertile of	Sex, BMI, race, and parent education, and preschool center (as a random variable).

total motor skill
performance (tertiles: low,
56.1, SE = 0.9;
intermediate, 54.5, SE =
0.9; high, 53.7, SE = 0.9;
p > 0.05) or object
control skills (tertiles:
low, 55.7, SE = 0.9;
intermediate, 54.5, SE =
0.9; high, 53.9, SE = 1.0;
p > 0.05).
Children in the highest
tertile of locomotor skills
score had significantly
less total % sedentary
time than children in the
low and intermediate
tertiles (tertiles: low, 55.7,
SE = 09; intermediate,
55.6, SE = 0.9; high, 53.1
SE = 0.9; p < 0.05).

B, unstandardized beta; β, standardized beta; CHAMPS, Children's Activity and Movement in Preschool Study; CI, confidence interval; CMSP, CHAMPS Motor Skill Protocol; Early STOPP, Early Stockholm Obesity Prevention Project; INFANT, Melbourne Infant Feeding, Activity and Nutrition Trial Program; NLSY, National Longitudinal Survey for Children and Youth study; PDMS-2, Peabody Developmental Motor Scales-second edition; PPVT-III, Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test III; QLSCD, Quebec Longitudinal Study of Child Development; SD, standard deviation; T1-T4, Time 1 to Time 4; TV, television; WRAVMA, Wide-Range Assessment of Visual Motor Ability.

Reference; Country; Larger Study/Cohort Name	Study Design	Sample	Exposure	Outcome	Main Findings	Covariates included in model (if applicable)
Study Design: RCT						
Yilmaz et al. 2014 [1]; Turkey	Randomized Controlled Trial (RCT)	N = 412 Intervention, n = 211; Control, n = 201 Mean age: Intervention, 3.52 yr Control, 3.49 yr Pre-schoolers	Intervention: 3 printed materials and interactive CDs and one counselling call, intending to decrease screen time. Control: Usual care; unaware of counselling interventions. Screen time (min/day) was assessed by parent- report 1-week time-record diary (unpublished). The intervention was 8 weeks in duration, with follow-up at 2, 6 and 9 months post-intervention.	Aggressive behavior (units not indicated) and delinquent behavior (units not indicated) assessed by parent-report using the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL).	Screen time was significantly lower in the intervention vs control group at 2, 6 and 9 month follow-up post- intervention (mean \pm SD: 2 month: 39.48 \pm 16.36 vs 86.64 \pm 21.63 min/day; 6 month: 24.72 \pm 4.45 vs 84.95 \pm 14.77 min/day; 9 month: 21.15 \pm 6.12 vs 93.96 \pm 18.84 min/day; all p < 0.001). Aggressive behavior was not different between groups at baseline (mean \pm SD: intervention, 6.94 \pm 1.66; control, 7.17 \pm 1.52; p = 0.283), but significantly lower in the intervention vs control group at 9-months post- intervention, 3.35 \pm 1.46; control, 3.85 \pm 1.38; p = 0.001). Delinquent behavior was not different between groups at baseline (mean \pm SD: intervention, 3.02 \pm 1.23; control, 3.02 \pm 1.24;	N/A

Table S3. Summary of findings for psychosocial health outcomes

	T	T				1
					p=0.858), but significantly	
					lower in the intervention	
					vs control group at 9-	
					months post-intervention	
					(mean \pm SD: intervention,	
					3.45 ± 1.56 ; control, 3.83	
					± 0.95; p=0.006).	
Study Design: Longitudinal						
Cheng et al. 2010	Longitudinal	N = 302	TV time (hr/day) at ages	Emotional symptoms,	Emotional symptoms at	Child sex, birth weight,
[72]; Japan	(~1 yr follow-		~18 and 30 mo assessed	conduct problems, peer-	age ~30 mo were not	gestational age, birth
	up)	Approximate age:	by parent-report	problems, and prosocial	different between	order, maternal education
Japan Children's		T1, 18 mo (~1.5 yr)	questionnaire	behaviour (all measured	categories of TV time at	and family income and
Study		T2, 30 mo (~2.5 yr)	(unpublished).	on a scale from 0 to 10;	age ~18 mo (mean scores	maternal stimulation.
		Toddlers		higher numbers are	by TV time categories:	
			TV time patterns from	unfavourable for all	<i>unadjusted</i> , <1hr/day,	
			age ~ 18 mo to age ~ 30	except prosocial	1.83; 95% CI: 1.4, 2.3; ≥1	
			mo [categories: high-	behaviour) assessed by	to <3 hr/day, 2.03, 95%	
			high , \geq 4 hr/day at 18 and	parent-report using the	CI: 1.7, 2.4; \geq 3 to <4	
			30 mo; high-low , ≥4	Japanese version of the	hr/day, 2.11, 95% CI: 1.7,	
			hr/day at 18 mo and <4	Strengths and Difficulties	2.6; ≥4 hr/day, 1.79, 95%	
			hr/day at 30 mo; low-	Questionnaire (SDQ).	CI: 1.4, 2.2; p-value for	
			high, <4 hr/day at 18 mo		mean differences, p =	
			and ≥ 4 hr/day at 30 mo;		0.599).	
			low-low <4 hr/day at 18			
			and 30 mo] assessed by		Conduct problems at age	
			parent-report		~30 mo were not different	
			questionnaire		between categories of TV	
			(unpublished).		time at age ~18 mo (mean	
					scores by TV time	
					categories: unadjusted,	
					<1hr/day, 3.07; 95% CI:	
					2.5, 3.7; \geq 1 to <3 hr/day,	
					3.17, 95% CI: 2.8, 3.5; ≥3	
					to <4 hr/day, 3.11, 95%	
					CI: 2.6, 3.6; \geq 4 hr/day,	
					3.22, 95% CI: 2.8, 3.7; p-	
					value for mean	
					differences, $p = 0.973$).	
		L			, P 0.770/	1

	Peer-problems at age ~30 mo were not different between categories of TV time at age ~18 mo (mean scores by TV time categories: <i>unadjusted</i> ,
	<1hr/day, 2.14; 95% CI: 1.6, 2.7; ≥ 1 to <3 hr/day, 2.17, 95% CI: 1.9, 2.5; ≥ 3 to <4 hr/day, 2.08, 95%
	CI: 1.7, 2.5; \geq 4 hr/day, 2.28, 95% CI: 1.9, 2.7; p- value for mean differences, p = 0.844).
	There was an unfavourable dose- response relationship between TV time at age ~18 mo and prosocial
	behaviour at age ~30 mo in <i>unadjusted</i> but not <i>adjusted</i> analyses (mean scores by TV time
	categories: <i>unadjusted</i> , <1hr/day, 5.98; 95% CI: 5.2, 6.7; ≥1 to <3 hr/day, 5.42, 95% CI: 5.0, 5.9; ≥3 to <4 hr/day, 5.26, 95%
	CI: 4.7, 5.8; \geq 4 hr/day, 4.65, 95% CI: 4.1, 5.2; p- value for mean differences, p = 0.020; p-
	value for linear trend for means, p = 0.004; <i>adjusted</i> , <1hr/day, 5.80; 95% CI: 4.9. 6.7; ≥1 to <3 hr/day, 5.50, 95% CI: 4.9,

Verlinden et al. 2012 [73]; Netherlands The Generation R Study	Longitudinal (~1 yr follow- up)	N = 3309 Approximate age: T1, 24 mo (~2 yr) T2, 36 mo (~3 yr) Toddlers	TV time (hr/day) at age ~24 mo and TV time pattern (categories: never, continued low, continued moderate, continued high, increased exposure) from age ~24 to ~36 mo, assessed by parent-report questionnaire (unpublished). Categories of "change in TV time pattern" were defined as follows:	Externalizing problems (categories: externalizing problems, score ≥18; no externalizing problems, score <18) assessed by parent-report using the CBCL.	6.0; ≥3 to <4 hr/day, 5.21, 95% CI: 4.5, 5.9; ≥4 hr/day, 4.73, 95% CI: 4.2, 5.3; p-value for mean differences, p = 0.132; p- value for linear trend, p = 0.039). Prosocial behaviour was not different across TV time patterns (high-high, 5.00, 95% CI: 4.3, 5.7; high-low, 4.32, 95% CI: 3.4, 5.2; low-high, 5.31, 95% CI: 4.2, 6.4; low-low, 5.48, 95% CI: 5.1, 5.8; p- value for mean differences, p = 0.088). TV time at age ~24 mo was not associated with the incidence of externalizing problems at age ~36 mo (<i>unadjusted</i> : OR = 2.24, 95% CI : 0.97, 5.18; <i>adjusted</i> : OR = 1.53, 95% CI: 0.62, 3.81). Continued high TV time and increased TV time between ~24 to ~36 mo of age were associated with an increased incidence of externalizing problems at	Externalizing symptoms at age 18 mo, and child's age, national origin, sex, day care attendance, maternal and paternal age, maternal and paternal educational level, marital status, monthly income, maternal symptoms of psychiatric disorders, parenting stress, parity.
			Categories of "change in		between ~24 to ~36 mo of age were associated with	
			defined as follows: - never: never or less than		externalizing problems at age ~36 mo (compared to	
			0.5 hr/day at both time points; - continued low:0.5-1		"never": <i>unadjusted:</i> continued low, OR = 1.13, 95% CI: 0.58, 2.23, p =	
			hr/day;		0.72; continued moderate,	

	1		ſ	1	l	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
			- continued moderate:1		OR = 1.47, 95% CI: 0.73,	
			hr/day;		2.93, p = 0.28; high, OR =	
			- high: both continued		2.62, 95% CI: 1.48, 4.66,	
			high (≥0.5 hr/day at 24		p = 0.001; continued high,	
			mo and ≥ 1 hr/ day at 36		OR = 2.66, 95% CI: 1.47,	
			mo) and increased (<0.5		4.79, p = 0.001; increased,	
			hr/day at 24 mo and ≥ 1		OR = 2.50, 95% CI: 1.15,	
			hr/ day at 36 mo);		5.41, p = 0.02; <i>adjusted</i> :	
			− continued high: ≥ 0.5		continued low, $OR = 1.01$,	
			hr/day at 24 mo and ≥ 1		95% CI: 0.55, 2.57, p =	
			hr/ day at 36 mo;		0.98; continued moderate,	
			- increased: <0.5 hr/day		OR = 1.20, 95% CI: 0.57,	
			at 24 mo and ≥ 1 hr/ day		2.50, p = 0.63; high, OR =	
			at 36 mo		2.00, 95% CI: 1.07, 3.75,	
					p = 0.03; continued high,	
					OR = 2.09, 95% CI: 1.08,	
					4.01, p = 0.03; increased,	
					OR = 1.90, 95% CI: 1.90,	
					4.21, p = 0.17).	
Pagani et al. 2010	Longitudinal	N = 1314	TV time (hr/week) at age	Victimization (no units)	TV time at age 29 months	TV time: Change in TV
[9]; Canada	(~8 yr follow-		29 mo assessed by parent-	assessed by teacher-report	was unfavourably	time, concurrent TV time,
	up)	T1, ~Age:	report questionnaire	using the Social	associated with	sex, temperament,
QLSCD (Quebec		29 mo (~2.4 yr)	(unpublished).	Behaviour Questionnaire	victimization in Grade 4	cognitive ability,
Longitudinal Study		Toddlers		(SBQ).	(age ~9-10 yr; $\beta = 0.10$,	impulsivity, emotional
of Child			Change in TV time		SE = 0.01; B = 0.03, 95%	distress, physical
Development)		T2, ~Age: 53 mo	(hr/week) from age 29 mo		CI: 0.01, 0.05; p <	aggression, hours of sleep,
		(4.4 yr)	to 53 mo.		0.0001).	maternal education,
		Pre-schoolers				family makeup, family
					The change in TV time	functioning.
		T3, Grade 4 (in			from age 29 mo to 53 mo	
		Grade 4 in Quebec,			was not associated with	Change in TV time:
		children are aged 9 to			victimization in Grade 4	Same as above, except
		10; School-age)			(age ~9-10 yr; $\beta = 0.06$,	inclusion of "baseline TV
					SE = 0.01; B = 0.01, 95%	time" instead of "change
					CI: -0.01, 0.03; p ≤ 0.05).	in TV time".
Pagani et al. 2013	Longitudinal	N = 1999	TV time (hr/day) at age	Anxiety, physical	TV time at age ~29 mo	Maternal education, early
[69]; Canada	(3 yr follow-		29 mo assessed by parent-	aggression, prosocial	was unfavourably	stimulation of literacy,
_	up)	Approximate Age:	report questionnaire	behaviour, and	associated victimization	early childhood
L		, :- -	-		I	-

QLSCD		T1, 29 mo (~2.4 yr) Toddlers T2, 65 mo (~5.4 yr) School-age	(unpublished).	victimization (scores ranging from 1 to 10; higher scores indicate a greater degree of the factor) a assessed by teachers using the SBQ.	 by classmates (B = 0.008, 95% CI: 0.002, 0.014, p = 0.005) at age ~65 mo. TV time at age ~29 mo was not associated with anxiety, physical aggression, or prosocial behaviour at age ~65 mo (values not reported). 	temperament, family functioning.
Watt et al. 2015 [74]; Canada; Quebec Longitudinal Study of Child Development (QLSCD)	Longitudinal (~9.5 yr follow-up)	N = 1314 Approximate age: T1, 29 mo (~2.4 yr) Toddlers T2, Grade 6 (~12 yr) School-age	TV time (hr/day; categories: ≤2 hr/day, >2 hr/day) assessed by parent-report questionnaire (unpublished).	Victimization (scores from 0 to 10; higher values indicate more victimization) assessed by self-report with the Social Behavior Questionnaire. Children were categorized as being in the high victimization group if their scores were beyond 71.2% of the sample (cutoff selected using the frequency distribution).	TV time at age ~2.4 yr was unfavourably associated with victimization at age ~12 yr (B = 0.031, SE = 0.01, 95% CI: 0.014, 0.042, p = 0.001; β = 0.11). Children who had >2 hr/day TV time were more likely than children who had ≤2 hr/day TV time to show a 0.086 SD unit increase in victimization (B = 0.428, 95% CI: 0.159, 0.696, p = 0.002), and were 54% more likely to be in the high victimization group.	Gender, factors at age ~2.4 yr (externalizing behaviour, cognitive ability, emotional distress), factors at age ~12 yr (concurrent TV time, family configuration, family functioning, family income, maternal education).
Mistry et al. 2007 [75]; USA; Healthy Steps for Young Children	Longitudinal (~3 yr follow- up)	N = 2707 Approximate age: T1: 30 to 33 mo (2.5 to 2.8 yr) Toddlers T2: 5.5 yr	TV time (hr/day, and categories: >2 hr/day, ≤2 hr/day) assessed by parent-report interview (unpublished format).	The following were assessed by parent-report using the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL): emotionally reactive (scale from 0 to 18), anxious or depressed (scale from 0 to 16),,	TV time at age ~2.5 yr was favourably associated with emotionally reactivity scores (<i>unadjusted:</i> $\beta = -0.33$, 95% CI: -0.59, -0.07, p \leq 0.05; <i>adjusted:</i> - $\beta = -0.43$, 95% CI: -0.69, -0.17, p \leq	Maternal demographic characteristics (age at child's birth, race, ethnicity, marital status, employment, education), child's gender, parity, household income, child's health status, maternal

Γ	School-age	aggressive behavior	0.01), but was not	depressive symptoms,
	School-age	(scale from 0 to 38), and	associated with anxious	parental involvement in
		externalizing scale (scale		child's activities,
		from 0 to 48; sum of	or depressed scores $(madiustad, R = 0.01)$	
			(<i>unadjusted</i> : $\beta = 0.01$,	intervention status (note:
		attention problems and	95% CI: -0.25, 0.25;	the intervention is
		aggressive behavior	<i>adjusted:</i> $\beta = -0.22, 95\%$	designed to enhance the
		scores). Higher scores	CI: -0.47, 0.04; both p >	delivery of developmental
		indicate more problems.	0.05), , aggressive	services for families).
			behavior (<i>unadjusted</i> : β =	
		The following were	0.11, 95% CI: -0.57, 0.80;	
		assessed by parent-report	<i>adjusted:</i> β = -0.30, 95%	
		using the Social Skills	CI: -0.98, 0.39; both p >	
		Rating System:	0.05), or externalizing	
		cooperation, assertion,	(<i>unadjusted</i> : $\beta = 0.25$,	
		responsibility, self-	95% CI: -0.56, 1.06;	
		control, and total social	<i>adjusted:</i> β = -0.37, 95%	
		skills (a composite of the	CI: -1.18, 0.43; both p >	
		other items). All items	0.05) at age ~5.5 yr.	
		rated on a scale from 0 to		
		20; higher scores indicate	TV time at age ~2.5 yr	
		greater social skills.	was unfavourably	
			associated with	
			cooperation and self-	
			control at age ~5.5 yr in	
			<i>unadjusted</i> (cooperation: β	
			= -0.39, 95% CI: -0.73, -	
			0.05; self-control: $\beta = -$	
			0.46, 95% CI: -0.82, -	
			0.10; both $p \le 0.05$) but	
			not adjusted (cooperation:	
			$\beta = -0.19, 95\%$ CI: -0.52,	
			0.15; self-control: $\beta = -$	
			0.16, 95% CI: -0.52, 0.20;	
			both $p > 0.05$) analyses.	
			TV time at age ~ 2.5 yr	
			was not associated with	
			assertion (<i>unadjusted:</i> $\beta =$	
			-0.07, 95% CI: -0.41,	
			$0.26; adjusted: \beta = 0.16,$	
			0.20, <i>aajusiea</i> . $p = 0.10$,	

					0.501 07 0.10 0.50 1 1	
					95% CI: -0.18, 0.50; both	
					p > 0.05), responsibility	
					(<i>unadjusted</i> : $\beta = 0.08$,	
					95% CI: -0.43, 0.27;	
					<i>adjusted:</i> $\beta = 0.02, 95\%$	
					CI: -0.33, 0.36; both p >	
					0.05) or total social skills	
					(unadjusted: $\beta = -0.97$,	
					95% CI: -2.11, 0.16;	
					<i>adjusted</i> : $\beta = -0.16, 95\%$	
					CI: -1.26, 0.94; both p >	
					0.05) at age ~5.5 yr.	
Verlinden et al. I	Longitudinal	N = 3423	TV time (hr/day) at age 2	Risk of being a bully,	Unadjusted and Adjusted	Child gender, age,
2014 [76];	(~4 yr follow-		yr, age 3 yr, age 4 yr, and	victim, bully-victim	Analyses:	national origin,
Netherlands u	up)	Approximate age at	at least twice between	(categories: bully, victim,		internalizing and
		baseline:	ages 2-5 (combined for	bully-victim, uninvolved	High TV time at ages 2-5	externalizing problems
Generation R		T1, assessed at least	analysis) assessed by	in bullying) assessed by	yr was unfavourably	and day-care attendance,
Study		twice between ages 2	parent-report	teacher-report	associated with teacher-	and maternal age, parity,
		to 5 yr	questionnaire	questionnaire	report of being a bully at	education, income, marital
		Pre-schoolers	(unpublished).	(unpublished) and by self-	age ~7 yr compared to low	status, maternal symptoms
				and proxy-report (peer	TV time in <i>unadjusted</i> but	of depression, parenting
		Mean age at follow-	TV time was divided into	nomination; unpublished	not adjusted analyses, but	stress.
		up:	four categories for	questionnaire) in Grades	there was no difference for	
		T2: Teacher report,	analysis for 2 year olds:	1-2.	mid-low or mid-high TV	
		6.8 yr; Self/proxy-	never, <0.5 hr/day, 0.5-1		time in either unadjusted	
		report, 7.6 yr	hr/day, >1 hr/day; and		or <i>adjusted</i> analyses	
		School-age	five categories for 3, 4		(compared to low TV	
			and 5 year olds: never,		time: unadjusted: mid-	
			<0.5 hr/day, 0.5-1 hr/day,		low, OR = 1.07, 95% CI:	
			1-2 hr/day, >2 hr/day. TV		0.79, 1.44, p = 0.66; mid-	
			time measures were also		high, OR = 1.35, 95% CI:	
			combined into a latent		0.98, 1.84, p = 0.07; high,	
			variable (categories: low,		OR = 1.74, 95% CI: 1.22,	
			mid-low, mid-high, high)		2.50, p = 0.002; <i>adjusted</i> :	
			to reflect TV time		mid-low, OR = 1.0, 95%	
			patterns throughout ages		CI: 0.74, 1.35, p = 0.99;	
			2-5 years.		mid-high, OR = 1.15, 95%	
					CI: 0.83, 1.59, p = 0.42;	
					high, OR = 1.27, 95% CI:	

	0.86, 1.86, p = 0.23).
	TV time patterns at ages
	2-5 yr were not associated
	with self- or proxy-report
	of being a bully at age ~7
	yr (compared to low TV
	time: unadjusted: mid-
	low, OR = 0.85, 95% CI:
	0.51, 1.43, p = 0.54; mid-
	high, OR = 1.28, 95% CI:
	0.75, 2.18, p = 0.37; high,
	OR = 1.33, 95% CI: 0.66,
	2.65, p = 0.43; <i>adjusted</i> :
	mid-low, OR = 0.68, 95%
	CI: 0.39, 1.18, p = 0.17;
	mid-high, OR = 0.86, 95%
	CI: 0.47, 1.55, p = 0.61;
	high, OR = 0.71, 95% CI:
	0.33, 1.54, p = 0.39).
	High TV time at ages 2-5
	yr was unfavourably
	associated with teacher -
	report of being a victim
	at age \sim 7 yr compared to
	low TV time, but there
	was no difference for mid -
	low or mid-high TV time
	(compared to low TV
	time: <i>unadjusted</i> : mid-
	low, $OR = 1.17, 95\%$ CI:
	0.71, 1.92, p = 0.54; mid-
	high, $OR = 1.11, 95\%$ CI:
	0.64, 1.95, p = 0.71; high,
	OR = 2.38, 95% CI: 1.33,
	4.28, p = 0.004; adjusted:
	4.26, p = 0.004, uajustea. mid-low, OR = 1.16, 95%
	CI: 0.70, 1.91, p = 0.57;
	(1, 0, 70, 1.71, p - 0.57, -0.57)

mid-high, OR = 1.02, 95% CI: 0.57, 1.82, p = 0.96; high, OR = 1.80, 95% 0.94, 3.41, p = 0.07). TV time patterns at ages 2-5 yr were not associated with self- or proxy-report of being a victim at age -7 yr (compared to low TV time: unadjusted: mid-low rdt were not associated with self- or proxy-report of being a victim at age -7 yr (compared to low TV time: unadjusted: mid-low, OR = 0.91, 95% CI: 0.63, 1.32, p = 0.64; mid-ling, OR = 0.89, 95% CI: 0.61, 1.56, p = 0.93; high, OR = 1.10, 95% CI: 0.61, 1.56, p = 0.51; mid-high, OR = 0.88, 95% CI: 0.51, 1.28, p = 0.7; adjusted: mid-high, OR = 0.83, 95% CI: 0.51, 1.28, p = 0.51; mid-high, OR = 0.83, 95% CI: 0.53, 1.37, p = 0.47; high, OR = 0.83, 95% CI: 0.53, 1.37, p = 0.43; High TV time and mid-high TV time and mid-high TV time at ages 2.5 yr were unfavourably associated with teacher- report of being a buly-
high, OR = 1.80, 95% CI: 0.94, 3.41, p = 0.07). TV time patterns at ages 2-5 yr were not associated with self- or proxy-report of being a victim at age -7 yr (compared to low TV time: <i>unadjusted</i> : mid- low, OR = 0.91, 95% CI: 0.63, 1.32, p = 0.64; mid- high, OR = 0.98, 95% CI: 0.61, 1.56, p = 0.93; high, OR = 1.10, 95% CI: 0.57, 2.13, p = 0.77; <i>udjusted</i> : mid-low, OR = 0.88, 95% CI: 0.61, 1.28, p = 0.51; mid-high, OR = 0.83, 95% CI: 0.61, 1.28, p = 0.51; mid-high, OR = 0.83, 95% CI: 0.61, 1.28, p = 0.63). High TV time and mid- high TV ti
0.94, 3.41, p = 0.07). TV time patterns at ages 2-5 yr were not associated with self- or proxy-report of being a victim at age -7 yr (compared to low TV time: <i>unadijusted:</i> mid- low, OR = 0.91, 95% CI: 0.61, 1.32, p = 0.64; mid- high, OR = 0.98, 95% CI: 0.61, 1.26, p = 0.93; high, OR = 1.10, 95% CI: 0.57, 2.13, p = 0.77; adjusted: mid-low, OR = 0.88, 95% CI: 0.61, 1.28, p = 0.51; mid-low, OR = 0.88, 95% CI: 0.51, 1.37, p = 0.47; high, OR = 0.83, 95% CI: 0.51, 1.37, p = 0.63). High TV time and mid-
TV time patterns at ages 2-5 yr were not associated with self- or proxy-report of being a victim at age -7 yr (compared to low TV time: <i>unadjusted</i> : mid- low, OR = 0.91, 95% CI: 0.63, 1.32, p = 0.64; mid- high, OR = 0.98, 95% CI: 0.61, 1.56, p = 0.93; high, OR = 1.10, 95% CI: 0.67, 2.13, p = 0.77; adjusted: mid-low, OR = 0.88, 95% CI: 0.61, 1.28, p = 0.51; mid-lingh, OR = 0.88, 95% CI: 0.43, 1.68, p = 0.63).High TV time and mid- high TV time and time teacher- report of Deing a bully-
2-5 yr were not associated with self- or proxy-report of being a victim at age ~7 yr (compared to low TV time: unadjusted: mid- low, OR = 0.91, 95% CI: 0.63, 1.32, p = 0.64; mid- high, OR = 0.98, 95% CI: 0.61, 1.56, p = 0.93; high, OR = 1.10, 95% CI: 0.61, 1.28, p = 0.51; mid-low, OR = 0.88, 95% CI: 0.61, 1.28, p = 0.51; mid-high, OR = 0.88, 95% CI: 0.50, 1.37, p = 0.47; high, OR = 0.85, 95% CI: 0.43, 1.68, p = 0.63). High TV time and mid- high TV time at ages 2-5 yr were unfavourably associated with teacher- report of being a bully-
2-5 yr were not associated with self- or proxy-report of being a victim at age ~7 yr (compared to low TV time: unadjusted: mid- low, OR = 0.91, 95% CI: 0.63, 1.32, p = 0.64; mid- high, OR = 0.93, 95% CI: 0.61, 1.56, p = 0.93; high, OR = 1.10, 95% CI: 0.61, 1.28, p = 0.51; mid-low, OR = 0.88, 95% CI: 0.61, 1.28, p = 0.51; mid-log, OR = 0.83, 95% CI: 0.50, 1.37, p = 0.47; high, OR = 0.83, 95% CI: 0.50, 1.37, p = 0.47; high, OR = 0.85, 95% CI: 0.43, 1.68, p = 0.63). High TV time and mid- high TV time at ages 2-5 yr were unfavourably associated with teacher- report of being a bully-
2-5 yr were not associated with self- or proxy-report of being a victim at age ~7 yr (compared to low TV time: unadjusted: mid- low, OR = 0.91, 95% CI: 0.63, 1.32, p = 0.64; mid- high, OR = 0.93, 95% CI: 0.61, 1.56, p = 0.93; high, OR = 1.10, 95% CI: 0.61, 1.28, p = 0.51; mid-low, OR = 0.88, 95% CI: 0.61, 1.28, p = 0.51; mid-log, OR = 0.83, 95% CI: 0.50, 1.37, p = 0.47; high, OR = 0.83, 95% CI: 0.50, 1.37, p = 0.47; high, OR = 0.85, 95% CI: 0.43, 1.68, p = 0.63). High TV time and mid- high TV time at ages 2-5 yr were unfavourably associated with teacher- report of being a bully-
with self- or proxy-report of being a victim at age -7 yr (compared to low TV time: unadjusted: mid- low, OR = 0.91, 95% CI: 0.63, 1.32, p = 0.64; mid- high, OR = 0.98, 95% CI: 0.61, 1.56, p = 0.93; high, OR = 1.10, 95% CI: 0.57, 2.13, p = 0.77; adjusted: mid-low, OR = 0.88, 95% CI: 0.61, 1.28, p = 0.51; mid-low, OR = 0.88, 95% CI: 0.50, 1.37, p = 0.47; high, OR = 0.85, 95% CI: 0.43, 1.68, p = 0.63). High TV time and mid- hig
of being a victim at age ~7 yr (compared to low TV time: unadjusted: mid- low, OR = 0.91, 95% CI: 0.63, 1.32, p = 0.64; mid- high, OR = 0.98, 95% CI: 0.61, 1.56, p = 0.93; high, OR = 1.10, 95% CI: 0.61, 1.56, p = 0.93; high, OR = 1.10, 95% CI: 0.61, 1.28, p = 0.51; mid-low, OR = 0.88, 95% CI: 0.61, 1.28, p = 0.51; mid-low, OR = 0.88, 95% CI: 0.50, 1.37, p = 0.47; high, OR = 0.85, 95% CI: 0.43, 1.68, p = 0.63). High TV time and mid- high TV time and per 2-5 yr were unfa
-7 yr (compared to low TV time: <i>unadjusted</i> : mid- low, OR = 0.91, 95% CI: 0.63, 1.32, p = 0.64; mid- high, OR = 0.98, 95% CI: 0.61, 1.56, p = 0.93; high, OR = 1.10, 95% CI: 0.57, 2.13, p = 0.77; <i>adjusted</i> : mid-low, OR = 0.88, 95% CI: 0.61, 1.28, p = 0.51; mid-high, OR = 0.83, 95% CI: 0.50, 1.37, p = 0.47; high, OR = 0.85, 95% CI: 0.43, 1.68, p = 0.63). High TV time and mid- high TV time and time
TV time: unadjusted: mid- low, OR = 0.91, 95% CI: 0.63, 1.32, p = 0.64; mid- high, OR = 0.98, 95% CI: 0.61, 1.56, p = 0.93; high, OR = 1.10, 95% CI: 0.57, 2.13, p = 0.77; adjusted: mid-low, OR = 0.88, 95% CI: 0.61, 1.28, p = 0.51; mid-high, OR = 0.83, 95% CI: 0.50, 1.37, p = 0.47; high, OR = 0.85, 95% CI: 0.43, 1.68, p = 0.63). High TV time at ages 2-5 yr were unfavourably associated with teacher- report of being a bully-
low, OR = 0.91, 95% CI: 0.63, 1.32, p = 0.64; mid- high, OR = 0.98, 95% CI: 0.61, 1.56, p = 0.93; high, OR = 1.10, 95% CI: 0.57, 2.13, p = 0.77; <i>adjusted:</i> mid-low, OR = 0.88, 95% CI: 0.61, 1.28, p = 0.51; mid-high, OR = 0.83, 95% CI: 0.50, 1.37, p = 0.47; high, OR = 0.85, 95% CI: 0.43, 1.68, p = 0.63). High TV time and mid- high TV time at ages 2-5 yr were unfavourably associated with teacher- report of being a bully-
0.63, 1.32, p = 0.64; mid-high, OR = 0.98, 95% CI: 0.61, 1.56, p = 0.93; high, OR = 1.10, 95% CI: 0.57, 2.13, p = 0.77; adjusted: mid-low, OR = 0.88, 95% CI: 0.61, 1.28, p = 0.51; mid-high, OR = 0.83, 95% CI: 0.50, 1.37, p = 0.47; high, OR = 0.85, 95% CI: 0.43, 1.68, p = 0.63). High TV time and mid-high TV time and mid-high TV time and mid-high TV time at ages 2-5 yr were unfavourably associated with teacher-report of being a bully-
high, OR = 0.98, 95% CI: 0.61, 1.56, p = 0.93; high, OR = 1.10, 95% CI: 0.57, 2.13, p = 0.77; adjusted: mid-low, OR = 0.88, 95% CI: 0.61, 1.28, p = 0.51; mid-high, OR = 0.83, 95% CI: 0.50, 1.37, p = 0.47; high, OR = 0.85, 95% CI: 0.43, 1.68, p = 0.63). High TV time and mid- high TV time
0.61, 1.56, p = 0.93; high, OR = 1.10, 95% CI: 0.57, 2.13, p = 0.77; adjusted: mid-low, OR = 0.88, 95% CI: 0.61, 1.28, p = 0.51; mid-high, OR = 0.83, 95% CI: 0.50, 1.37, p = 0.47; high, OR = 0.85, 95% CI: 0.43, 1.68, p = 0.63). High TV time and mid- high TV time at ages 2-5 yr were unfavourably associated with teacher- report of being a bully-
OR = 1.10, 95% CI: 0.57, 2.13, p = 0.77; adjusted: mid-low, OR = 0.88, 95% CI: 0.61, 1.28, p = 0.51; mid-high, OR = 0.83, 95% CI: 0.50, 1.37, p = 0.47; high, OR = 0.85, 95% CI: 0.43, 1.68, p = 0.63). High TV time and mid-
2.13, p = 0.77; <i>adjusted:</i> mid-low, OR = 0.88, 95% CI: 0.61, 1.28, p = 0.51; mid-high, OR = 0.83, 95% CI: 0.50, 1.37, p = 0.47; high, OR = 0.85, 95% CI: 0.43, 1.68, p = 0.63). High TV time and mid- high TV time and mid- high TV time at ages 2-5 yr were unfavourably associated with teacher- report of being a bully-
mid-low, OR = 0.88, 95% CI: 0.61, 1.28, p = 0.51; mid-ligh, OR = 0.83, 95% CI: 0.50, 1.37, p = 0.47; high, OR = 0.85, 95% OI: 0.43, 1.68, p = 0.63). High TV time and mid- high TV time and mid- high TV time at ages 2-5 yr were unfavourably associated with teacher- report of being a bully-
CI: 0.61, 1.28, p = 0.51; mid-high, OR = 0.83, 95% CI: 0.50, 1.37, p = 0.47; high, OR = 0.85, 95% CI: 0.43, 1.68, p = 0.63). High TV time and mid- high TV time and mid- high TV time at ages 2-5 yr were unfavourably associated with teacher- report of being a bully-
mid-high, OR = 0.83, 95% CI: 0.50, 1.37, p = 0.47; high, OR = 0.85, 95% OI: 0.43, 1.68, p = 0.63). High TV time and mid- high TV time at ages 2-5 yr were unfavourably associated with teacher- report of being a bully-
CI: 0.50, 1.37, p = 0.47; high, OR = 0.85, 95% CI: 0.43, 1.68, p = 0.63). High TV time and mid- high TV time at ages 2-5 yr were unfavourably associated with teacher- report of being a bully-
high, OR = 0.85, 95% CI: 0.43, 1.68, p = 0.63). High TV time and mid- high TV time at ages 2-5 yr were unfavourably associated with teacher- report of being a bully-
0.43, 1.68, p = 0.63). High TV time and mid- high TV time at ages 2-5 yr were unfavourably associated with teacher- report of being a bully-
High TV time and mid- high TV time at ages 2-5 yr were unfavourably associated with teacher- report of being a bully-
high TV time at ages 2-5 yr were unfavourably associated with teacher- report of being a bully-
high TV time at ages 2-5 yr were unfavourably associated with teacher- report of being a bully-
yr were unfavourably associated with teacher - report of being a bully-
associated with teacher- report of being a bully-
report of being a bully-
victim at age ~7 yr
compared to low TV time
in <i>unadjusted</i> but not
adjusted analyses, and
there was no difference for
mid-low TV time in
unadjusted or adjusted
analyses (compared to low
TV time: unadjusted: mid-
low, OR = 1.21, 95% CI:

0.88. 165, p = 0.34, mid-high, CR = 17.3, 95% CE 1.25, 2.40, p = 0.001; ligh, CR = 2.11, 95% CE 1.42, 3.13, p < 0.001; adjusted: mid-low, OR = 1.08, 95% CE: 0.79, 1.48, p = 0.64; mid-high, OR = 1.31, 95% CE: 0.79, 1.48, p = 0.64; mid-high, OR = 1.31, 95% CE: 0.79, 1.48, p = 0.43; high, OR = 1.31, 95% CE: 0.70, 1.85, p = 0.13; high, OR = 0.70, High TV time at ages 2-5 yr was unfavourably associated with self- or proxy-report of being a bully-victim at age: -7 yr compared to low TV time in unadjusted but not adjusted malyses (compared to low TV time in unadjusted indiverse (compared to low TV time: anradjusted indiverse (compared to low TV <				50
125,240, p = 0.001; high, OR = 2.11,95% CI; 142,313, p < 0.001; adjusted: mid-low, OR = 108,95% CI: 0.79, 1.48, p = 0.64; mid-high, OR = 13,195% CI: 0.93, 1.85, p = 0.17; High TV time at ages 2-5 yr was unfavourably associated with self-or proxy-report of being a bully-victim at age -7 yr compared to low TV time in unadjusted but not adjusted analyses, and there was no difference for mid-low or mid-high TV time: in unadjusted of adjusted analyses (compared to low TV time: unadjusted.rmid- low, OR = 1.17, 19% CI: 0.88, 3.32, p = 0.11; mid- high, OR = 1.05, 95% CI: 0.99, 3.33, p = 0.05; high, OR = 3.68, 95% CI: 0.74, p = 0.001; adjusted; mid-low or Distrigh, OR = 3.18, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.68, p = 0.37; mid-low, OR = 1.31, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.68, p = 0.37; mid-low, OR = 1.36, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.68, p = 0.37; mid-low, OR = 1.36,			0.88, 1.65, p = 0.24; mid-	
high, OR = 2.11, 95% CI: 1.42, 313, p < 0.001:			high, OR = 1.73, 95% CI:	
1 1.42, 3.13, p < 0.001;			1.25, 2.40, p = 0.001;	
adjusted: mid-low, OR = 1.08, 95% CE: 0.79, 1.48, p = 0.64; mid-high, OR = 1.31, 95% CE: 0.39, 1.85, p = 0.13; high, OR = 1.35, 95% CE: 0.38, 2.08, p = 0.17).High TV time at ages 2-5 yr was unfavourably associated with self- or proxy-report of being a bully-victim at age -7 yr compared to low TV time in machisted or adjusted analyses, and there was no difference for mid-low or mid-high TV time in machisted or adjusted analyses (compared to low TV time: mid-low or WT time: mid-low or WT time: mid-low or WT time: mid-low or WT time: mid-low SS, p = 0.11, mid- high, OR = 1.37, 95% CE: $0.88, 3.32, p = 0.11, mid-high, OR = 1.36, 95% CE:0.99, 3.33, p = 0.05, high,OR = 1.36, 95% CE: 0.77, 7.4, p = 0.001; adjusted:mid-low, OR = 1.36, 95% CE:0.17, 2.65, p = 0.37;mid-high, OR = 1.21, 95% CE:0.17, 2.65, p = 0.37;$			high, OR = 2.11, 95% CI:	
Image: Section 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10,			1.42, 3.13, p < 0.001;	
p = 0.64; mid-high, OR = 1.31, 95%, CI: 0.93, 1.85, p = 0.13; high, OR = 1.35, 95%, CI: 0.88, 2.08, p = 0.17). High TV time at ages 2-5 yr was unfavourably associated with self- or proxy-report of being a bully-vetim at age - 7yr compared to low TV time in unadjusted but not adjusted analyses; (compared to low TV time in unadjusted or adjusted analyses (compared to low TV time unadjusted or adjusted analyses (compared to low TV time. 0.99, 3.83, p = 0.05; high, 0R = 1.30, 95%, CI: 0.99, 3.83, p = 0.05; high, 0R = 1.30, 95%, CI: 0.88, 3.84, p = 0.01; adjusted: mid-low, OR = 1.21, 95%, CI: 0.98, 1.30, 95%, CI: 0.77, 774, p = 0.001; adjusted: mid-low, OR = 1.21, 95%, CI: 0.09, 2.65, p = 0.37; mid-high, OR = 1.21, 95%, CI: 0.95, CI: 0.95, CI: 0.95, CI: 0.95, CI: 0.95, CI: <td></td> <td></td> <td>adjusted: mid-low, OR =</td> <td></td>			adjusted: mid-low, OR =	
1.31, 95% CI: 0.93, 1.85, $p = 0.13$, high, OR = 1.35, 95% CI: 0.88, 2.08, $p = 0.17$). High TV time at ages 2-5 yr was unfavourably associated with self- or proxy-report of being a bully-victim at age -7 yr compared to low TV time in <i>unadjusted analyses</i> , and there was on difference for mid-low or mid-high TV time in <i>unadjusted or</i> adjusted analyses (compared to low TV time) in unadjusted or adjusted analyses (compared to low TV) time in <i>unadjusted or</i> adjusted analyses (compared to low TV) time, unadjusted wild- low, OR = 1.71, 95% CI: 0.99, 3.83, p = 0.01; mid- high, OR = 1.26, 95% CI: 0.99, 2.85, p = 0.37; mid-high, OR = 1.21, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.20, 95% CI: 0.77, high, OR = 1.21, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.20, 95% CI: high, OR = 1.21, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.20, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.20, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.20, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.20, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.20, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.20, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.20, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.20, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.20, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.20, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.20, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.60, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.60, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.60, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.60, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.60, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.60, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.60, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.60, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.60;<			1.08, 95% CI: 0.79, 1.48,	
p = 0.13; high, OR = 1.35, 95% CI: 0.88, 2.08, p = 0.17). High TV time at ages 2-5 yr was unfavourably associated with self- or proxy-report of being a bully-victim at age -7 yr compared to low TV time in unadjusted but not adjusted analyses, and there was no difference for mid-low or mid-high TV time in unadjusted or adjusted analyses (compared to low TV time: unadjusted or adjusted analyses (compared to low TV time: unadjusted: mid- low, OR = 1.71, 95% CI: 0.99, 3.83, p = 0.01; mid- high, OR = 1.95, 95% CI: 0.99, 3.83, p = 0.05; high, 0.07, 7,4, p = 0.001; adjusted: mid-low, OR = 1.36, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.37; mid-ligh, OR = 1.21, 95% CI: 0.59, 2.46, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.60, 95% CI:			p = 0.64; mid-high, OR =	
95% CI: 0.88, 2.08, p = 0.17). High TV time at ages 2-5 yr was unfavourably associated with self- or proxy-report of being a bully-victim at age -7 yr compared to low TV time in unadjusted but not adjusted analyses, and there was no difference for mid-low or mid-high TV time in unadjusted or adjusted markyses (compared to low TV time: unadjusted. billy-victim adjusted. billy-victim adjusted. mid-low or mid-high TV time: unadjusted. billy-victim adjusted. compared to low TV time: unadjusted. billy-or = 1.36, 95% CI: 0.88, 332, p = 0.11; mid-high, 0R = 1.35, 95% CI: 0.99, 3.83, p = 0.05; high, 0R = 3.68, 95% CI: 0.07, 2.65, p = 0.37; mid-high, 0R = 1.36, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.37; mid-high, 0R = 1.30, 95% CI: billy-0R = 1.60, 95% CI: CI: 0.59, 2.46, p = 0.60; billy-0R = 1.60, 95% CI:			1.31, 95% CI: 0.93, 1.85,	
0.17). High TV time at ages 2-5 yr was unfavourably associated with self- or proxy-report of being a bully-victim at age ~7 yr compared to low TV time in <i>unadjusted</i> but not <i>adjusted</i> analyses, and there was no difference for mid-low or mid-high TV time in <i>unadjusted</i> or <i>adjusted</i> analyses (compared to low TV time: <i>unadjusted</i> or <i>adjusted</i> analyses (compared to low TV time: <i>unadjusted</i> : mid- low, OR = 1.71, 95% CI: 0.88, 3.32, p = 0.11; mid- high, OR = 1.95, 95% CI: 0.77, 74, p = 0.001; <i>adjusted</i> : mid-low, OR = 1.36, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.37; mid-high, OR = 1.21, 95% CI: 0.59, 2.46, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.60, 95% CI:			p = 0.13; high, OR = 1.35,	
High TV time at ages 2-5 yr was unfavourably associated with self- or proxy-report of being a bully-victim at age -7 yr compared to low TV time in unadjusted but not adjusted analyses, and there was no difference for mid-low or mid-high TV time in unadjusted or adjusted analyses (compared to low TV time: unadjusted indi- low, OR = 1.71, 55% CI: 0.88, 3.32, p = 0.01; mid- high, OR = 1.95, 95% CI: 0.99, 3.83, p = 0.05; high, OR = 3.68, 95% CI: 1.75, 7.74, p = 0.001; adjusted: mid-bigh, OR = 1.21, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.37; mid-bigh, OR = 1.21, 95% CI: 0.59, 2.46, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.60, 55%			95% CI: 0.88, 2.08, p =	
yr was unfavourably associated with self- or proxy-report of being a bully-victim at age ~7 yr compared to low TV time in <i>unadjusted</i> but not <i>adjusted analyses</i> , and there was no difference for mid-low or mid-high TV time in <i>unadjusted</i> or <i>adjusted analyses</i> (compared to low TV time: <i>unadjusted</i> : mid- low, OR = 1.71, 95% CI: 0.88, 3.32, p = 0.11; mid- high, OR = 1.95, 95% CI: 0.99, 3.83, p = 0.05; high, OR = 3.68, 95% CI: 1.75, 7.74, p = 0.001; <i>adjusted</i> : mid-low, OR = 1.36, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.37; mid-high, OR = 1.21, 95% CI: 0.79, 2.46, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.60, 95% CI:			0.17).	
yr was unfavourably associated with self- or proxy-report of being a bully-victim at age ~7 yr compared to low TV time in <i>unadjusted</i> but not <i>adjusted analyses</i> , and there was no difference for mid-low or mid-high TV time in <i>unadjusted</i> or <i>adjusted analyses</i> (compared to low TV time: <i>unadjusted</i> : mid- low, OR = 1.71, 95% CI: 0.88, 3.32, p = 0.11; mid- high, OR = 1.95, 95% CI: 0.99, 3.83, p = 0.05; high, OR = 3.68, 95% CI: 1.75, 7.74, p = 0.001; <i>adjusted</i> : mid-low, OR = 1.36, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.37; mid-high, OR = 1.21, 95% CI: 0.79, 2.46, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.60, 95% CI:				
associated with self- or proxy-report of being a bully-victim at age ~7 yr compared to low TV time in <i>unadjusted</i> but not <i>adjusted analyses</i> , and there was no difference for mid-low or mid-high TV time in <i>unadjusted</i> or <i>adjusted analyses</i> (compared to low TV time: <i>unadjusted</i> : mid- low, OR = 1.71, 95% CI: 0.88, 3.32, p = 0.11; mid- high, OR = 1.95, 95% CI: 0.99, 3.83, p = 0.05; high, OR = 3.68, 95% CI: 1.75, 7.74, p = 0.001; <i>adjusted</i> : mid-low, OR = 1.21, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.37; mid-high, OR = 1.21, 95% CI: 0.59, 2.46, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.60, 95% CI:			High TV time at ages 2-5	
proxy-report of being a bully-victim at age -7 yr compared to low TV time in <i>unadjusted</i> but not <i>adjusted analyses</i> , and there was no difference for mid-low or mid-high TV time in <i>unadjusted</i> or <i>adjusted analyses</i> (compared to low TV time: <i>unadjusted</i> : mid- low, OR = 1.71, 95% CI: 0.88, 3.32, p = 0.11; mid- high, OR = 1.95, 95% CI: 0.99, 3.83, p = 0.05; high, OR = 3.68, 95% CI: 1.75, 7.74, p = 0.001; <i>adjusted</i> : mid-low, OR = 1.36, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.37; mid-high, OR = 1.21, 95%			yr was unfavourably	
bully-victim at age ~ 7 yr compared to low TV time in umadjusted but not adjusted analyses, and there was no difference for mid-low or mid-high TV time in unadjusted or adjusted analyses (compared to low TV time: unadjusted mid- low, OR = 1.71, 95% CI: 0.88, 3.32, p = 0.11; mid- high, OR = 1.95, 95% CI: 0.99, 3.83, p = 0.05; high, OR = 3.68, 95% CI: 1.75, 7.74, p = 0.001; adjusted: mid-low, OR = 1.36, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.37; mid-high, OR = 1.21, 95% CI: 0.59, 2.46, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.60, 95% CI:			associated with self- or	
compared to low TV time in <i>unadjusted</i> but not <i>adjusted</i> analyses, and there was no difference for mid-low or mid-high TV time in <i>unadjusted</i> or <i>adjusted</i> analyses (compared to low TV time: unadjusted: mid- low, OR = 1.71, 95% CI: 0.88, 3.32, p = 0.11; mid- high, OR = 1.95, 95% CI: 0.99, 3.83, p = 0.05; high, OR = 3.68, 95% CI: 1.75, 7.74, p = 0.001; <i>adjusted</i> : mid-low, OR = 1.36, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.37; mid-high, OR = 1.21, 95% CI: 0.59, 2.46, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.20, 95% CI:			proxy-report of being a	
in <i>unadjusted</i> but not <i>adjusted</i> analyses, and there was no difference for mid-low or mid-high TV time in <i>unadjusted</i> or <i>adjusted</i> analyses (compared to low TV time: <i>unadjusted</i> : mid- low, OR = 1.71, 95% CI: 0.88, 3.32, p = 0.11; mid- high, OR = 1.95, 95% CI: 0.99, 3.83, p = 0.05; high, OR = 3.68, 95% CI: 1.75, 7.74, p = 0.001; <i>adjusted</i> : mid-low, OR = 1.36, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.37; mid-high, OR = 1.20, 95% CI: 0.59, 2.46, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.60, 95% CI:				
adjusted analyses, and there was no difference for mid-low or mid-ligh TV time in unadjusted or adjusted analyses (compared to low TV time: unadjusted: mid- low, OR = 1.71, 95% CI: 0.88, 3.32, p = 0.11; mid- high, OR = 1.95% CI: 0.99, 3.83, p = 0.05; high, OR = 3.68, 95% CI: 1.75, 7.74, p = 0.001; adjusted: mid-low, OR = 1.36, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.37; mid-ligh, OR = 1.21, 95% CI: 0.59, 2.46, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.60, 95% CI:			-	
there was no difference for mid-low or mid-high TV time in <i>unadjusted</i> or <i>adjusted analyses</i> (compared to low TV time: <i>unadjusted</i> : mid- low, OR = 1.71, 95% CI: 0.88, 3.32, p = 0.11; mid- high, OR = 1.95, 95% CI: 0.99, 3.83, p = 0.05; high, OR = 3.68, 95% CI: 1.75, 7.74, p = 0.001; <i>adjusted</i> : mid-low, OR = 1.36, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.37; mid-high, OR = 1.21, 95% CI: 0.59, 2.46, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.60, 95% CI:			-	
mid-low or mid-high TV time in unadjusted or adjusted analyses (compared to low TV time: unadjusted: mid- low, OR = 1.71, 95% CI: 0.88, 3.32, p = 0.11; mid- high, OR = 1.95, 95% CI: 0.99, 3.83, p = 0.05; high, OR = 3.68, 95% CI: 1.75, 7.74, p = 0.001; adjusted: mid-low, OR = 1.36, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.37; mid-high, OR = 1.21, 95% CI: 0.59, 2.46, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.60, 95% CI:			•	
time in unadjusted or adjusted analyses (compared to low TV time: unadjusted: mid- low, OR = 1.71, 95% CI: 0.88, 3.32, p = 0.11; mid- high, OR = 1.95, 95% CI: 0.99, 3.83, p = 0.05; high, OR = 3.68, 95% CI: 1.75, 7.74, p = 0.001; adjusted: mid-low, OR = 1.36, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.37; mid-high, OR = 1.21, 95% CI: 0.59, 2.46, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.60, 95% CI:				
adjusted analyses (compared to low TV time: unadjusted: mid- low, OR = 1.71, 95% CI: 0.88, 3.32, p = 0.11; mid- high, OR = 1.95, 95% CI: 0.99, 3.83, p = 0.05; high, OR = 3.68, 95% CI: 1.75, 7.74, p = 0.001; adjusted: mid-low, OR = 1.36, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.37; mid-high, OR = 1.21, 95% CI: 0.59, 2.46, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.60, 95% CI:				
(compared to low TV time: <i>unadjusted</i> : mid- low, OR = 1.71, 95% CI: 0.88, 3.32, p = 0.11; mid- high, OR = 1.95, 95% CI: 0.99, 3.83, p = 0.05; high, OR = 3.68, 95% CI: 1.75, 7.74, p = 0.001; <i>adjusted</i> : mid-low, OR = 1.36, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.37; mid-high, OR = 1.21, 95% CI: 0.59, 2.46, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.60, 95% CI:			-	
time: <i>unadjusted</i> : mid- low, OR = 1.71, 95% CI: 0.88, 3.32, p = 0.11; mid- high, OR = 1.95, 95% CI: 0.99, 3.83, p = 0.05; high, OR = 3.68, 95% CI: 1.75, 7.74, p = 0.001; <i>adjusted</i> : mid-low, OR = 1.36, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.37; mid-high, OR = 1.21, 95% CI: 0.59, 2.46, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.60, 95% CI:				
low, OR = 1.71, 95% CI: 0.88, 3.32, p = 0.11; mid- high, OR = 1.95, 95% CI: 0.99, 3.83, p = 0.05; high, OR = 3.68, 95% CI: 1.75, 7.74, p = 0.001; <i>adjusted:</i> mid-low, OR = 1.36, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.37; mid-high, OR = 1.21, 95% CI: 0.59, 2.46, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.60, 95% CI:			_	
$\begin{array}{c} 0.88, 3.32, p = 0.11; \text{ mid-high, } OR = 1.95, 95\% \text{ CI:} \\ 0.99, 3.83, p = 0.05; \text{ high,} \\ OR = 3.68, 95\% \text{ CI: } 1.75, \\ 7.74, p = 0.001; adjusted: \\ \text{mid-low, } OR = 1.36, 95\% \\ \text{CI: } 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.37; \\ \text{mid-high, } OR = 1.21, 95\% \\ \text{CI: } 0.59, 2.46, p = 0.60; \\ \text{high, } OR = 1.60, 95\% \text{ CI:} \end{array}$			-	
high, OR = 1.95, 95% CI: 0.99, 3.83, p = 0.05; high, OR = 3.68, 95% CI: 1.75, 7.74, p = 0.001; <i>adjusted:</i> mid-low, OR = 1.36, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.37; mid-high, OR = 1.21, 95% CI: 0.59, 2.46, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.60, 95% CI:				
0.99, 3.83, p = 0.05; high, OR = 3.68, 95% CI: 1.75, 7.74, p = 0.001; <i>adjusted:</i> mid-low, OR = 1.36, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.37; mid-high, OR = 1.21, 95% CI: 0.59, 2.46, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.60, 95% CI:			_	
OR = 3.68, 95% CI: 1.75, 7.74, p = 0.001; <i>adjusted</i> : mid-low, OR = 1.36, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.37; mid-high, OR = 1.21, 95% CI: 0.59, 2.46, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.60, 95% CI:			-	
7.74, p = 0.001; <i>adjusted:</i> mid-low, OR = 1.36, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.37; mid-high, OR = 1.21, 95% CI: 0.59, 2.46, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.60, 95% CI:				
mid-low, OR = 1.36, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.37; mid-high, OR = 1.21, 95% CI: 0.59, 2.46, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.60, 95% CI:				
CI: 0.70, 2.65, p = 0.37; mid-high, OR = 1.21, 95% CI: 0.59, 2.46, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.60, 95% CI:			÷ ,	
mid-high, OR = 1.21, 95% CI: 0.59, 2.46, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.60, 95% CI:				
CI: 0.59, 2.46, p = 0.60; high, OR = 1.60, 95% CI:			_	
high, OR = 1.60, 95% CI:				
			_	
0.72, 3.55, p = 0.25).				
			0.72, 3.55, p = 0.25).	

Adjusted analyses only: TV time at age 2 yr was not associated with being a buly at age -7 yr (compared to "never"): <i>teacher-report:</i> -0.5 hr/day, OR = 1.29, 95% C1: 0.82, 2.09, p = 0.29; 0.5: 1 hr, OR = 1.24, 95% C1: 0.82, 0.29, p = 0.29; 0.5: 1 hr, OR = 1.24, 95% C1: 0.80, 2.77, p = 0.27; self- or praxy-report: -0.5 hr, OR = 1.18, 95% C1: 0.54, 2.38, p = 0.03; 0.54 l hr, OR = -1.22, 95% C1: 0.54, 2.27, p = 0.20; >1 hr, OR = -1.22, 95% C1: 0.42, 3.09, p = 0.34). IV time at age 2 yr was not associated with being a victim at age -7 yr (compared to "never": <i>teacher-report:</i> -0.5 hr/day, OR = 2.69, 95% C1: 0.58, 6.64, p = 0.28; >1 hr, OR = -3.79, 95% C1: 0.58, 6.64, p = 0.28; >1 hr, OR = -3.89, 95% C1: 0.99, 11:56, p = 0.05; self- ar pray-report: -0.5 hr, OR = 1.06, 95% C1: 0.54, 2.07, p = 0.36; 0.34, in OR = 1.06, 95% C1: 0.54, 2.07, p = 0.36; 0.36, in OR = 0.08, 95% C1: 0.36, 0.71, p = 0.36; 0.36, in OR = 0.06, 95% C1: 0.36, 2.07, p = 0.36; 0.36, in OR = 0.06, 95% C1: 0.36, 2.07, p = 0.36; 0.36, in OR = 0.06, 95% C1: 0.36, 2.07, p = 0.36; 0.36, in OR = 0.06, 95% C1: 0.36, 2.07, p = 0.36; 0.36, in OR = 0.08, 95% C1: 0.36,				5
Image: Second			Adjusted analyses only:	
Image: Second			TV time at age 2 yr was	
a bully at age -7 yr (compared to "never": teacher-report: -0.5 hriduy, OR = 1.29, 95% CI: 0.82, 2.09, p = 0.29; 0.5 1 hr, OR = 1.12, 95% CI: 0.82, 2.09, p = 0.29; 0.5 1 hr, OR = 1.34, 95% OR = 0.18, 95% CI: 0.82, 2.09, p = 0.27; self- or proxy-report: -0.5 hr, OR = 1.18, 95% OR = 1.18, 95% CI: 0.54, 2.58, p = 0.63; 0.54 hr, 0.7, p = 0.20; 51 hr, OR 0.8, 0.527, p = 0.20; 51 hr, OR = 0.98, 95% OR = 0.98, 95% OR = 0.98, 95% OR = 0.98, 95% CI: 0.48, 309, p = 0.84). TV time at age -7 yr (compared to "never": teacher-report: -0.5 hrduy, OR = 2.69, 95% CI: 0.81, 897, p = 0.113; 0.51 hr, OR = 1.37, 95% CI: 0.58, 664, p = 0.28; VIII, NOR = 3.38, 95% OR = 0.06, 95% CI: 0.58, 664, p = 0.28; VIII, OR = 3.38, 95% OR = 1.06, 95% OR = 1.06, 95% OR = 0.05, 95% OR = 0.06, 95% <				
(compared to "never"): teacher-report: <0.5			_	
Image: Second Secon				
hr/day, $OR = 1.29, 95\%$ C1: 0.82, 2.09, p= 0.29; 0.5: 1hr, $OR = 1.12, 95\%$ C1: 0.69, 1.82, p = 0.65; >1 nr, OR = 1.34, 95% C1: 0.82, 27, p = 0.27; self- or praxy-report: <0.5 hr,				
C1: 0 82, 2.09, p = 0 29; 0.5-1 hr, OR = 1.12, 95% C1: 0.69, 1.82, p = 0.65; > 1 hr, OR = 1.34, 95% C1: 0.80, 2.27, p = 0.27, self- or prox-report: <0.5 hr, OR = 1.18, 95% C1: 0.54, 2.58, p = 0.63; 0.5-1 hr, OR = 0.98, 95% C1: 0.42, 2.27, p = 0.20; >1 hr, OR = 1.22, 95% C1: 0.48, 3.09, p = 0.84). TV time at age 2 yr was not associated with being a victim at age -7 yr (compared to "newer": teacher-report: <0.5 hr/day, OR = 2.69, 95% C1: 0.58, 6.47, p = 0.113; 0.5-1 hr, OR = 1.97, 95% C1: 0.58, 6.47, p = 0.113; 0.5-1 hr, OR = 1.97, 95% C1: 0.58, 8.97, p = 0.05; self- or proxy-report: <0.5 hr, OR = 1.06, 95% C1: 0.48, 2.07, p = 0.86; 0.5-1 hr, OR = 1.06, 95% C1: 0.54, 2.07, p = 0.86; 0.5-1 hr, OR = 1.06, 95% C1: 0.46, 1.86, p = 0.82; >1 hr, OR			-	
0.5-1 hr, OR = 1.12, 95% C1: 0.69, 1.82, p = 0.65; >1 hr, OR = 1.34, 95% OR = 0.84, 95% OR = 1.18, 95% C1: 0.59, 0.14, OR = 0.88, 95% C1: 0.05, 0.14, 2.27, p = 0.02; 0.14, OR = 0.98, 95% C1: 0.04, 2.27, p = 0.02; 0.14, OR = 0.98, 95% C1: 0.04, 2.27, p = 0.02; 0.14, OR = 0.92, 95% C1: 0.44, 3.09, p = 0.84). TV time at age 2 yr was not associated with being a vietim at age -7 yr (compared to "never"): teacher-report: <0.5				
CI: 0.69, 1.82, p = 0.65; > 1 hr, OR = 1.34, 95% CI: 0.80, 2.27, p = 0.27; self- or proxy-report: <0.5 hr, OR = 1.18, 95% CI: 0.54, 2.58, p = 0.63; 0.5-1 hr, OR = 0.98, 95% CI: 0.42, 2.27, p = 0.20; >1 hr, OR = 1.22, 95% CI: 0.42, 2.27, p = 0.20; >1 hr, OR = 1.22, 95% CI: 0.48, 3.09, p = 0.84). TV time at age 2 yr was not associated with being a victim at age -7 yr (compared to 'mever': teacher-report: <0.5 hr/day, OR = 2.69, 95% CI: 0.58, 6.64, p = 0.28; >1 hr, OR = 1.97, 95% CI: 0.58, 6.64, p = 0.28; >1 hr, OR = 3.38, 95% CI: 0.99, 11.56, p = 0.05; self- or proxy-report: <0.5 hr, OR = 1.06, 95% CI: 0.54, 2.07, p = 0.86; 0.5-1 hr, OR = 1.06, 95% CI: 0.46, 1.86, p = 0.82; >1 hr, OR				
$\begin{array}{c} >1 \ \text{hr}, \text{OR} = 1.34, 95\% \ \text{CI:} \\ 0.80, 2.27, p = 0.27, self- or proxy-report: <0.5 \ \text{hr}, \\ \text{OR} = 0.98, 95\% \ \text{CI:} 0.54, \\ 2.58, p = 0.63, 0.5-1 \ \text{hr}, \\ \text{OR} = 0.98, 95\% \ \text{CI:} 0.42, \\ 2.27, p = 0.20; >1 \ \text{hr}, \text{OR} \\ = 1.22, 95\% \ \text{CI:} 0.48, \\ 3.09, p = 0.84). \end{array}$				
0.80, 2.27, p = 0.27; self- or proxy-report: <0.5 hr, OR = 1.18, 95% CI: 0.54, 2.58, p = 0.63; 0.5-1 hr, OR = 0.98, 95% CI: 0.42, 2.27, p = 0.20; >1 hr, OR = 1.22, 95% CI: 0.48, 3.09, p = 0.84). TV time at age 2 yr was not associated with being a victim at age 2 yr was not associated with being a victim at age 7 yr (compared to "never": <i>teacher-report:</i> <0.5 hr/day, OR = 2.69, 95% CI: 0.58, 6.64, p = 0.28; >1 hr, OR = 1.97, 95% CI: 0.58, 6.64, p = 0.028; >1 hr, OR = 0.28; >1 hr, OR = 0.05, br, OR = 1.06, 95% CI: 0.54, 2.07, p = 0.05; self- or proxy-report: <0.5 hr, OR = 1.06, 95% CI: 0.54, 2.07, p = 0.85; 0.5-1 hr, OR = 0.92, 95% CI: 0.54, 2.07, p = 0.85; 0.5-1 hr, OR = 0.92, 95% CI: 0.54, 2.07, p = 0.85; 0.5-1 hr, OR = 0.92, 95% CI: 0.54, 2.07, p = 0.85; 0.5-1 hr, OR			_	
or proxy-report: <0.5 hr,				
OR = 1.18, 95% CI: 0.54, 2.58, p = 0.63; 0.5-1 hr, OR = 0.98, 95% CI: 0.42, 2.27, p = 0.20; >1 hr, OR = 1.22, 95% CI: 0.48, 3.09, p = 0.84). TV time at age 2 yr was not associated with being a victim at age - 7 yr (compared to "never"): teacher-report: <0.5				
$\begin{array}{c} 2.58, p = 0.63; 0.5-1 hr, \\ OR = 0.98, 95\% CI: 0.42, \\ 2.27, p = 0.20; >1 hr, OR \\ = 1.22, 95\% CI: 0.48, \\ 3.09, p = 0.84. \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{c} TV \ \text{time at age 2 yr was} \\ \text{not associated with being} \\ \textbf{a victim at age ~7 yr} \\ (compared to "never": \\ teacher-report: <0.5 \\ hr/day, OR = 2.69, 95\% \\ CI: 0.81, 8.97, p = 0.113; \\ 0.5-1 hr, OR = 1.97, 95\% \\ CI: 0.58, 6.64, p = 0.28; \\ >1 hr, OR = 3.89, SC \ CI: \\ 0.99, 11.56, p = 0.05; self- \\ or proxy-report: <0.5 hr, \\ OR = 1.06, 95\% \ CI: 0.54, \\ 2.07, p = 0.86; 0.5-1 hr, \\ OR = 0.92, 95\% \ CI: 0.46, \\ 1.86, p = 0.82; >1 hr, OR \end{array}$				
$\begin{array}{c} 2.27, p = 0.20; >1 \text{ hr, OR} \\ = 1.22, 95\% \text{ CI: } 0.48, \\ 3.09, p = 0.84). \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{c} \text{TV time at age 2 yr was} \\ \text{not associated with being} \\ \textbf{a victim at age ~7 yr} \\ (compared to "never": \\ teacher-report: < 0.5 \\ \text{hr/day, OR} = 2.69, 95\% \\ \text{CI:} 0.81, 8.97, p = 0.113; \\ 0.5-1 \text{ hr, OR} = 1.97, 95\% \\ \text{CI: } 0.58, 6.64, p = 0.28; \\ >1 \text{ hr, OR} = -1.38, 95\% \text{ CI:} \\ 0.99, 11.56, p = 0.05; self- \\ or proxy-report: < 0.5 \text{ hr,} \\ \text{OR} = -106, 95\% \text{ CI: } 0.54, \\ 2.07, p = 0.86; 0.5-1 \text{ hr,} \\ \text{OR} = -0.92, 95\% \text{ CI: } 0.46, \\ 1.86, p = 0.82; >1 \text{ hr, OR} \end{array}$				
$= 1.22, 95\% \text{ CI: } 0.48, \\ 3.09, p = 0.84).$ TV time at age 2 yr was not associated with being a victim at age -7 yr (compared to "never": <i>teacher-report:</i> <0.5 hr/day, OR = 2.69, 95% CI: 0.81, 8.97, p = 0.113; 0.5-1 hr, OR = 1.97, 95% CI: 0.58, 6.64, p = 0.28; >1 hr, OR = 3.38, 95% CI: 0.99, 11.56, p = 0.05; <i>self-</i> <i>or proxy-report:</i> <0.5 hr, OR = 1.06, 95% CI: 0.54, 2.07, p = 0.86; 0.5-1 hr, OR = 0.92, 95% CI: 0.46, 1.86, p = 0.82; >1 hr, OR			OR = 0.98, 95% CI: 0.42,	
3.09, p = 0.84). TV time at age 2 yr was not associated with being a victim at age ~7 yr (compared to "never": <i>teacher-report:</i> <0.5 hr/day, OR = 2.69, 95% CI:0.81, 8.97, p = 0.113; 0.5-1 hr, OR = 1.97, 95% CI: 0.58, 6.64, p = 0.28; > 1 hr, OR = 3.38, 95% CI: 0.99, 11.56, p = 0.05; <i>self- or proxy-report:</i> <0.5 hr, OR = 1.06, 95% CI: 0.54, 0.07, p = 0.86; 0.5-1 hr, OR = 0.92, 95% CI: 0.46, 1.86, p = 0.82; >1 hr, OR			2.27, p = 0.20; >1 hr, OR	
TV time at age 2 yr was not associated with being a victim at age ~7 yr (compared to "never": teacher-report: <0.5 hr/day, $OR = 2.69, 95\%$ CI:0.81, 8.97, p = 0.113; 0.5-1 hr, $OR = 1.97, 95\%$ CI: 0.58, 6.64, p = 0.28; >1 hr, $OR = 3.38, 95\%$ CI: 0.99, 11.56, p = 0.05; self- or proxy-report: <0.5 hr, OR = 1.06, 95% CI: 0.54, 2.07, p = 0.86; 0.5-1 hr, OR = 0.92, 95% CI: 0.46, 1.86, p = 0.82; >1 hr, OR			= 1.22, 95% CI: 0.48,	
not associated with being a victim at age ~7 yr (compared to "never": teacher-report: <0.5			3.09, p = 0.84).	
not associated with being a victim at age ~7 yr (compared to "never": teacher-report: <0.5				
a victim at age \sim 7 yr (compared to "never": teacher-report: <0.5			TV time at age 2 yr was	
$ \begin{array}{c} (compared to "never": \\ teacher-report: <0.5 \\ hr/day, OR = 2.69, 95\% \\ CI:0.81, 8.97, p = 0.113; \\ 0.5-1 hr, OR = 1.97, 95\% \\ CI: 0.58, 6.64, p = 0.28; \\ >1 hr, OR = 3.38, 95\% CI: \\ 0.99, 11.56, p = 0.05; self- \\ or proxy-report: <0.5 hr, \\ OR = 1.06, 95\% CI: 0.54, \\ 2.07, p = 0.86; 0.5-1 hr, \\ OR = 0.92, 95\% CI: 0.46, \\ 1.86, p = 0.82; >1 hr, OR \end{array} $			not associated with being	
$\begin{array}{c} teacher-report: <0.5 \\ hr/day, OR = 2.69, 95\% \\ CI:0.81, 8.97, p = 0.113; \\ 0.5-1 hr, OR = 1.97, 95\% \\ CI: 0.58, 6.64, p = 0.28; \\ >1 hr, OR = 3.38, 95\% CI: \\ 0.99, 11.56, p = 0.05; self- \\ or proxy-report: <0.5 hr, \\ OR = 1.06, 95\% CI: 0.54, \\ 2.07, p = 0.86; 0.5-1 hr, \\ OR = 0.92, 95\% CI: 0.46, \\ 1.86, p = 0.82; >1 hr, OR \end{array}$			a victim at age ~7 yr	
$ \begin{array}{c} hr/day, OR = 2.69, 95\% \\ CI:0.81, 8.97, p = 0.113; \\ 0.5-1 hr, OR = 1.97, 95\% \\ CI: 0.58, 6.64, p = 0.28; \\ >1 hr, OR = 3.38, 95\% CI: \\ 0.99, 11.56, p = 0.05; self- \\ or proxy-report: <0.5 hr, \\ OR = 1.06, 95\% CI: 0.54, \\ 2.07, p = 0.86; 0.5-1 hr, \\ OR = 0.92, 95\% CI: 0.46, \\ 1.86, p = 0.82; >1 hr, OR \end{array} $			(compared to "never":	
CI:0.81, 8.97, $p = 0.113$; 0.5-1 hr, OR = 1.97, 95% CI: 0.58, 6.64, $p = 0.28$; >1 hr, OR = 3.38, 95% CI: 0.99, 11.56, $p = 0.05$; self- or proxy-report: <0.5 hr, OR = 1.06, 95% CI: 0.54, 2.07, $p = 0.86$; 0.5-1 hr, OR = 0.92, 95% CI: 0.46, 1.86, $p = 0.82$; >1 hr, OR			<i>teacher-report:</i> <0.5	
$\begin{array}{c} 0.5\text{-1 hr, OR} = 1.97, 95\%\\ \text{CI: } 0.58, 6.64, p = 0.28;\\ >1 \text{ hr, OR} = 3.38, 95\% \text{ CI:}\\ 0.99, 11.56, p = 0.05; self-\\ or proxy-report: <0.5 \text{ hr,}\\ \text{OR} = 1.06, 95\% \text{ CI: } 0.54,\\ 2.07, p = 0.86; 0.5\text{-1 hr,}\\ \text{OR} = 0.92, 95\% \text{ CI: } 0.46,\\ 1.86, p = 0.82; >1 \text{ hr, OR} \end{array}$			hr/day, OR = 2.69, 95%	
CI: $0.58, 6.64, p = 0.28;$ >1 hr, OR = $3.38, 95\%$ CI: 0.99, 11.56, p = 0.05; self- or proxy-report: <0.5 hr, OR = $1.06, 95\%$ CI: $0.54,$ 2.07, p = 0.86; 0.5-1 hr, OR = $0.92, 95\%$ CI: $0.46,$ 1.86, p = 0.82; >1 hr, OR			CI:0.81, 8.97, p = 0.113;	
>1 hr, OR = 3.38, 95% CI: 0.99, 11.56, p = 0.05; <i>self-</i> <i>or proxy-report:</i> <0.5 hr, OR = 1.06, 95% CI: 0.54, 2.07, p = 0.86; 0.5-1 hr, OR = 0.92, 95% CI: 0.46, 1.86, p = 0.82; >1 hr, OR			0.5-1 hr, OR = 1.97, 95%	
$\begin{array}{c} 0.99, 11.56, p = 0.05; self-\\ or proxy-report: < 0.5 hr,\\ OR = 1.06, 95\% \text{ CI: } 0.54,\\ 2.07, p = 0.86; 0.5-1 hr,\\ OR = 0.92, 95\% \text{ CI: } 0.46,\\ 1.86, p = 0.82; >1 hr, OR \end{array}$			CI: 0.58, 6.64, p = 0.28;	
<i>or proxy-report:</i> <0.5 hr, OR = 1.06, 95% CI: 0.54, 2.07, p = 0.86; 0.5-1 hr, OR = 0.92, 95% CI: 0.46, 1.86, p = 0.82; >1 hr, OR			>1 hr, OR = 3.38, 95% CI:	
OR = 1.06, 95% CI: 0.54, 2.07, p = 0.86; 0.5-1 hr, OR = 0.92, 95% CI: 0.46, 1.86, p = 0.82; >1 hr, OR			0.99, 11.56, p = 0.05; <i>self</i> -	
2.07, p = 0.86; 0.5-1 hr, OR = 0.92, 95% CI: 0.46, 1.86, p = 0.82; >1 hr, OR				
OR = 0.92, 95% CI: 0.46, 1.86, p = 0.82; >1 hr, OR				
1.86, p = 0.82; >1 hr, OR			-	
= 0.89, 95% CI: 0.39,			_	
			= 0.89, 95% CI: 0.39,	

2.06, p = 0.79).
TV time at age 2 yr was
not associated with being
a bully-victim at age ~7
yr (compared to "never":
teacher-report: <0.5
hr/day, OR = 0.64, 95%
CI: 0.39, 1.04, p = 0.07;
0.5-1 hr, OR = 0.82, 95%
CI: 0.50, 1.34, p = 0.43;
>1 hr, OR = 0.85, 95% CI:
0.50, 1.42, p = 0.53; <i>self</i> -
<i>or proxy-report:</i> <0.5 hr,
OR = 1.72, 95% CI: 0.52,
5.75, p = 0.38; 0.5-1 hr,
OR = 1.82, 95% CI: 0.55,
6.02, p = 0.33; >1 hr, OR
= 1.40, 95% CI: 0.39,
5.02, p = 0.60).
TV time at age 3 yr was
not associated with being
a bully at age ~7 yr
(compared to "never" and
<0.5 hr/day: <i>teacher</i> -
report: 0.5-1 hr, OR =
0.95, 95% CI: 0.71, 1.26,
p = 0.71; 1-2 hr, OR =
p = 0.71, 1-2 m, OK = 1.09, 95% CI: 0.80, 1.50,
p = 0.57; >2 hr, OR =
p = 0.57, >2 m, GK = 1.00, 95% CI: 0.65, 1.53,
p = 0.98; self- or proxy-
p = 0.98, set - or proxy- report: 0.5-1 hr, OR =
0.66, 95% CI: 0.39, 1.12,
p = 0.13; 1-2 hr, OR =
0.85, 95% CI: 0.48, 1.51,
p = 0.57; >2 hr, OR =
0.72, 95% CI: 0.32, 1.59,

		p = 0.42).	
		TV time at age 3 yr was	
		not associated with being	
		a victim at age ~7 yr	
		(compared to "never" and	
		<0.5 hr/day: teacher-	
		<i>report:</i> 0.5-1 hr, OR =	
		1.51, 95% CI: 0.89, 2.56,	
		p = 0.12; 1-2 hr, OR =	
		1.36, 95% CI: 0.75, 2.45,	
		p = 0.31; >2 hr, OR =	
		1.80, 95% CI: 0.86, 3.75,	
		p = 0.12; <i>self- or proxy-</i>	
		<i>report:</i> 0.5-1 hr, OR =	
		0.80, 95% CI: 0.53, 1.21,	
		p = 0.29; 1-2 hr, OR =	
		0.87, 95% CI: 0.51, 1.48,	
		p = 0.61; >2 hr, OR =	
		0.61, 95% CI: 0.24, 1.55,	
		p = 0.30).	
		TV time at age 3 yr was	
		not associated with being	
		a bully-victim at age ~7	
		yr (compared to "never"	
		and <0.5 hr/day: teacher-	
		<i>report:</i> 0.5-1 hr, OR =	
		0.97, 95% CI: 0.71, 1.31,	
		p = 0.83; 1-2 hr, OR =	
		1.30, 95% CI: 0.93, 1.82,	
		p = 0.12; >2 hr, OR =	
		1.17, 95% CI: 0.74, 1.87,	
		p = 0.50; <i>self- or proxy-</i>	
		<i>report:</i> $0.5-1$ hr, OR =	
		1.40, 95% CI: 0.77, 2.55,	
		p = 0.27; 1-2 hr, OR =	
		1.32, 95% CI: 0.65, 2.69,	
		p = 0.45; >2 hr, OR =	
		r 0.10,72 m, 01(-	l

$\begin{bmatrix} 2.06, 95\% (C1: 0.81, 5.25, p = 0.13), \\ TV ime at age 4 yr was not associated with being a bully at age - 7 yr (compared to -0.5 hr/day: tencher-equer: 0.5-1 hr, OR = 0.80, 95% (C1: 0.53, 1.18, p = 0.27, 1.2 hr, OR = 0.80, 95% (C1: 0.53, 1.21, p = 0.30, -25% (C1: 0.54, 1.65, p = 0.58, 1.26, r, OR = 0.99, 95% (C1: 0.84, 1.56, p = 0.58, 1.26, r, OR = 0.99, 95% (C1: 0.84, 1.56, p = 0.58, 1.26, r, OR = 0.97, 95% (C1: 0.84, 1.56, p = 0.95, 1.26, r, OR = 0.97, 95% (C1: 0.84, 1.26, p = 0.95, 1.26, r, OR = 0.97, 95% (C1: 0.84, 1.26, p = 0.95, 1.26, r, OR = 0.97, 95% (C1: 0.84, 1.26, p = 0.95, 1.26, r, OR = 0.97, 95% (C1: 0.84, 1.26, p = 0.95, 1.26, r, OR = 0.97, 95% (C1: 0.84, 1.26, p = 0.95, 1.26, r, OR = 0.97, 95% (C1: 0.84, 1.26, p = 0.35, 1.26, r, OR = 0.97, 95% (C1: 0.84, 1.26, p = 0.35, 1.26, r, OR = 0.97, 95\% (C1: 0.34, 1.26, p = 0.35, 1.26, r, OR = 0.37, 1.26, r, OR = 0.37, 1.26, r, OR = 0.33, 1.20, p = 0.35, 1.16, OR = 0.23, 95\% (C1: 0.33, 1.20, p = 0.35, 1.16, OR = 0.23, 95\% (C1: 0.33, 1.20, p = 0.35, 1.16, OR = 0.23, 95\% (C1: 0.33, 1.20, p = 0.35, 1.16, OR = 0.23, 95\% (C1: 0.33, 1.20, p = 0.35, 1.16, OR = 0.23, 95\% (C1: 0.33, 1.20, p = 0.35, 1.16, OR = 0.23, 95\% (C1: 0.33, 1.20, p = 0.35, 1.16, OR = 0.23, 95\% (C1: 0.33, 1.20, p = 0.35, 1.16, OR = 0.23, 95\% (C1: 0.36, 0.26, 0$				0.
TV time at age 4 yr was not associated with being a bully at age -7 yr (compared to 0.5 hr/day; <i>teacher report</i> : 0.5 hr/day; <i>teacher report</i> : 0.5 hr, OR = 0.80, 05% CI: 0.54, 1.18, p = 0.27; 1:2 hr, OR = 0.09, 05% CI: 0.53, 1.21, p = 0.30; s-21rr, OR = 0.09, 05% CI: 0.51, hr, OR = 0.08, 05% CI: 0.51, hr, OR = 0.08, 05% CI: 0.52, hr, OR = 0.08, 05% CI: 0.08, 2.31, p = 0.05; s-21rr, OR = 0.07, 95% CI: 0.44, 2.29, p = 0.59; s-21rr, OR = 0.07, 95% CI: 0.44, 2.29, p = 0.05; c-21rr, OR = 0.07, 05% CI: 0.44, 2.29, p = 0.05; CI: 0.40, 1.22, p = 0.23; 1.2 hr, OR = 1.34, 95% CI: 0.40, 1.22, p = 0.25; 2.1 hr, OR = 1.34, 95% CI: 0.47, 2.69, p = 0.40; w.Wer proxy-repart: 0.5-1 hr, OR = 2.03, 95% CI: 0.47, 2.69, p = 0.40; w.Wer proxy-repart: 0.5-1 hr, OR = 2.03, 95% CI: 0.40, 4.407, p = 0.04; 1.2 hr, OR = 1.46, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.89, p = 0.29; 2.2 hr, OR			2.06, 95% CI: 0.81, 5.25,	
Image: Second			p = 0.13).	
Image: Second				
a bully at age -7 yr (compared to -3.5 hr/day: (eacher-report: 0.5-1 hr, OR = 0.80, 95% C1: 0.54, $1.18, p = 0.27; 1-2 hr, OR$ $= 0.80, 95\% C1: 0.53,$ $1.21, p = 0.30; 2-2 hr, OR$ $= 0.99, 95\% C1: 0.61,$ $1.63, p = 0.98; self-or$ $proxy-report: 0.5-1 hr, OR$ $= 0.99, 95\% C1: 0.61,$ $1.63, p = 0.98; self-or$ $proxy-report: 0.5-1 hr, OR$ $= 0.69, 95\% C1: 0.54,$ $1.56, p = 0.58; 1-2 hr, OR$ $= 0.69, 95\% C1: 0.41,$ $2.29, p = 0.95).$ TV time at age 4 yr was not associated with being a victim at age -7 yr (compared to -0.51 hr, OR $= 0.63, 95\% C1: 0.41,$ $2.29, p = 0.95).$ TV time at age -7 yr (compared to -0.51 hr, OR $= 0.63, 95\% C1: 0.41,$ $2.29, p = 0.30; C1: 0.41,$ $2.29, p = 0.30; C1: 0.41,$ $2.29, p = 0.30;$ tracker treport: 0.5-1 hr, OR = 0.70, 95\% C1: 0.41, $2.29, p = 0.30; C1: 0.41,$ $2.29, p = 0.30; C1: 0.41,$ $2.29, p = 0.30;$ $1.$			TV time at age 4 yr was	
$ \left\{ \begin{array}{c} (compared to <0.5 \ {\rm mr/day}; \\ teacher-report; 0.5-1 \ {\rm mr}, \\ 0.8 0, 95\% (C1; 0.54, \\ 1.18, p = 0.27; 1.2 \ {\rm mr}, OR \\ = 0.80, 95\% (C1; 0.53, \\ 1.21, p = 0.30; >2 \ {\rm mr}, OR \\ = 0.99, 95\% (C1; 0.61, \\ 1.63, p = 0.98; self- or \\ prov-report; 0.5-1 \ {\rm mr}, OR \\ = 0.84, 95\% (C1; 0.84, \\ 1.56, p = 0.58; 1-2 \ {\rm mr}, OR \\ = 0.69, 95\% (C1; 0.58, \\ 2.31, p = 0.69; >26 \ {\rm mr}, OR \\ = 0.97, 95\% (C1; 0.41, \\ 2.29, p = 0.95). \end{array} \right. $			not associated with being	
$ \left \begin{array}{c} teacher-report: 0.5-1 hr, \\ OR = 0.80, 95\% Ct: 0.54, \\ 1.18; p = 0.27; 1-2 hr, OR \\ = 0.80, 95\% Ct: 0.63, \\ 1.21; p = 0.30; >2 hr, OR \\ = 0.99, 95\% Ct: 0.61, \\ 1.63; p = 0.98; self-or \\ proxy-report: 0.5-1 hr, OR \\ = 0.84, 95\% Ct: 0.84, \\ 1.56; p = 0.58; 1-2 hr, OR \\ = 0.69, 95\% Ct: 0.68, \\ 2.31; p = 0.69; >2 hr, OR \\ = 0.97, 95\% Ct: 0.64, \\ 2.29; p = 0.95). \end{array} $			a bully at age ~7 yr	
OR = 0.80, 95% CI: 0.54, 1.18, $p = 0.27, 1-2$ Ir, OR = 0.80, 95% CI: 0.53, 1.21, $p = 0.30; 52$ Ir, OR = 0.99, 95% CI: 0.61, 1.63, $p = 0.98;$ setf- or proxy-report: 0.5-1 Hr, OR = 0.84, 95% CI: 0.84, 1.56, $p = 0.58;$ 1: 2 hr, OR = 0.69, 95% CI: 0.41, 2.29, $p = 0.95$). TV time at age 4 yr was not associated with being a victim at age -7 yr (compared to <0.5 hr/day;			(compared to <0.5 hr/day:	
1.18, p = 0.27; 1-2 hr, OR $= 0.80, 95\%$ C1: 0.51, hr, OR $= 0.99, 95\%$ C1: 0.61, 1.63, p = 0.98, self- or $= 0.99, 95\%$ C1: 0.51, hr, OR $= 0.84, 95\%$ C1: 0.58, 1.2 hr, OR $= 0.84, 95\%$ C1: 0.58, 1.2 hr, OR $= 0.69, 95\%$ C1: 0.58, 1.2 hr, OR $= 0.69, 95\%$ C1: 0.58, 1.2 hr, OR $= 0.69, 95\%$ C1: 0.41, 1.2 hr, OR $= 0.69, 95\%$ C1: 0.41, 1.2 hr, OR $= 0.69, 95\%$ C1: 0.41, 1.2 hr, OR $= 0.79, 95\%$ C1: 0.41, 1.2 hr, OR $= 0.79, 95\%$ C1: 0.41, 1.2 hr, OR $= 0.70, 95\%$ C1: 0.51 hr, OR $= 0.69, 1.2 hr, OR$ $= 0.70, 95\%$ C1: 0.41, 1.2 hr, OR $= 0.63, 95\%$ C1: 0.31, 1.2 hr, OR $= 0.63, 95\%$ C1: 0.33, 1.2 hr, OR $= 0.63, 95\%$ C1: 0.33, 1.2 hr, OR $= 0.63, 95\%$ C1: 0.57, 2.69, p = 0.40; self- or $= 0.39, 95\%$ C1: 0.57, 2.69, p = 0.40; self- or $= 0.23, 95\%$ C1: 0.57, 2.69, p = 0.40; self- or $= 0.23, 95\%$ C1: 0.70, 2.54 hr, OR $= 0.39, 95\%$ C1: 0.70, 2.54 hr, OR $= 0.39, 95\%$ C1: 0.70, 2.54 hr, OR			teacher-report: 0.5-1 hr,	
$= 0.80, 95\% CI: 0.53, \\ 1.21, p = 0.30, 52 \text{ Jr, OR} \\ = 0.99, 55\% CI: 0.61, \\ 1.63, p = 0.98; self- or \\ proxy-report: 0.5-1 \text{ Jr, OR} \\ = 0.84, 95\% CI: 0.84, \\ 1.56, p = 0.58; 1-2 \text{ Jr, OR} \\ = 0.69, 55\% CI: 0.58, \\ 2.31, p = 0.69; 52 \text{ Jr, OR} \\ = 0.97, 95\% CI: 0.41, \\ 2.29, p = 0.95).$ TV time at age 4 yr was not associated with being a victim at age 7 yr (compared to <0.5 \text{ Jr/day:} teacher-report: 0.5-1 \text{ Jr, OR} \\ = 0.70, 95\% CI: 0.40, \\ 1.22, p = 0.33; 1-2 \text{ Ir, OR} \\ = 0.63, 95\% CI: 0.40, \\ 1.22, p = 0.33; 1-2 \text{ Jr, OR} \\ = 0.63, 95\% CI: 0.40, \\ 1.22, p = 0.33; 1-2 \text{ Jr, OR} \\ = 0.63, 95\% CI: 0.47, \\ 2.69, p = 0.40; self- or \\ 2.03, 95\% CI: 0.47, \\ 2.69, p = 0.40; self- or \\ proxy-report: 0.5-1 \text{ Jr, OR} \\ = 2.03, 55\% CI: 1.07, \\ 4.07, p = 0.04; 1-2 \text{ Jr, OR} \\ = 1.46, 95\% CI: 0.70, \\ 2.98, p = 0.29; > 2 \text{ Jr, OR} \\ = 1.46, 95\% CI: 0.70, \\ 2.98, p = 0.29; > 2 \text{ Jr, OR} \\ = 1.46, 95\% CI: 0.70, \\ 2.98, p = 0.29; > 2 \text{ Jr, OR} \\ = 0.45, 95\% CI: 0.70, \\ 2.98, p = 0.29; > 2 \text{ Jr, OR} \\ = 0.45, 95\% CI: 0.70, \\ 2.98, p = 0.29; > 2 \text{ Jr, OR} \\ = 0.46, 95\% CI: 0.70, \\ 2.98, p = 0.29; > 2 \text{ Jr, OR} \\ = 0.45, 95\% CI: 0.70, \\ 2.98, p = 0.29; > 2 \text{ Jr, OR} \\ = 0.45, 95\% CI: 0.70, \\ 2.98, p = 0.29; > 2 \text{ Jr, OR} \\ = 0.45, 95\% CI: 0.70, \\ 2.98, p = 0.29; > 2 \text{ Jr, OR} \\ = 0.46, 95\% CI: 0.70, \\ 2.98, p = 0.29; > 2 \text{ Jr, OR} \\ = 0.45, 95\% CI: 0.70, \\ 2.98, p = 0.29; > 2 \text{ Jr, OR} \\ = 0.45, 95\% CI: 0.70, \\ 2.98, p = 0.29; > 2 \text{ Jr, OR} \\ = 0.45, 95\% CI: 0.70, \\ 2.98, p = 0.29; > 2 \text{ Jr, OR} \\ = 0.45, 95\% CI: 0.70, \\ 2.98, p = 0.29; > 2 \text{ Jr, OR} \\ = 0.45, 95\% CI: 0.70, \\ 2.98, p = 0.29; > 2 \text{ Jr, OR} \\ = 0.45, 95\% CI: 0.70, \\ 2.98, p = 0.29; > 2 \text{ Jr, OR} \\ = 0.45, 95\% CI: 0.70, \\ 2.98, p = 0.29; > 2 \text{ Jr, OR} \\ = 0.45, 95\% CI: 0.70, \\ 2.98, p = 0.29; > 2 \text{ Jr, OR} \\ = 0.45, 95\% CI: 0.70, \\ 2.98, p = 0.29; > 2 \text{ Jr, OR} \\ = 0.45, 95\% CI: 0.70, \\ 2.98, p = 0.29; > 2 \text{ Jr, OR} \\ = 0.45, 95\% CI: 0.70, \\ 2.98, p = 0.29; > 2 \text{ Jr, OR} \\ = 0.45, 95\% CI: 0.70, \\ 2.98, p = 0.29; > 2 Jr			OR = 0.80, 95% CI: 0.54,	
1.21, $p = 0.30; > 2hr, OR$ $= 0.99, 55\%$ (Ct. 0.61, 1.63, $p = 0.98; self - ar$ $proxy-report: 0.5-1$ hr, OR $= 0.84, 95\%$ (Ct. 0.84, 1.56, $p = 0.58; 1-2$ hr, OR $= 0.69, 55\%$ (Ct. 0.84, 1.56, $p = 0.58; -21$ hr, OR $= 0.69, 55\%$ (Ct. 0.41, $2.29, p = 0.95$). TV time at age 4 yr was not associated with being a victim at age -7 yr (compared to <0.5 hr/day:			1.18, p = 0.27; 1-2 hr, OR	
$= 0.99, 95\% CI: 0.61, \\ 1.63, p = 0.98; self- or \\ proxy-report: 0.5-1 hr, OR \\ = 0.84, 95\% CI: 0.84, \\ 1.56, p = 0.58; 1-2 hr, OR \\ = 0.69, 95\% CI: 0.58, \\ 2.31, p = 0.69; >2 hr, OR \\ = 0.97, 95\% CI: 0.41, \\ 2.29, p = 0.95).$ $TV time at age 4yr was not associated with being a victim at age -7 yr (compared to <0.5 hr/day: teacher-report: 0.5-1 hr, OR = 0.63, 95% CI: 0.30, \\ 1.22, p = 0.23; 1-2 hr, OR \\ = 0.63, 95\% CI: 0.33, \\ 1.20, p = 0.56; >2 hr, OR \\ = 1.34, 95\% CI: 0.67, \\ 2.69, p = 0.40; self- or \\ 2.69, p = 0.40; self- or \\ proxy-report: 0.5-1 hr, OR \\ = 2.03, 95\% CI: 0.20, \\ 4.07, p = 0.04; 1-2 hr, OR \\ = 1.46, 95\% CI: 0.70, \\ 2.98, p = 0.29; >2 hr, OR \\ = 1.46, 95\% CI: 0.70, \\ 2.98, p = 0.29; >2 hr, OR \\ = 1.46, 95\% CI: 0.70, \\ 2.98, p = 0.29; >2 hr, OR \\ = 0.46, 2.95, >2 hr, OR \\ = 1.46, 95\% CI: 0.70, \\ 2.98, p = 0.29; >2 hr, OR \\ = 0.59; >2 hr, OR \\ = 0.$			= 0.80, 95% CI: 0.53,	
1.63, $p = 0.98$; self- or proxy-report: 0.5-1 hr, OR = 0.84, 95% CI: 0.84, 1.56, $p = 0.58$; 1.2 hr, OR = 0.69, 95% CI: 0.58, 2.31, $p = 0.69$; 22 hr, OR = 0.97, 95% CI: 0.41, 2.29, $p = 0.95$). TV time at age 4 yr was not associated with being a victim at age -7 yr (compared to <0.5 hr/day:			1.21, p = 0.30; >2 hr, OR	
$ \begin{array}{c} proxy-report: 0.5-1 hr, OR \\ = 0.84, 95\% CI: 0.84, \\ 1.56, p = 0.58; 1-2 hr, OR \\ = 0.69, 95\% CI: 0.58, \\ 2.31, p = 0.69; >2 hr, OR \\ = 0.97, 95\% CI: 0.41, \\ 2.29, p = 0.95. \end{array} $			= 0.99, 95% CI: 0.61,	
= 0.84, 95% CI: 0.84, 1.56, p = 0.58; 1-2 hr, OR = 0.69, 95% CI: 0.69, 95% CI: 0.69, 95% CI: 0.61, 2.29, p = 0.95). $TV time at age 4 yr was not associated with being a victim at age -7 yr (compared to <0.5 hr/day: teacher-report. 0.5-1 hr, OR = 0.70, 95% CI: 0.40, 1.22, p = 0.23; 1.2 hr, OR = 0.63, 95% CI: 0.33, 1.20, p = 0.56; >2 hr, OR = 1.34, 95% CI: 0.33, 1.20, p = 0.40; self-or prozy-report: 0.5-1 hr, OR = 1.34, 95% CI: 0.37, 2.69, p = 0.40; self-or prozy-report: 0.5-1 hr, OR = 2.03, 95% CI: 0.24, 0.71, 2.69, p = 0.40; self-or prozy-report: 0.5-1 hr, OR = 1.34, 95% CI: 0.75, 2.69, p = 0.40; self-or prozy-report: 0.5-1 hr, OR = 1.34, 95% CI: 0.77, 2.69, p = 0.40; self-or prozy-report: 0.5-1 hr, OR = 1.46, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.98, p = 0.29; >2 hr, OR = 1.46, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.98, p = 0.29; >2 hr, OR = 1.46, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.98, p = 0.29; >2 hr, OR = 0.40; self-or prozy-2 hr, OR = 1.46, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.98, p = 0.29; >2 hr, OR = 0.40; self-or prozy-2 hr, OR = 0.20; 95% CI: 0.70, 2.98, p = 0.29; >2 hr, OR = 0.40; self-or prozy-2 hr, O$			1.63, p = 0.98; <i>self- or</i>	
$\begin{bmatrix} 1.56, p = 0.58; 1-2 \text{ hr}, \text{OR} \\ = 0.69, 95\% \text{ Ct}: 0.58, \\ 2.31, p = 0.69; 25 \text{ hr}, \text{OR} \\ = 0.97, 95\% \text{ Ct}: 0.41, \\ 2.29, p = 0.95). \end{bmatrix}$ $TV \text{ time at age 4 yr was not associated with being a victim at age -7 yr (compared to <0.5 hr/day: teacher-report: 0.5-1 hr, OR = 0.63, 95\% \text{ Ct}: 0.40, \\ 1.22, p = 0.23; 1-2 \text{ hr}, \text{OR} = 0.63, 95\% \text{ Ct}: 0.40, \\ 1.22, p = 0.23; 1-2 \text{ hr}, \text{OR} = 0.63, 95\% \text{ Ct}: 0.33, \\ 1.20, p = 0.56; -2 \text{ hr}, \text{OR} = 0.63, 95\% \text{ Ct}: 0.67, \\ 2.69, p = 0.40; self-or proxy-report: 0.5-1 hr, \text{OR} = 2.03, 95\% \text{ Ct}: 0.07, \\ 1.40, 5\% \text{ Ct}: 0.07, \\ 2.69, p = 0.40; self-or proxy-report: 0.5-1 hr, \text{OR} = 1.44, 95\% \text{ Ct}: 0.70, \\ 1.40, 79, 6 \text{ Ct}: 1.02, \\ 4.07, p = 0.04; 1-2 \text{ hr}, \text{OR} = 1.44, 95\% \text{ Ct}: 0.70, \\ 2.98, p = 0.29; -2 \text{ hr}, \text{OR} = 0.40; self-or Restrict the self of th$			proxy-report: 0.5-1 hr, OR	
$= 0.69, 95\% \text{ CI: } 0.58, \\ 2.31, p = 0.69, >2 \text{ hr, OR} \\ = 0.97, 95\% \text{ CI: } 0.41, \\ 2.29, p = 0.95).$ TV time at age 4 yr was not associated with being a vietim at age -7 yr (compared to <0.5 hr/day: teacher-report: 0.5 -1 hr, OR = 0.70, 95% CI: 0.40, \\ 1.22, p = 0.23; 1-2 \text{ hr, OR} \\ = 0.63, 95\% \text{ CI: } 0.33, \\ 1.20, p = 0.56; >2 \text{ hr, OR} \\ = 1.34, 95\% \text{ CI: } 0.67, \\ 2.69, p = 0.40; self- or proxy-report: 0.5-1 hr, OR \\ = 2.03, 95\% \text{ CI: } 0.2, \\ 4.07, p = 0.04; 1-2 \text{ hr, OR} \\ = 1.46, 95\% \text{ CI: } 0.70, \\ 2.98, p = 0.29; >2 \text{ hr, OR}			= 0.84, 95% CI: 0.84,	
2.31, p = 0.69; > 2 hr, OR = 0.97, 95% CI: 0.41, 2.29, p = 0.95). TV time at age 4 yr was not associated with being a victim at age ~7 yr (compared to <0.5 hr/day:			1.56, p = 0.58; 1-2 hr, OR	
= 0.97, 95% CI: 0.41, 2.29, p = 0.95). TV time at age 4 yr was not associated with being a victim at age -7 yr (compared to <0.5 hr/day: <i>teacher-report:</i> 0.5-1 hr, OR = 0.70, 95% CI: 0.40, 1.22, p = 0.23; 1-2 hr, OR = 0.63, 95% CI: 0.73, 1.20, p = 0.56; >2 hr, OR = 1.34, 95% CI: 0.67, 2.69, p = 0.40; <i>self- or proxy-report:</i> 0.5-1 hr, OR = 2.03, 95% CI: 0.02, 4.07, p = 0.04; 1-2 hr, OR = 1.46, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.98, p = 0.29; >2 hr, OR			= 0.69, 95% CI: 0.58,	
2.29, p = 0.95). TV time at age 4 yr was not associated with being a victim at age ~7 yr (compared to <0.5 hr/day: <i>teacher-report</i> : 0.5-1 hr, OR = 0.70, 95% CI: 0.40, 1.22, p = 0.23; 1-2 hr, OR = 0.63, 95% CI: 0.33, 1.20, p = 0.56; >2 hr, OR = 1.34, 95% CI: 0.67, 2.69, p = 0.40; self- or proxy-report: 0.5-1 hr, OR = 2.03, 95% CI: 1.02, 4.007, p = 0.04; 1-2 hr, OR = 1.46, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.98, p = 0.29; >2 hr, OR			2.31, p = 0.69; >2 hr, OR	
TV time at age 4 yr was not associated with being a victim at age ~7 yr (compared to <0.5 hr/day: <i>teacher-report</i> : 0.5-1 hr, OR = 0.70, 95% CI: 0.40, 1.22, p = 0.23; 1-2 hr, OR = 0.63, 95% CI: 0.33, 1.20, p = 0.56; >2 hr, OR = 1.34, 95% CI: 0.67, 2.69, p = 0.40; <i>self- or</i> <i>proxy-report</i> : 0.5-1 hr, OR = 2.03, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.03, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.98, p = 0.29; >2 hr, OR			= 0.97, 95% CI: 0.41,	
not associated with being a victim at age ~7 yr (compared to <0.5 hr/day:			2.29, p = 0.95).	
not associated with being a victim at age ~7 yr (compared to <0.5 hr/day:				
a victim at age -7 yr (compared to <0.5 hr/day:			TV time at age 4 yr was	
(compared to <0.5 hr/day: teacher-report: 0.5-1 hr, OR = 0.70, 95% CI: 0.40, 1.22, p = 0.23; 1-2 hr, OR = 0.63, 95% CI: 0.33, 1.20, p = 0.56; >2 hr, OR = 1.34, 95% CI: 0.67, 2.69, p = 0.40; self- or proxy-report: 0.5-1 hr, OR = 2.03, 95% CI: 1.02, 4.07, p = 0.04; 1-2 hr, OR = 1.46, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.98, p = 0.29; >2 hr, OR			_	
$\begin{array}{c} \textit{teacher-report: } 0.5-1 \ \text{hr}, \\ \text{OR} = 0.70, 95\% \ \text{CI: } 0.40, \\ 1.22, p = 0.23; 1-2 \ \text{hr}, \text{OR} \\ = 0.63, 95\% \ \text{CI: } 0.33, \\ 1.20, p = 0.56; >2 \ \text{hr}, \text{OR} \\ = 1.34, 95\% \ \text{CI: } 0.67, \\ 2.69, p = 0.40; \textit{self- or} \\ \textit{proxy-report: } 0.5-1 \ \text{hr}, \text{OR} \\ = 2.03, 95\% \ \text{CI: } 1.02, \\ 4.07, p = 0.04; 1-2 \ \text{hr}, \text{OR} \\ = 1.46, 95\% \ \text{CI: } 0.70, \\ 2.98, p = 0.29; >2 \ \text{hr}, \text{OR} \end{array}$				
$\begin{array}{c} OR = 0.70, 95\% \text{ CI: } 0.40, \\ 1.22, p = 0.23; 1-2 \text{ hr, OR} \\ = 0.63, 95\% \text{ CI: } 0.33, \\ 1.20, p = 0.56; >2 \text{ hr, OR} \\ = 1.34, 95\% \text{ CI: } 0.67, \\ 2.69, p = 0.40; self- or \\ proxy-report: 0.5-1 \text{ hr, OR} \\ = 2.03, 95\% \text{ CI: } 1.02, \\ 4.07, p = 0.04; 1-2 \text{ hr, OR} \\ = 1.46, 95\% \text{ CI: } 0.70, \\ 2.98, p = 0.29; >2 \text{ hr, OR} \end{array}$				
$\begin{array}{c} 1.22, p = 0.23; 1-2 \text{ hr, OR} \\ = 0.63, 95\% \text{ CI: } 0.33, \\ 1.20, p = 0.56; >2 \text{ hr, OR} \\ = 1.34, 95\% \text{ CI: } 0.67, \\ 2.69, p = 0.40; self- or \\ proxy-report: 0.5-1 \text{ hr, OR} \\ = 2.03, 95\% \text{ CI: } 1.02, \\ 4.07, p = 0.04; 1-2 \text{ hr, OR} \\ = 1.46, 95\% \text{ CI: } 0.70, \\ 2.98, p = 0.29; >2 \text{ hr, OR} \end{array}$				
$= 0.63, 95\% \text{ CI: } 0.33, \\1.20, p = 0.56; >2 \text{ hr, OR} \\= 1.34, 95\% \text{ CI: } 0.67, \\2.69, p = 0.40; self- or \\proxy-report: 0.5-1 \text{ hr, OR} \\= 2.03, 95\% \text{ CI: } 1.02, \\4.07, p = 0.04; 1-2 \text{ hr, OR} \\= 1.46, 95\% \text{ CI: } 0.70, \\2.98, p = 0.29; >2 \text{ hr, OR} \end{cases}$				
$\begin{array}{c} 1.20, p = 0.56; >2 \text{ hr, OR} \\ = 1.34, 95\% \text{ CI: } 0.67, \\ 2.69, p = 0.40; self- or \\ proxy-report: 0.5-1 \text{ hr, OR} \\ = 2.03, 95\% \text{ CI: } 1.02, \\ 4.07, p = 0.04; 1-2 \text{ hr, OR} \\ = 1.46, 95\% \text{ CI: } 0.70, \\ 2.98, p = 0.29; >2 \text{ hr, OR} \end{array}$			_	
= 1.34, 95% CI: 0.67, $2.69, p = 0.40; self- or$ $proxy-report: 0.5-1 hr, OR$ $= 2.03, 95% CI: 1.02,$ $4.07, p = 0.04; 1-2 hr, OR$ $= 1.46, 95% CI: 0.70,$ $2.98, p = 0.29; >2 hr, OR$				
2.69, $p = 0.40$; self- or proxy-report: 0.5-1 hr, OR = 2.03, 95% CI: 1.02, 4.07, $p = 0.04$; 1-2 hr, OR = 1.46, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.98, $p = 0.29$; >2 hr, OR			_	
<i>proxy-report:</i> 0.5-1 hr, OR = 2.03, 95% CI: 1.02, 4.07, p = 0.04; 1-2 hr, OR = 1.46, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.98, p = 0.29; >2 hr, OR				
= 2.03, 95% CI: 1.02, 4.07, p = 0.04; 1-2 hr, OR = 1.46, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.98, p = 0.29; >2 hr, OR			2.69, p = 0.40; <i>self- or</i>	
4.07, p = 0.04; 1-2 hr, OR = 1.46, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.98, p = 0.29; >2 hr, OR				
= 1.46, 95% CI: 0.70, 2.98, p = 0.29; >2 hr, OR				
2.98, p = 0.29; >2 hr, OR			_	
= 2.12, 95% CI: 0.86,				
			= 2.12, 95% CI: 0.86,	

		1			1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
					5.22, p = 0.10).	
					5.22, p = 0.10). TV time at age 4 yr was not associated with being a bully-victim at age ~7 yr (compared to <0.5 hr/day: <i>teacher-report:</i> 0.5-1 hr, OR = 1.03, 95% CI: 0.66, 1.60, p = 0.90; 1- 2 hr, OR = 1.10, 95% CI: 0.69, 1.75, p = 0.68; >2 hr, OR = 1.28, 95% CI: 0.73, 2.24, p = 0.39; <i>self- or</i> <i>proxy-report:</i> 0.5-1 hr, OR = 0.59, 95% CI: 0.33, 1.06, p = 0.08; 1-2 hr, OR = 0.61, 95% CI: 0.32,	
					= 0.01, 95% C1: 0.52, 1.16, p = 0.13; >2 hr, OR	
					= 0.85, 95% CI: 0.38,	
					1.93, p = 0.70).	
Zimmerman et al. 2005 [77]; USA National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1979 Children and Youth Adults (NLSY-Child)	Longitudinal (~5 yr follow- up)	N = 1266 Approximate age: T1, "survey year occurring closest to the 4-year birthday" Pre-schoolers Mean age: T2, 9.19 yr School-age	TV time (hr/day) assessed by parent-report questionnaire (unpublished).	Bullying (categories: bullies, nonbullies) assessed by parent-report questionnaire (unpublished).	TV time at age ~4 yr was unfavourably associated with being a bully at age ~9 yr (for each hr/day TV time: OR = 1.06, 95% CI: 1.02, 1.11).	Age, sex, race or ethnicity, parents' income and education.
Hinkley et al. 2014	Longitudinal	N = 3604	TV time (approximate	Emotional problems	TV time at age 4.3 yr was	Region, age,
[78]; Belgium, Cyprus, Estonia,	(~2 yr follow- up)	T1, 4.3 yr	min/hr) on weekdays and weekend days, and time	(e.g., often worried, unhappy, depressed), and	not associated with being at-risk for emotional	socioeconomic position, body mass index,
Germany,	up)	Pre-schoolers	spent e-gaming or on a	peer problems (e.g.,	problems at age 6.3 yr	clustering by centre of
Hungary, Italy,			computer (approximate	rather solitary, picked	(weekdays: <i>boys:</i> OR =	recruitment, baseline
Spain, Sweden		T2, 6.3 yr	min/hr) on weekdays and	on/bullied), assessed by	1.2, 95% CI: 0.9, 1.5;	levels of SDQ or KINDL
		School-age	weekend days, assessed	parent-report using the	<i>girls:</i> OR = 1.3, 95% CI:	outcome variable under

Identification and	by parent-report	SDQ. Items are scored as	1.0, 1.7; weekend days:	investigation
Prevention of	questionnaire (adapted	"healthy" (normal) or "at-	<i>boys</i> : $OR = 1.0, 95\%$ CI:	III. OBILIUI
Dietary-and	from the "Generation M-	risk" (borderline and	0.8, 1.3; girls: OR = 1.3,	
Lifestyle-Induced	study" [79]).	abnormal).	95% CI: 1.0, 1.6; all p >	
Health Effects in	study [72]).	abilormar).	0.05).	
Children and		Self-esteem (e.g., proud	0.05).	
Infants (IDEFICS)		of self peased with self),	TV time at age 4.3 yr was	
Infants (IDEFICS)		emotional well-being	not associated with being	
		•	•	
		(e.g., had fun, was scared),	at-risk for peer problems	
		family functioning (e.g.,	at age 6.3 yr (weekdays:	
		felt fine at home, got on	<i>boys:</i> $OR = 1.0, 95\%$ CI:	
		well with parents), and	0.8, 1.3; girls: OR = 1.1,	
		social networks (e.g.,	95% CI: 0.9, 1.5; weekend	
		liked by other children,	days: <i>boys:</i> $OR = 1.0, 95\%$	
		got on well with friends)	CI: 0.9, 1.2; <i>girls:</i> OR =	
		assessed by parent-report	1.1, 95% CI: 1.0, 1.5; all p	
		using the KINDL ^R	> 0.05).	
		(Questionnaire for		
		Measuring Health-Related	TV time at age 4.3 yr was	
		Quality of Life in	not associated with being	
		Children and Adolescents-	at-risk for self-esteem	
		Revised Version). Each	problems (weekdays:	
		item receives a total	<i>boys:</i> OR = 1.1, 95% CI:	
		scaled score of 100	0.9, 1.3; <i>girls:</i> OR = 1.0,	
		possible points (higher	95% CI: 0.8, 1.3; weekend	
		scores are more	days: <i>boys:</i> OR = 1.1, 95%	
		favourable); scores ≤25th	CI: 0.9, 1.3; <i>girls:</i> OR =	
		percentile considered "at	1.0, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.1; all p	
		risk", and scores >25 th	> 0.05).	
		percentile considered "not		
		at risk".	TV time at age 4.3 yr was	
			not associated with being	
			at-risk for emotional	
			well-being problems at	
			age 6.3 yr (weekdays:	
			<i>boys:</i> OR = 1.2, 95% CI:	
			1.0, 1.4; <i>girls:</i> OR = 1.1,	
			95% CI: 0.9, 1.4; weekend	
			days: <i>boys:</i> OR = 1.1, 95%	
		1		

CI: 1.0, 1.3; <i>girls:</i> OR =
1.1, 95% CI: 0.9, 1.3; all p
> 0.05).
TV time on weekdays at
age 4.3 yr was
unfavourably associated
with being at-risk for
family functioning
problems at age 6.3 yr
(<i>boys:</i> OR = 1.2, 95% CI:
1.0, 1.5; <i>girls:</i> OR = 1.3,
95% CI: 1.0, 1.6; both p >
0.05). TV time on
weekend days at age 4.3
yr was unfavourably
associated with being at
risk for family
functioning problems at
age 6.3 yr in <i>girls</i> (OR =
1.3, 95% CI: 1.0, 1.5, p <
0.05) but not <i>boys</i> (OR =
1.1, 95% CI: 0.9, 1.3, p >
0.05).
TV time at age 4.3 yr was
not associated with being
at-risk for social
functioning problems at
age 6.3 yr (weekdays:
<i>boys:</i> OR = 1.2, 95% CI:
1.0, 1.4; <i>girls</i> : OR = 0.9,
95% CI: 0.7, 1.1; weekend
days: <i>boys:</i> OR = 1.0, 95%
CI: 0.9, 1.2; <i>girls:</i> OR =
1.1, 95% CI: 0.9, 1.3; all p
> 0.05).
Time spent e-gaming or

on a computer on weekings at age 4.3 yr was unlavourably associated with being at- risk for emotional problems at age 6.3 yr in girls (OR = 1.3, 95% CE 1.0.40, p < 0.05) but not boys (OR = 1.3, 95% CE 0.8, 2.1, p > 0.05). Time spent egoming or on a computer on weekend days at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at- risk for emotional problems at age 6.3 yr (brys: OR = 1.0, 95% CE 0.7, 1.4; girls: OR = 1.1, 95% CE 0.7 1.8; both p > 0.05). Time spent egoming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for gere problems at age 6.3 yr (weekday: looy:: OR = 0.6, 95% CE 0.8, 95% CE 0.5, 1.3; girls: OR = 1.9, 95% CE 1.0, 3, weelend days: being at-risk for gere problems at age 6.3 yr (weekday: looy:: OR = 0.6, 95% CE 0.6, 9.95% CE 0.6, 1.3; girls: OR = 1.9, 95% CE 0.6, 9.95% CE 0.6, 1.3; girls: OR = 1.2, 95% CE 0.8, 1.8; all p > 0.05). Time spent egoming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for gene group end age: 1.2, 95% CE 0.8, 1.8; all p > 0.05).		66
was unfavourably associated with being at- risk for emotional problems at age 6.3 yr in girls (OR = 2.0, 95% CI: 1.0, 4.0, p < 0.05) but not boys (OR = 1.3, 95% CI: 0.8, 2.1, p > 0.05). Time sport e-ganing or on a computer on weekend days at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at- risk for emotional problems at age 6.3 yr (brys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.4; girls: OR = 1.1, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.4; girls: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.3; girls: OR = 1.9, 95% CI: 1.0, 3.3; weekend days: boys: OR = 0.0, 95% CI: 1.0, 3.3; weekend days: boys: OR = 0.0, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.2; girls: OR = 1.2, 95% CI: 0.3, 1.8; all p > 0.05). Time spent e-ganing or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with	on a computer on	
associated with being at- risk for emotional problems at age 6.3 yr in girls (OR = 2.0, 95% CI: 10, 4.0, p < 0.05) but not boys (OR = 1.3, 95% CI: 0.8, 2.1, p > 0.05). Time spent e-gaming or on a computer on weekend days at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at- risk for emotional problems at age 6.3 yr (boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.4; girk: OR = 1.1, 95% CI: 0.7 1.8; both p > 0.05). Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for peer problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 0.8, 95% CI: 0.7 1.8; both p > 0.05). Time spent e-gaming or 0.8, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.3; girls: OR = 1.2, 0.8, 1.3; all p > 0.05). Time spent e-gaming or 0.3, 2.4; cordend days; boys: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.2; girls: OR = 1.2, 0.95). Time spent e-gaming or <td< th=""><th>weekdays at age 4.3 yr</th><th></th></td<>	weekdays at age 4.3 yr	
risk for emotional problems at age 6.3 yr in gdris (OR = 2.0, 95% CI: 1.0, 4.0, p < 0.05) but not boys (OR = 1.3, 95% CI: 0.8, 2.1, p > 0.05). Time spent eganing or on a computer on weekend days at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at- risk for emotional problems at age 6.3 yr (boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.4; grits: OR = 1.1, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.8; both p > 0.05). Time spent e-ganing or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for peer problems at age 6.3 yr (boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.8; both p > 0.05). Time spent e-ganing or on a computer at age 4.3 yr (weeddays: boy: OR = 0.8, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.3; gdris: OR = 1.9, 95% CI: 0.3, 8; weekend days: boys: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.3, 8; weekend days: boys: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.3, 8; weekend days: boys: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.4; gris: OR = 1.2; gri	was unfavourably	
Image: Second	associated with being at-	
girls (OR = 2.0, 95% CI: 1.0, 4.0, p < 0.05) but not bays (OR = 1.3, 95% CI: 0.8, 2.1, p > 0.05). Time space-gaming or on a computer on weekend days at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at- risk for emotional problems at age 6.3 yr (bays: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.4; girls: OR = 1.1, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.8; both p > 0.05).Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for peer problems at age 6.3 yr (weekedys: boys: OR = 0.8, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.3; girls: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.05).Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for peer problems at age 6.3 yr (weekedys: boys: OR = 0.8, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.3; girls: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 1.0, 3.8; weekend days: boys: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.05).1.0, 3.8; weekend days: boys: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.05).0.3; 0.2; 0.3; 1.3; all p > 0.05).Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at a age 4.3; boys: OR = 0.0, 95% CI: 0.05, 1.2; all p > 0.05).	risk for emotional	
$\begin{bmatrix} 1, 0, 4, 0, p < 0.05 \ but not \\ bys (OR = 1.3, 95\% CI: \\ 0.8, 2.1, p > 0.05. Time \\ spent e-ganing or on a \\ computer on weekend \\ days at age 4.3 yr was not \\ associated with being at-risk for emotional problems at age 6.3 yr (boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.4; grids: OR = 1.1, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.8; both p > 0.05). Time spent e-ganing or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for peer problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 1 0.8, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.3; grids: OR = 19, 95% CI: 1.0, 3.8; weekend days: boys: OR = 19, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.2; grids: OR = 1.9, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.2; grids: OR = 1.2, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.2; grids: OR = 1.2, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.2; grids: OR = 1.2, 95% CI: 0.05). Time spent e-ganing or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with $	problems at age 6.3 yr in	
boys $(OR = 1.3, 95\% CI: 0.8, 2.1, p > 0.05)$. Time spent - caming or on a computer on weekend days at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at- risk for emotional problems at age 6.3 yr (boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.4; girls: OR = 1.1, 95% CI: 0.7 1.8; both p > 0.05). Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for peer problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: hoys: OR = 1.9, 95% CI: 1.0, 3.8; weekend days: hoys: OR = 1.2, 95% CI: 1.0, 3.8; weekend days: hoys: OR = 1.2, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.2; girls: OR = 1.2, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.3; all p > 0.05).	<i>girls</i> (OR = 2.0, 95% CI:	
 0.8, 2.1, p > 0.05). Time spent e-gaming or on a computer on weekend days at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being attrik for emotional problems at age 6.3 yr (boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.4; girls: OR = 1.1, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.4; girls: OR = 1.1, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.4; girls: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.8; both p > 0.05). Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for peer problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 1.0, 3.8; weekend days: boys: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.2; girls: OR = 1.2, 95\% CI: 0	1.0, 4.0, p < 0.05) but not	
spent e-gaming or on a computer on weekend days at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being atrisk for emotional problems at age 6.3 yr (boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.4; girls: OR = 1.1, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.8; both p > 0.05). Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being atrisk for peer problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.3; girls: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 1.0, 3.8; weekend days: boys: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.3; girls: OR = 1.2, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.3; all p > 0.05). Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being atriated at age 6.3 yr (weekend days: boys: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.3; girls: OR = 1.2, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.8; all p > 0.05).	<i>boys</i> (OR = 1.3, 95% CI:	
Image: Computer on veckend days at age 4.3 yr was not associated with Image: Computer on veckend days at age 4.3 yr was not associated with Image: Computer on veckend days at age 4.3 yr was not associated with Image: Computer on veckend days at age 4.3 yr was not associated with Image: Computer on veckend days at age 4.3 yr was not associated with Image: Computer on veckend days Image: Computer on veckend days </th <th>0.8, 2.1, p > 0.05). Time</th> <th></th>	0.8, 2.1, p > 0.05). Time	
Image: Computer on veckend days at age 4.3 yr was not associated with Image: Computer on veckend days at age 4.3 yr was not associated with Image: Computer on veckend days at age 4.3 yr was not associated with Image: Computer on veckend days at age 4.3 yr was not associated with Image: Computer on veckend days at age 4.3 yr was not associated with Image: Computer on veckend days Image: Computer on veckend days </th <th>spent e-gaming or on a</th> <th></th>	spent e-gaming or on a	
associated with being at- risk for emotional problems at age 6.3 yr (boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.4; girls: OR = 1.1, 95% CI: 0.7 1.8; both p > 0.05). Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for peer problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 0.8, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.3; girls: OR = 1.9, 95% CI: 1.0, 3.8; weekend days: boys: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.2; girls: OR = 1.2, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.8; all p > 0.05). Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with		
risk for emotional problems at age 6.3 yr (boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.4; girls: OR = 1.1, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.8; both p > 0.05). Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for peer problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 0.8, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.3; girls: OR = 1.9, 95% CI: 1.0, 5.3; weekend days: boys: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.2; girls: OR = 1.2, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.8; all p > 0.05). Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with	days at age 4.3 yr was not	
problems at age 6.3 yr (boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.4; girls: OR = 1.1, 95% CI: 0.7 1.8; both p ≥ 0.05). Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for peer problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 0.8, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.3; girls: OR = 1.9, 95% CI: 1.0, 3.8; weekend days: boys: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.2; girls: OR = 1.2, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.8; all p ≥ 0.05). Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with	associated with being at-	
(boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.4; girls: OR = 1.1, 95% CI: 0.7 1.8; both p > 0.05). Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for peer problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 0.8, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.3; girls: OR = 1.9, 95% CI: 1.0, 3.8; weekend days: boys: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.2; girls: OR = 1.2, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.8; all p > 0.05). Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with	risk for emotional	
0.7, 1.4; girls: OR = 1.1, 95% CI: $0.7 1.8; both p > 0.05).$ Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for peer problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = $0.8, 95%$ CI: $0.5, 1.3;$ girls: OR = 1.9, 95% CI: $1.0, 3.8;$ weekend days: boys: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: $0.6, 1.2; girls: OR = 1.2,$ $95%$ CI: $0.6, 1.2; girls: OR = 1.2,$ $95%$ CI: $0.05).Time spent e-gaming oron a computer at age 4.3yr was not associated with$	problems at age 6.3 yr	
95% CI: 0.7 1.8; both p > 0.05). Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for peer problems at age 6.3 yr (weekday: boys: OR = 0.8, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.3; girls: OR = 1.9, 95% CI: 1.0, 3.8; weekend days: boys: OR = 1.9, 95% CI: 1.0, 3.8; weekend days: boys: OR = 1.2, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.8; all p > 0.05). Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with	(<i>boys:</i> OR = 1.0, 95% CI:	
0.05). Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for peer problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 0.8, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.3; girls: OR = 1.9, 95% CI: 1.0, 3.8; weekend days: boys: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.2; girls: OR = 1.2, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.8; all p > 0.05). Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with	0.7, 1.4; <i>girls:</i> OR = 1.1,	
Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for peer problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 0.8, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.3; girls: OR = 1.9, 95% CI: 1.0, 3.8; weekend days: boys: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.2; girls: OR = 1.2, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.8; all p > 0.05). Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with	95% CI: 0.7 1.8; both p >	
on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for peer problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 0.8, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.3; girls: OR = 1.9, 95% CI: 1.0, 3.8; weekend days: boys: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.2; girls: OR = 1.2, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.8; all p > 0.05). Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with	0.05).	
on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for peer problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 0.8, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.3; girls: OR = 1.9, 95% CI: 1.0, 3.8; weekend days: boys: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.2; girls: OR = 1.2, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.8; all p > 0.05). Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with		
on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for peer problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 0.8, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.3; girls: OR = 1.9, 95% CI: 1.0, 3.8; weekend days: boys: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.2; girls: OR = 1.2, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.8; all p > 0.05). Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with	Time spent e-gaming or	
being at-risk for peer problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: <i>boys</i> : OR = 0.8, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.3; <i>girls</i> : OR = 1.9, 95% CI: 1.0, 3.8; weekend days: <i>boys</i> : OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.2; <i>girls</i> : OR = 1.2, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.8; all p > 0.05). Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with		
problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 0.8, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.3; girls: OR = 1.9, 95% CI: 1.0, 3.8; weekend days: boys: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.2; girls: OR = 1.2, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.8; all p > 0.05). Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with	yr was not associated with	
(weekdays: boys: OR = 0.8, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.3; girls: OR = 1.9, 95% CI: 1.0, 3.8; weekend days: boys: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.2; girls: OR = 1.2, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.8; all p > 0.05). Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with	being at-risk for peer	
0.8, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.3; girls: OR = 1.9, 95% CI: 1.0, 3.8; weekend days: boys: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.2; girls: OR = 1.2, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.8; all p > 0.05). Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with	problems at age 6.3 yr	
girls: OR = 1.9, 95% CI: 1.0, 3.8; weekend days: boys: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.2; girls: OR = 1.2, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.8; all p > 0.05). Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with	(weekdays: <i>boys:</i> OR =	
1.0, 3.8; weekend days: boys: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.2; girls: OR = 1.2, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.8; all p > 0.05). Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with	0.8, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.3;	
boys: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.2; girls: OR = 1.2, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.8; all p > 0.05). Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with	<i>girls:</i> OR = 1.9, 95% CI:	
0.6, 1.2; girls: OR = 1.2, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.8; all p > 0.05). Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with	1.0, 3.8; weekend days:	
95% CI: 0.8, 1.8; all p > 0.05). Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with	<i>boys:</i> OR = 0.9, 95% CI:	
0.05). Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with	0.6, 1.2; <i>girls:</i> OR = 1.2,	
0.05). Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with	95% CI: 0.8, 1.8; all p >	
on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with	0.05).	
on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with		
on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with	Time spent e-gaming or	
yr was not associated with		
	being at-risk for self-	

steem problems at age sign (weekaps: koys: OR = 1.0, 95% C1: 0.7, 1.4; girls: OR = 1.0, 95% C1: 0.8, 1.4; girls: OR = 1.0, 95% C1: 0.7, 0.7, 1.3; girls: OR = 1.0, 95% C1: 0.7, 0.7, 1.3; girls: OR = 1.0, 95% C1: 0.7, 0.7, 1.3; girls: OR = 0.9, 95% C1: 0.7, 0.7, 1.3; girls: OR = 0.9, 95% C1: 0.7, 0.7, 1.3; girls: OR = 0.9, 95% C1: 0.7, 0.7, 1.3; girls: OR = 0.9, 95% C1: 0.7, 0.7, 1.3; girls: OR = 0.9, 95% C1: 0.7, 0.7, 1.3; girls: OR = 0.9, 95% C1: 0.7, 0.7, 1.3; girls: OR = 0.9, 95% C1: 0.7, 0.7, 1.3; girls: OR = 0.9, 95% C1: 0.7, 0.7, 1.3; girls: OR = 1.0, 95% C1: 0.7, 0.7, 1.3; girls: OR = 1.0, 95% C1: 0.7, 0.7, 1.3; girls: 0.8, 1.0, 95% C1: 0.7, 0.7, 1.3; girls: 0.8, 1.0, 95% C1: 0.6, 1.4; girls: OR = 0.9, 95%			
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c } \hline OR = 1.0, 95\% \ CI: 0.7, \\ 1.4; girls; OR = 1.0, 95\% \\ CI: 0.6, 1.9; weekend \\ days; brys; OR = 1.1, 95\% \\ CI: 0.8, 1.4; girls; OR = \\ 1.0, 95\% \ CI: 0.7, 1.4; all p \\ > 0.05. \end{array} $			
11.4: gids: $OR = 1.0, 95\%$ CI: 0.6, 1.9: weekend days: hoys: $OR = 1.1, 95\%$ CI: 0.8, 1.4; gids: $OR =$ 1.0, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.4; all p > 0.05).7Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for social well-being problems at age 6.3 yr (weeklays: boys: $OR = 1.2, 95\%$ CI: 0.8, 1.3; gids: $OR = 1.2, 95\%$ CI: 0.7, 2.0; weekend days: hoys: $OR = 1.0, 95\%$ CI: 0.7, 2.0; weekend days: hoys: $OR = 1.0, 95\%$ CI: 0.7, 1.3; all p > 0.05).7Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for family functioning problems at age 6.3 yr (weeklays: boys: $OR = 1.0, 95\%$ CI: 0.7, 1.3; all p > 0.05).7Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for family functioning problems at age 6.3 yr (weeklays: boys: $OR = 1.0, 95\%$ CI: 0.5, 1.7; weekend days: hoys: $OR = 0.9, 95\%$ CI: 0.5, 1.7; weekend days: hoys: $OR = 0.8, 95\%$ CI: 0.5, 1.7; weekend days: hoys: $OR = 0.8, 95\%$ CI: 0.5, 1.7; weekend days: hoys: $OR = 0.8, 95\%$ CI: 0.5, 1.5; all p > 0.05).			
Ch: 0.6, 1.9; weekend Ch: 0.8, 1.4; girls: OR = 11, 95% Ch: 0.8, 1.4; girls: OR = 10, 95% Ch: 0.7, 1.4; all p > 0.05). Time spent c-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for social well-being problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 1.1, 95% Ch: 0.8, 1.5; girls: OR = 1.2, 95% OR = 1.1, 95% Ch: 0.8, 1.5; girls: OR = 1.2, 95% OR = 1.0, 95% Ch: 0.7, 2.0; weekend days: boys: OR = 1.0, 95% Ch: 0.8, 1.3; girls: OR = 0.9, 95% OB 0.9, 95% Ch: 0.7, 1.3; all p > 0.05). Time spent e-gaming or On a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for family functioning problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 0.9, 95% C1: 0.6, 1.4; girls: OR = 0.9, 9.5% C1: 0.5, 1.7; weekend days: boys: OR = 0.8, 95% C1: 0.6, 1.			OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.7,
days: boys: OR = 1.1, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.4; girls: OR = 10, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.4; all p > 0.05).Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for social well-being problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 1.2, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.5; girls: OR = 1.2, 95% CI: 0.7, 2.0; weekend days: boys: OR = 1.1, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.3; girls: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.3; all p > 0.05).Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 or was not associated with being at-risk for family lunctioning problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.3; all p > 0.05).Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 or yr was not associated with being at-risk for family lunctioning problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.7; weekend days: boys: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.7; weekend days: boys: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.7; weekend days: boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.7; weekend days: boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.7; weekend days: boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.7; weekend days: boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.7; weekend days: boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.7; weekend days: boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.7; weekend days: boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.7; weekend days: boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.7; weekend days: boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.7; weekend days: boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.5; all p > 0.05).			1.4; <i>girls:</i> OR = 1.0, 95%
CI: 0.8, 14; girls: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.4; all p > 0.05).Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being ar-risk for social well-being problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 1.1, 95% CI: $0.8, 1.5; girls: OR = 1.2,$ 95% CI: 0.7, 2.0; weekend days: hoys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.3; girls: OR = $0.9, 95\%$ CI: 0.7, 1.3; all p > 0.05).Time spent e-gaming or or a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for family functioning problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.3; girls: OR = $0.9, 95\%$ CI: 0.7, 1.3; all p > 0.05).			CI: 0.6, 1.9; weekend
1.0. 95% CI: 0.7, 1.4; all p > 0.05).Time spent e-gaming or computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 1.1, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.3; girls: OR = 1.2, 95% CI: 0.7, 2.0; weekend days: boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.3; girls: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.3; all p > 0.05).Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for family functioning problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.3; all p > 0.05).			days: <i>boys:</i> OR = 1.1, 95%
 > 0.05). Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for social well-being problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 1.1, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.5; girls: OR = 1.2, 95% CI: 0.7, 2.0; weekend days: boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.3; girls: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.3; all p > 0.05b. Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for family functioning problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.4; girls: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.7; weekend days: boys: OR = 0.8, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.0; girls: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.5; all p > 0.05). 			CI: 0.8, 1.4; <i>girls:</i> OR =
Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for social well-being problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: $boys: OR = 1.1, 95\%$ CI: $0.8, 1.5; girls: OR = 1.2,$ 95% CI: 0.7, 2.0; weekend days: boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.3; girls: OR = $0.9, 95\%$ CI: 0.7, 1.3; all p > 0.05).Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with bcing at-risk for family functioning problems at age 6.3 yr (weekday: $boys: OR = 1.0, 95\%$ CI: $0.7, 1.3;$ all p > 0.05).			1.0, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.4; all p
on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being ar-risk for social well-being problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 1.1, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.5; girls: OR = 1.2, 95% CI: 0.7, 2.0; weekend days: boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.3; girls: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.3; all p > 0.05). Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being ar-tisk for family functioning problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.4; girls: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.5; all p > 0.05).			> 0.05).
on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being ar-risk for social well-being problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 1.1, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.5; girls: OR = 1.2, 95% CI: 0.7, 2.0; weekend days: boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.3; girls: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.3; all p > 0.05). Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being ar-tisk for family functioning problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.4; girls: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.5; all p > 0.05).			
on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being ar-risk for social well-being problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 1.1, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.5; girls: OR = 1.2, 95% CI: 0.7, 2.0; weekend days: boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.3; girls: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.3; all p > 0.05). Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being ar-tisk for family functioning problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.4; girls: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.5; all p > 0.05).			Time spent e-gaming or
being at-risk for social well-being problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: $OR = 1.1, 95\%$ CI: 0.8, 1.5; girls: $OR = 1.2,$ 95% CI: 0.7, 2.0; weekend days: boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.3; girls: $OR =$ 0.9, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.3; all p > 0.05). Time spent eganing or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for family functioning problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: $OR = 1.0, 95\%$ CI: 0.6, 1.4; girls: $OR = 0.9,$ 95% CI: 0.5, 1.7; weekend days: boys: OR = 0.8, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.0; girls: $OR =$ 1.0, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.5; all p > 0.05).			
being at-risk for social well-being problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: $OR = 1.1, 95\%$ CI: 0.8, 1.5; girls: $OR = 1.2,$ 95% CI: 0.7, 2.0; weekend days: boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.3; girls: $OR =$ 0.9, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.3; all p > 0.05). Time spent eganing or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for family functioning problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: $OR = 1.0, 95\%$ CI: 0.6, 1.4; girls: $OR = 0.9,$ 95% CI: 0.5, 1.7; weekend days: boys: OR = 0.8, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.0; girls: $OR =$ 1.0, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.5; all p > 0.05).			yr was not associated with
well-being problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 1.1, 95% CI: 0.8, 15; girls: OR = 1.2, 95% CI: 0.7, 2.0; weekend days: boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.3; girls: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.3; all p > 0.05). Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for family functioning problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.4; girls: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.7; weekend days: boys: OR = 0.8, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.0; girls: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.5; all p > 0.05).			being at-risk for social
age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 1.1, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.5; girls: OR = 1.2, 95% CI: 0.7, 2.0; weekend days: boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.3; girls: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.3; all p > 0.05). Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for family functioning problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.4; girls: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.7; weekend days: boys: OR = 0.8, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.0; girls: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.5; all p > 0.05).			-
0.8, 1.5; girls: OR = 1.2, 95% CI: 0.7, 2.0; weekend days: boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.8, 1.3; girls: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.3; all p > 0.05). Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for family functioning problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.4; girls: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.7; weekend days: boys: OR = 0.8, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.0; girls: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.5; all p > 0.05).			age 6.3 yr (weekdays:
95% CI: $0.7, 2.0;$ weekend days: boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: $0.8, 1.3;$ girls: OR = $0.9, 95\%$ CI: $0.7, 1.3;$ all p > 0.05).Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for family functioning problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: $0.6, 1.4;$ girls: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: $0.5, 1.7;$ weekend days: boys: OR = 0.8, 95% CI: $0.6, 1.4;$ girls: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: $0.5, 1.7;$ weekend days: boys: OR = 0.8, 95% CI: $0.6, 1.0;$ girls: OR = $1.0, 95\%$ CI: $0.7, 1.5;$ all p > 0.05).			<i>boys:</i> OR = 1.1, 95% CI:
days: boys: $OR = 1.0, 95\%$ CI: $0.8, 1.3;$ girls: $OR =$ $0.9, 95\%$ CI: $0.7, 1.3;$ all p > 0.05).Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for family functioning problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: $OR = 1.0, 95\%$ CI: $0.6, 1.4;$ girls: $OR = 0.9,$ 95% CI: $0.5, 1.7;$ weekend days: boys: $OR = 0.8, 95\%$ CI: $0.6, 1.0;$ girls: $OR =$ $1.0, 95\%$ CI: $0.7, 1.5;$ all p > 0.05).			0.8, 1.5; <i>girls:</i> OR = 1.2,
CI: $0.8, 1.3; girls: OR =$ $0.9, 95\%$ CI: $0.7, 1.3;$ all p > 0.05).Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for family functioning problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: $0.6, 1.4; girls: OR = 0.9,$ 95% CI: $0.5, 1.7;$ weekend days: boys: OR = 0.8, 95% CI: $0.6, 1.0; girls: OR =$ $1.0, 95\%$ CI: $0.7, 1.5;$ all p > 0.05).			95% CI: 0.7, 2.0; weekend
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c } \hline 0.9, 95\% & \text{CI: } 0.7, 1.3; \text{ all } p \\ > 0.05). \end{array}$ Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for family functioning problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.4; girls: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.7; weekend days: boys: OR = 0.8, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.0; girls: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.5; all p > 0.05).			days: <i>boys:</i> OR = 1.0, 95%
 > 0.05). Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for family functioning problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.4; girls: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.7; weekend days: boys: OR = 0.8, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.0; girls: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.5; all p > 0.05). 			CI: 0.8, 1.3; <i>girls:</i> OR =
Time spent e-gaming or on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for family functioning problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.4; girls: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.7; weekend days: boys: OR = 0.8, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.0; girls: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.5; all p > 0.05).			0.9, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.3; all p
on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for family functioning problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.4; girls: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.7; weekend days: boys: OR = 0.8, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.0; girls: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.5; all p > 0.05).			> 0.05).
on a computer at age 4.3 yr was not associated with being at-risk for family functioning problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.4; girls: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.7; weekend days: boys: OR = 0.8, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.0; girls: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.5; all p > 0.05).			
yr was not associated with being at-risk for family functioning problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: <i>boys:</i> OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.4; <i>girls:</i> OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.7; weekend days: <i>boys:</i> OR = 0.8, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.0; <i>girls:</i> OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.5; all p > 0.05).			Time spent e-gaming or
being at-risk for family functioning problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.4; girls: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.7; weekend days: boys: OR = 0.8, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.0; girls: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.5; all p > 0.05).			on a computer at age 4.3
functioning problems at age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.4; girls: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.7; weekend days: boys: OR = 0.8, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.0; girls: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.5; all p > 0.05).			yr was not associated with
age 6.3 yr (weekdays: boys: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.4; girls: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: 0.5, 1.7; weekend days: boys: OR = 0.8, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.0; girls: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.5; all p > 0.05).			being at-risk for family
boys: $OR = 1.0, 95\%$ CI: 0.6, 1.4; girls: OR = 0.9, 95% CI: $0.5, 1.7;$ weekend days: boys: $OR = 0.8, 95\%$ CI: $0.6, 1.0; girls: OR =$ 1.0, 95% CI: $0.7, 1.5;$ all p > 0.05).			functioning problems at
$\begin{array}{c} 0.6, 1.4; girls: OR = 0.9, \\ 95\% CI: 0.5, 1.7; weekend \\ days: boys: OR = 0.8, 95\% \\ CI: 0.6, 1.0; girls: OR = \\ 1.0, 95\% CI: 0.7, 1.5; all p \\ > 0.05). \end{array}$			
95% CI: 0.5, 1.7; weekend days: <i>boys:</i> OR = 0.8, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.0; <i>girls:</i> OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.5; all p > 0.05).			<i>boys:</i> OR = 1.0, 95% CI:
days: boys: OR = 0.8, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.0; girls: OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.5; all p > 0.05).			0.6, 1.4; <i>girls:</i> OR = 0.9,
CI: 0.6, 1.0; <i>girls</i> : OR = 1.0, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.5; all p > 0.05).			
1.0, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.5; all p > 0.05).			
> 0.05).			
			1.0, 95% CI: 0.7, 1.5; all p
Time spent e-gaming or			> 0.05).
Time spent e-gaming or			
			Time spent e-gaming or

					on a computer at age 4.3	
					yr was not associated with	
					being at-risk for social	
					functioning problems at	
					age 6.3 yr (weekdays:	
					<i>boys:</i> OR = 0.7, 95% CI:	
					0.5, 1.1; <i>girls:</i> OR = 0.8,	
					95% CI: 0.5, 1.5; weekend	
					days: <i>boys:</i> OR = 0.9, 95%	
					CI: 0.7, 1.1; <i>girls:</i> OR =	
					0.8, 95% CI: 0.6, 1.2; all p	
					> 0.05).	
Study Design:						
Cross-sectional						
Intusoma et al.	Cross-	N = 3802	TV time (hr/day) at ages	Social-emotional	TV time was favourably	Temperament, mother's
2013 [80];	sectional		1 yr and 3 yr (combined	competence (categories:	associated with social-	education, recreational
Thailand		Approximate age:	for analysis), assessed by	low, not low) at ages 1 yr	emotional competence,	places visited, positive
		T1, 1 yr	parent-report	and 3 yr (combined for	but the beneficial effect	reinforcement, gender,
Prospective Cohort		T2, 3 yr	questionnaire	analysis) assessed by	diminished or disappeared	main caregiver, family
Study of Thai		Toddlers	(unpublished).	parent-report interview	when TV duration	income, father's
Children (PCTC)				using the Modified Infant-	exceeded 120 min/day	education, number of
cohort study				Toddler Social and	(compared to no TV time:	siblings, interactive play,
				Emotional Assessment	$1-30 \min/day, OR = 0.86,$	negative reinforcement.
				(MIT-SEA) instrument.	95% CI: 0.70, 1.06, p >	
					0.05; 31-60 min/day, OR	
					= 0.64, 95% CI: 0.46,	
					0.87, p < 0.01; 61-90	
					min/day, OR = 0.57, 95%	
					CI: 0.26, 1.28, p > 0.05;	
					91-120 min/day, OR =	
					0.53, 95% CI: 0.34, 0.82,	
					p < 0.01; 121-150	
					min/day, OR = 0.37, 95%	
					CI: 0.05, 2.77, p > 0.05;	
					151-180 min/day, OR =	
					0.55, 95% CI: 0.31, 0.98,	
					p < 0.05; >180 min/day,	
					OR = 0.66, 95% CI: 0.35,	
					1.23, p > 0.05).	
		1			1.23, p > 0.03).	

Cheng et al. 2010	Cross-	N = 302	TV time (hr/day) assessed	Emotional symptoms,	Emotional symptoms	Child sex, birth weight,
[72]; Japan	sectional		by parent-report	conduct problems, peer-	were not different between	gestational age, birth
		Approximate age:	questionnaire	problems, and prosocial	categories of TV time	order, maternal education
Japan Children's		30 mo (~2.5 yr)	(unpublished).	behaviour (all measured	(scores by TV time	and family income and
Study		Toddlers		on a scale from 0 to 10;	categories: unadjusted,	maternal stimulation.
				higher numbers are	<1hr/day, 2.03; 95% CI:	
				unfavourable) assessed by	1.4, 2.6; ≥ 1 to <3 hr/day,	
				parent-report using the	2.04, 95% CI: 1.8, 2.3; ≥3	
				SDQ.	to <4 hr/day, 1.81, 95%	
					CI: 1.3, 2.3; ≥4 hr/day,	
					1.82, 95% CI: 1.4, 2.3; p-	
					value for group mean	
					differences, $p = 0.739$).	
					Conduct problems were	
					not different between	
					categories of TV time	
					(scores by TV time	
					categories: unadjusted,	
					<1hr/day, 2.86; 95% CI:	
					2.1, 3.6; \geq 1 to <3 hr/day,	
					3.19, 95% CI: 2.9, 3.5; ≥3	
					to <4 hr/day, 3.44, 95%	
					CI: 2.8, 4.1; ≥4 hr/day,	
					3.00, 95% CI: 2.6, 3.4; p-	
					value for group mean	
					differences, $p = 0.449$).	
					Peer-problems were not	
					different between	
					categories of TV time	
					(scores by TV time	
					categories: unadjusted,	
					<1hr/day, 2.31; 95% CI:	
					1.7, 2.9; \geq 1 to <3 hr/day,	
					2.09, 95% CI: 1.8, 2.4; ≥3	
					to <4 hr/day, 2.50, 95%	
					CI: 1.9, 3.1; ≥4 hr/day,	
					2.08, 95% CI: 1.7, 2.4; p-	

					value for group mean differences, $p = 0.359$).	
					• •	
					C1: $4.9, 5.8; \ge 3$ to <4 hr/day, $4.96, 95\%$ C1: $4.0, 5.6; \ge 4$ hr/day, $5.09, 95\%$ C1: $4.6, 5.8;$ p-value for	
					group mean differences $p = 0.718$).	
Manganello and Taylor 2009 [81]; USA	Cross- sectional	N = 3023 Mean age: 36 mo (~3 yr)	TV time (hr/day) assessed by parent-report questionnaire (unpublished).	Aggression (score from 0 to 30; higher scores indicate greater aggression) assessed by	TV time was unfavourably associated with aggression (<i>unadjusted: r</i> = 0.15, p <	Child sex; maternal characteristics: age, nativity, race, education, work hr/wk, relationship
The Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study		Pre-schoolers		parent-report using the CBCL/2-3.	(analytical $P = 0.15, p < 0.001; \beta = 0.39, p < 0.001; adjusted: \beta = 0.16, 95% CI: 0.08, 0.25, p < 0.001).$	status; paternal characteristics: age, education; Household risk characteristics: married at child's birth, income, used food stamps in the past year, additional adults in home, additional children in home.
Teramoto et al.	Cross-	N = 670	TV time (hr/day) assessed	Total behaviour	TV time was	Coffee drinking during
2005 [82]; Japan	sectional		by parent-report	problems, externalizing	unfavourably associated	pregnancy, number of

		Age range: 36 to 47 mo (~3 to 4 yr) Pre-schoolers	questionnaire (unpublished).	behaviour problems (oppositional, aggressive/destructive and attention domains), and internalizing behaviour problems (withdrawn behaviour, separation anxiety and anxious/neurotic domains) (units for all were <i>T</i> scores; abnormal range <i>T</i> \geq 64) measured using the Japanese CBCL/2-3.	with total behaviour problems (OR = 1.23, 95% CI: 1.06, 1.43, p = 0.011), and externalizing behaviour problems (OR = 1.26, 95% CI: 1.08, 1.48, p = 0.004), but not internalizing behaviour problems (values not reported).	older brothers/sister, family income.
Miller et al. 2012 [83]; USA	Cross- sectional	N = 150 Mean age: 3.64 yr Pre-schoolers	TV time (categories: 0-1 hr/day, 2-5 hr/day, 6-9 hr/day, 10 or more hr/day) assessed by parent-report interview (unpublished format).	Aggression toward a sibling (scale from 1 to 4; higher scores indicate more aggression) assessed by parent-report using the Aggressive Sibling Social Behavior Scale.	TV time was not associated with aggression toward a sibling ($r = 0.14$, p > 0.01; $\beta = 0.11$, p > 0.05).	Child sex, income, maternal depression, father-child physical aggression, intimate partner violence, hours of violent TV, community violence.
Irwin et al. 2015 [84]; Canada Learning Environments' Activity Potential for Preschoolers (LEAPP) study	Cross- sectional	N = 216 Age range: 2.5 to 5 yr Pre-schoolers	Total sedentary time (min/day; collected during the preschool day only; <50 counts/15 sec epoch) measured by accelerometer (Actical).	Soothability (unit- weighted scale scores), sociability (units not indicated), and emotionality (units not indicated) assessed by parent-report using the Child Temperament Questionnaire (CTQ).	Total sedentary time was not associated with soothability ($r = 0.07$, 95%CI: -0.06, 0.21), sociability ($r = -0.01$, 95%CI: -0.15, 0.12), or emotionality ($r = -0.09$, 95%CI: -0.22, 0.04).	N/A
Zimmerman et al. 2005 [77]; USA NLSY-Child	Cross- sectional	N = 1266 Approximate age: "survey year occurring closest to the 4-year birthday" Pre-schoolers	TV time (hr/day) assessed by parent-report questionnaire (unpublished).	Bullying (categories: bullies, nonbullies) assessed by parent-report questionnaire (unpublished).	Bullies had significantly greater TV time than non- bullies at age 4 yr (Bullies, 5.03 hr/day, SD = 3.92; nonbullies, 3.23 hr/day, SD = 3.92; p = 0.004).	N/A

AFQT, Armed Forces Qualification Test; B, unstandardized beta; β, standardized beta; BASC-2, Behavior Assessment System for Children, second edition; BPI, Behavior Problems Index; CD, compact disk; CBCL, Child Behavior Checklist; CI, confidence interval; CTQ, Child Temperament Questionnaire; IDEFICS, Identification and Prevention of Dietary-and Lifestyle-Induced Health Effects in Children and Infants; KINDL, Questionnaire for Measuring Health-Related Quality of Life in Children and Adolescents-Revised Version; LEAPP, Learning Environments' Activity Potential for Preschoolers; MIT-SEA, Modified Infant-Toddler Social and Emotional Assessment; NLSY-Child, National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1979 Children and Youth Adults; NLSY79, National Longitudinal Survey of Youth; OR, odds ratio; PSID, Panel Study of Income Dynamics; PCTC, Prospective Cohort Study in Thai Children; QLSCD, Quebec Longitudinal Study of Child Development; RCT, Randomized Controlled Trial; SBQ, Social Behavior Questionnaire; SD, standard deviation; SDQ, Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire; SE, standard error, T1-T4, Time 1 to Time 4; TV, television.

Reference; Country; Larger Study or Cohort Name	Study Design	Sample	Exposure	Outcome	Main Findings	Covariates included in model (if applicable)
Study Design: Longitudinal						
Tomopoulos et al. 2010 [85]; USA Bellevue Project for Early Language, Literacy, and Education Success (BELLE)	Longitudinal (~8 mo follow-up)	N = 259 Approximate age: T1, 6 mo (~0.5 yr) T2, 14 mo (~1.2 yr) Infants	Electronic media exposure (min/day) assessed by maternal- report interview (24-hour recall diary).	Cognitive development assessed using Bayley Scales of Infant Development-third edition (BSID-III). Language development (total) and two subscales, auditory comprehension and expressive communication, assessed using the Preschool Language Scale-4 (PLS- 4).	Electronic media exposure at age 6 mo was unfavourably associated with cognitive development ($r = -0.07$, p = 0.008; B = -1.5, 95% CI: -2.7, -0.3; $\beta = -0.15$, p = 0.02), language development ($r = -0.16$, p = 0.009; B = -1.2, 95% CI: -2.0, -0.4; $\beta = -0.16$, p = 0.005), and auditory comprehension ($r = -$ 0.16, p = 0.01; B = -1.1, 95% CI: -2.0, -0.2; $\beta = -$ 0.14, p = 0.02) at age 14 mo. Electronic media exposure at age 6 mo was not associated with expressive communication at age 14 mo in unadjusted analysis ($r = -0.12$, p = 0.06) but was unfavourably associated after adjustments (B = -1.0, 95% CI: -1.9, -0.1; $\beta = -$ 0.13, p = 0.02).	Sex, position in birth order, maternal factors (age, educational level, country of origin, primary language, marital status, depressive symptoms, cognitive home environment), intervention status.

Reference; Country; Larger Study or Cohort Name	Study Design	Sample	Exposure	Outcome	Main Findings	Covariates included in model (if applicable)
McKean et al. 2015	Longitudinal	N = 763	TV time (hr/day) at age	Language development	There was a dose-response	Gender, birth weight, non-
[86]; Australia	(~5 yr follow-		~4 yr assessed by parent-	(SD) assessed by: (1) the	unfavourable relationship	verbal IQ, family history,
	up)	Approximate Ages:	report questionnaire	Australian adaptation of	between TV time at age 4	developmental disorder,
Early Language in		T1, 8 mo (Infants)	(unpublished).	the Clinical Evaluation of	and the rate of change in	shy/approach-withdrawal,
Victoria Study		T2, 1 yr (Infants)		Language Fundamentals-	language development	language background,
(ELVS)		T3, 2 yr (Toddlers)	Average frequency of	Preschool, Second Edition	between ages 5-7, such	social disadvantage index,
		T4, 3 yr (Toddlers)	parents reading [scored	(CELF-P2) at age 4 yr, (2)	that those with more TV	low income, maternal age,
		T5, 4 yr (Pre-	as: not very often (1),	the Clinical Evaluation of	time had a slower rate of	birth position, maternal
		schoolers)	sometimes (2), or often	Language Fundamentals,	change (improvement) in	education, family literacy,
		T6, 7 yr	(3)] to their child;	Fourth Edition (CELF-4)	language development;	conduct score, peer score,
			assessed at 8 mo, 1, 2, 3	Australian Standardisation	compared to the lowest	pro-social score,
			and 4 yr.	at ages 5 and 7 yr.	Quartile:	emotional score,
					Q2: Coefficient = -0.3 ,	hyperactivity/inattention,
				Rate of change in	95% CI: -0.07, 0.01, p <	speech development,
				language development	0.10	frequency of reading to
				(SD change per year)	Q3: Coefficient = -0.04 ,	child, number of children's
				between ages 4 yr and 7	95% CI: -0.08, 0.10, p <	books in the home.
				yr.	0.10	
					Q4: Coefficient = -0.07,	
					95% CI: -0.13, -0.03, p <	
					0.001.	
					There was a dose-response	
					favourable relationship	
					between frequency of	
					reading to child from	
					ages 8 mo to 4 yr and	
					language development at	
					age 4 yr, such that	
					children in the Q3 and Q4	
					of frequency of parents	
					reading to child from	
					ages 8 mo to 4 yr, but not	
					those in Q2, had lower	
					language development	

Reference; Country; Larger Study or Cohort Name	Study Design	Sample	Exposure	Outcome	Main Findings	Covariates included in model (if applicable)
					than children in Q1 at age	
					4 yr; compared to Q1	
					(score 3, "often)):	
					Q2 (score 2.6-2.8):	
					Coefficient = -0.15, 95%	
					CI: -0.30, 0.01, p < 0.10	
					Q3 (score >2.2 and <2.6):	
					Coefficient = -0.21, 95%	
					CI: -0.35, -0.06, p < 0.01	
					Q4 (score ≤2.2,	
					"sometimes or not very	
					often"): Coefficient = -	
					0.38, 95% CI: -0.56, -	
					0.21, p < 0.001	
					There was a dose-response	
					favourable relationship	
					between frequency of	
					reading to child between	
					ages 8 mo to 4 yr and the	
					rate of change in	
					language development	
					between ages 5-7, such	
					that those with a greater	
					frequency of reading to	
					child had a faster rate of	
					change (improvement) in	
					language development;	
					compared to the highest	
					Quartile (Q1):	
					Q2: Coefficient = 0.05 ,	
					95% CI: 0.01, 0.10, p <	
					0.05	
					Q3: Coefficient = 0.05 ,	
					95% CI: 0.01, 0.10, p <	

Reference; Country; Larger Study or Cohort Name	Study Design	Sample	Exposure	Outcome	Main Findings	Covariates included in model (if applicable)
					0.01 Q4: Coefficient = 0.02, 95% CI: -0.03, 0.07, p > 0.05.	
Cheng et al. 2010 [72]; Japan Japan Children's Study	Longitudinal (~1 yr follow- up)	N = 302 Approximate age: T1, 18 mo (~1.5 yr) T2, 30 mo (~2.5 yr) Toddlers	TV time (hr/day) at ages ~18 and 30 mo assessed by parent-report questionnaire (unpublished). TV time patterns from age ~18 mo to age ~30 mo [categories: high-high, ≥4 hr/day at 18 and 30 mo; high-low, ≥4 hr/day at 18 mo and <4 hr/day at 30 mo; low-high, <4 hr/day at 18 mo and ≥4 hr/day at 30 mo; low-low <4 hr/day at 18 and 30 mo] assessed by parent-report questionnaire (unpublished).	Hyperactivity- inattention (measured on a scale from 0 to 10; higher numbers are unfavourable) assessed by parent-report using the Japanese version of the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ).	There was an unfavourable dose- response relationship between TV time at age ~18 mo and hyperactivity-inattention at age ~30 mo (mean scores by TV time categories: <i>unadjusted</i> , <1hr/day, 3.26; 95% CI: 2.7, 3.8; \geq 1 to <3 hr/day, 3.83, 95% CI: 3.5, 4.2; \geq 3 to <4 hr/day, 4.45, 95% CI: 3.9, 4.9; \geq 4 hr/day, 4.61, 95% CI: 4.3, 5.0; p- value for mean differences, p < 0.0001; p- value for linear trend for means, p < 0.0001; <i>adjusted</i> , <1hr/day, 3.41; 95% CI: 2.7, 4.1; \geq 1 to <3 hr/day, 3.81, 95% CI: 3.4, 4.2; \geq 3 to <4 hr/day, 4.26, 95% CI: 3.7, 4.8; \geq 4 hr/day, 4.59, 95% CI: 4.1, 5.0; p-value for mean differences, p = 0.012; p- value for linear trend, p = 0.002).	Child sex, birth weight, gestational age, birth order, maternal education and family income and maternal stimulation.

Reference; Country; Larger Study or Cohort Name	Study Design	Sample	Exposure	Outcome	Main Findings	Covariates included in model (if applicable)
					Children with high-high and high-low TV time patterns had more unfavourable hyperactivity-inattention scores compared to children with low-low TV time patterns (high-high, 4.49, 95% CI: 3.9, 5.1; high-low, 4.70, 95% CI: 4.0, 5.4; low-high, 4.40, 95% CI: 3.5, 5.3; low-low, 3.79, 95% CI: 3.5, 4.1; p- value for mean differences, p = 0.029; p- values for post hoc tests for specific group differences, not reported).	
Mistry et al. 2007 [75]; USA; Healthy Steps for Young Children	Longitudinal (~3 yr follow- up)	N = 2707 Approximate age: T1: 30 to 33 mo (2.5 to 2.8 yr) Toddlers T2: 5.5 yr School-age	TV time (hr/day, and categories: >2 hr/day, ≤2 hr/day) assessed by parent-report interview (unpublished format).	Attention problems (scale from 0 to 10; higher scores indicate more problems) assessed by parent-report using the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL).	TV time at age ~2.5 yr was not associated with attention problems (<i>unadjusted:</i> $\beta = 0.14$, 95% CI: -0.05, 0.33; <i>adjusted:</i> $\beta = -0.07$, 95% CI: -0.25, 0.12; both p > 0.05) at age ~5.5 yr.	Maternal demographic characteristics (age at child's birth, race, ethnicity, marital status, employment, education), child's gender, parity, household income, child's health status, maternal depressive symptoms, parental involvement in child's activities, intervention status (note: the intervention is designed to enhance the delivery of developmental services for families).

Reference; Country; Larger Study or Cohort Name	Study Design	Sample	Exposure	Outcome	Main Findings	Covariates included in model (if applicable)
Foster and Watkins	Longitudinal	N = 946	TV time (hr/day) at ages 1	Attentional problems	TV time at age ~1 yr was	Gender, age, race,
2010 [87]; USA	(~6 yr follow-		and 3 yr assessed by	(categories: no attentional	not associated with	gestational age of child,
	up)	Approximate age:	parent-report interview	problems, score <120;	attentional problems at	alcohol and tobacco
National		T1, 1 yr	(unpublished format).	attentional problems,	age ~7 yr (OR = 1.06, SE	consumption during
Longitudinal		T2, 3 yr		score ≥ 120) assessed by	= 0.05, p > 0.05;	pregnancy, number of
Survey of Youth		Toddlers		parent-report using the	compared to 0 hr/day: 0-1	children in the household,
(NLSY79)				hyperactivity subscale of	hr/day, OR= 0.80, SE =	presence of two parents,
		T3, 7 yr		the Behavior Problems	0.50; 1-2 hr/day,	cognitive stimulation and
NOTE: This study		School-age		Index (BPI).	OR=1.25, SE = 0.52; 2-3	emotional support scores,
is a reanalysis of					hr/day, OR=1.04, SE =	mother's age, urbanicity,
data in Christakis					0.44; 3-4 hr/day,	year fixed effects,
et al. 2004 [88].					OR=1.82, SE = 0.82; 4-5	maternal depression,
					hr/day, OR=1.99, SE =	maternal self-esteem,
					1.03; 5-6 hr/day,	mother's Armed Forces
					OR=0.74, SE = 0.60; 6-7	Qualification Test
					hr/day, OR= 1.24, SE =	(AFQT) score, family
					1.18; >7 hr/day, OR=1.58,	poverty status.
					SE = 0.90; all p > 0.05).	
					TV time at age ~3 yr was	
					not associated with	
					attentional problems at	
					age ~7 yr (OR = 1.05, SE	
					= 0.05, p > 0.05;	
					compared to 0-1 hr/day:	
					1-2 hr/day, OR=0.39, SE	
					= 0.25; 2-3 hr/day,	
					OR=0.77, SE = 0.43; 3-4	
					hr/day, OR=0.82, SE =	
					0.46; 4-5 hr/day,	
					OR=0.49, SE = 0.30; 5-6	
					hr/day, OR=0.83, SE =	
					0.57; 6-7 hr/day,	
					OR=3.29, SE = 2.53; >7	
					hr/day, OR=1.41, SE =	

Reference; Country; Larger Study or Cohort Name	Study Design	Sample	Exposure	Outcome	Main Findings	Covariates included in model (if applicable)
					0.92; all p > 0.05).	
Pagani et al. 2013 [69]; Canada Quebec Longitudinal Study of Child Development (QLSCD)	Longitudinal (~3 yr follow- up)	N = 1999 Approximate Age: T1, 29 mo (~2.4 yr) Toddlers T2, 65 mo (~5.4 yr) School-age	TV time (hr/day) at age 29 mo assessed by parent- report questionnaire (unpublished).	Receptive vocabulary(SD; higher scores arebetter) assessed by trainedresearch assistants usingthe Peabody PictureVocabulary Test (PPVT)score (French adaptation).Number knowledge(units) assessed from theNumber Knowledge Test(NKT) (abridged version).Classroom engagement(scores ranging from 1 to5; higher scores are better)	TV time at age ~29 mo was unfavourably associated with receptive vocabulary (B = -0.22, 95% CI: -0.291, -0.149, p < 0.000) number knowledge (B = -0.029, 95% CI: -0.043, -0.015, p < 0.000), and classroom engagement (B = -0.002, 95% CI: -0.004, -0.000, p = 0.015) at age ~65 mo.	Receptive vocabulary: Not reported. Number knowledge: Maternal education, early stimulation of literacy, early childhood temperament, family functioning.
Description of all 2010	Lengitudinal	N 1214	TV times (hu/much) at any	assessed by teacher-report questionnaire [89].	TV time of any 20 months	TV dimension TV
Pagani et al. 2010 [9]; Canada	Longitudinal (~8 yr follow-	N = 1314	TV time (hr/week) at age 29 mo assessed by parent-	Cognitive ability (no units; higher scores are	TV time at age 29 months was unfavourably	TV time: Change in TV time, concurrent TV time,
QLSCD	up)	Approximate age: T1, 29 mo (~2.4 yr) Toddlers	report questionnaire (unpublished).	better) assessed using the Imitation Sorting Task.	associated with classroom engagement in Grade 4 (β = -0.07, SE = 0.003; B = -	sex, temperament, cognitive ability, impulsivity, emotional
		T2, 53 mo (~4.4 yr) Pre-schoolers T3, Grade 4 (in Grade 4 in Quebec, children are aged 9 to 10; School-age)	Change in TV time (hr/week) from age 29 mo to 53 mo.	Classroom engagement assessed by teacher-report using a Classroom Engagement Scale (11 items representing task orientation, compliance, and persistence, rated on a 3-point Likert scale with higher values indicating a higher degree of the	0.01, 95% CI: -0.02, - 0.004; $p \le 0.05$). TV time at age 29 mo was unfavourably associated with mathematical success in Grade 4 (age ~9-10 yr) (standardized regression: $\beta = -0.06$, SE = 0.01, $p \le 0.05$) or not	distress, physical aggression, <i>hours of sleep</i> , maternal education, family makeup, family functioning. Change in TV time: Same as above, except inclusion of "baseline TV time" instead of "change

Reference; Country; Larger Study or Cohort Name	Study Design	Sample	Exposure	Outcome	Main Findings	Covariates included in model (if applicable)
				factor). Mathematical success rated as relative to the distribution in the class (scale ranging from -2 to 2, with -2 being "bottom of the class").	(unstandardized regression: B = -0.01, 95% CI: -0.03, 0.01, p>0.05). The change in TV time from age 29 mo to 53 mo was not associated with classroom engagement in Grade 4 (age ~9-10 yr; β = 0.03, SE = 0.002, p > 0.05). The change in TV time from age 29 mo to 53 mo was not associated with mathematical success in Grade 4 (age ~9-10 yr; β = 0.04, SE = 0.004, p > 0.05).	in TV time".
Schmidt et al. 2009 [6]; USA Project Viva	Longitudinal (~2.5 yr follow-up)	N = 872 Approximate age: T1, 6 mo (~0.5 yr) to 2 yr Toddlers to Pre- schoolers T2, 3 yr Pre-schoolers	TV time (hr/day) assessed by parent-report questionnaire [adapted from questionnaire used in the National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth study (NLSY)] at ages 6 mo, 1 yr and 2 yr, and as the weighted average of TV exposure from birth and 2 yr.	Receptive vocabulary (units not indicated; higher scores are better) assessed by trained research assistants using the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test III score (PPVT-III).	Receptive vocabulary scores at age 3 differed by TV time from birth to 2 yr of age (mean PPVT-III score by TV time: 0 to 0.5 hr/day, mean = 106.2, SD = 14.1; 0.5 to < 1 hr/day, mean = 103.1, SD = 14.1; 1 to <2 hr/day, mean = 105.7, SD = 14.0; \geq 2 hr/day, mean = 102.6, SD = 14.4; p = 0.03; post hoc tests not performed to identify specific	TV time from age birth to 2 yr: Age, gender, maternal age, education, marital status, parity, household income, child birth weight for gestational age z score, breastfeeding duration, race/ethnicity, English language, <i>average daily</i> <i>sleep duration from 6 mo</i> <i>to 2 yr</i> . TV time at ages 6 mo, 1

Reference; Country; Larger Study or Cohort Name	Study Design	Sample	Exposure	Outcome	Main Findings	Covariates included in model (if applicable)
Zimmerman and Christakis 2005 [90]; USA National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1979 Children and Young Adults (NLSY-Child)	Longitudinal (~4 yr follow- up)	N = 1797 Age at baseline: "younger than 3 yr" (Toddlers) and "age 3 to 5 yr" (Pre- schoolers)	TV time (hr/day) assessed by parent-report questionnaire (unpublished) before age 3 yr and between ages 3 to 5 yr. Children were divided into TV time categories according to their viewing histories at baseline and follow-up: (1) "low-low TV": <3 hr/day before age 3 yr and at age 3-5 yr; (2) "low-high TV": <3 hr/day before age 3 yr and > 3hr/day at age 3-5 yr;	Mathematics, reading recognition, and reading comprehension Performance (all age- standardized scores with no units) measured by the Peabody Individual Achievement Test (PIAT). Short-term memory (age-standardized score; no units) measured by the Memory for Digit Span assessment from the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC).	differences). TV time from birth to 2 yr was not associated with receptive vocabulary at age 3 yr (B = 0.58, 95% CI: -0.45, 1.61). TV time at 6 mo, 1 yr and 2 yr of age was not associated with receptive vocabulary at age 3 yr (6 mo: B = 0.43, 95% CI: - 0.32, 1.18; 1 yr: B = 0.24, 95% CI: -0.37, 0.85; 2yr: B = 0.59, 95% CI: -0.28, 1.46). TV time at <3 yr (B = - 0.17, 95% CI: -0.50, 0.16) and 3-5 yr (B = -0.01, 95% CI: -0.41, 0.39) was not associated with Mathematics at age 6 yr. Compared to high-high TV (reference group), Mathematics at age 6 yr was more favourable in the low-high TV (B = 2.74, 95% CI: 0.89, 4.60) and low-low TV (B = 2.03, 95% CI: 0.24, 3.83) groups, but was not different in the high-low TV group (B = 1.99, 95%	yr and 2 yr: Maternal age, education, marital status, parity, household income, child birth weight for gestational age z score, breastfeeding duration, race/ethnicity, English language, <i>average daily</i> <i>sleep duration</i> . TV time at age 6 yr; parental cognitive stimulation at ages 0 to 3 yr, 3 to 5 yr and at 6 yr; non-English native language; race/ethnicity; mother's education and intelligent quotient (IQ).

Reference; Country; Larger Study or Cohort Name	Study Design	Sample	Exposure	Outcome	Main Findings	Covariates included in model (if applicable)
			(3) " high-low TV ": >3		CI: -0.97, 4.96).	
			hr/day before age <3 yr		Mathematics in the low-	
			and <3hr/day at age 3-5		low TV and low-high TV	
			yr;		groups were not different	
			(4) "high-high TV":		from each other.	
			>3hr/day at age <3 yr and			
			at age 3-5 yr.		TV time at <3 yr was	
					unfavourably associated	
					with reading recognition	
					at age 6 yr ($B = -0.31$,	
					95% CI: -0.61, -0.01).	
					TV time at 3-5 yr was	
					favourably associated with	
					reading recognition at	
					age 6 yr ($B = 0.51, 95\%$	
					CI: 0.17, 0.85).	
					Compared to high-high	
					TV (reference group),	
					reading recognition at	
					age 6 yr was more	
					favourable in the low-high	
					TV (B = 1.85, 95% CI:	
					0.15, 3.55), but not the	
					low-low TV ($B = 0.01$,	
					95% CI: -1.74, 1.75) or	
					high-low TV groups (B =	
					-0.91, 95% CI: -3.56,	
					1.74).	
					TV time at <3 yr was	
					unfavourably associated	
					with reading	
					comprehension at age 6	
					yr (B = -0.58, 95% CI: -	

Reference; Country; Larger Study or Cohort Name	Study Design	Sample	Exposure	Outcome	Main Findings	Covariates included in model (if applicable)
					0.94, -0.21), but TV time	
					at ages 3-5 yr was not (B	
					= 0.28, 95% CI: -0.12,	
					0.68).	
					Compared to high-high	
					TV (reference group),	
					reading comprehension	
					at age 6 yr was more	
					favourable in the low-high	
					TV (B = 3.92, 95% CI:	
					1.89, 5.95) and low-low	
					TV (B = 2.32, 95% CI:	
					0.43, 4.22) but not the	
					high-low TV (B = 1.66,	
					95% CI: -1.82, 5.13)	
					groups.	
					TV time at <3 yr was not	
					associated with short-	
					term memory at age 7 yr	
					(B = -0.10, 95% CI: -0.20,	
					0). TV time at ages 3-5	
					yr was not associated with	
					short-term memory at	
					age 7 yr (B = 0.09, 95%	
					CI: -0.04, 0.22).	
					Compared to high-high	
					TV (reference group),	
					short-term memory at	
					age 7 yr was more	
					favourable in the low-low	
					TV group (B = 0.59, 95%	
					CI: 0.03, 1.15), but not the	

Reference; Country; Larger Study or Cohort Name	Study Design	Sample	Exposure	Outcome	Main Findings	Covariates included in model (if applicable)
Christakis et al. 2004 [88]; USA	Longitudinal (~6 yr follow-	N = 1345	TV time (hr/day) assessed by parent-report	Attentional problems ("present" if score ≥1.2	low-high TV (B = 0.52, 95% CI: -0.07, 1.12) or high-low TV (B = 0.30, 95% CI: -0.67, 1.27) groups. TV time at age ~1 yr was unfavourably associated with ottentional	Gender; race/ethnicity; child age at index
NLSY-Child (1986-2000)	up)	Mean age: T1, 1.8 yr Toddlers T2, 3.8 yr Pre-schoolers T3, ~7 yr School-age	questionnaire (unpublished).	SDs above the mean age- specific standardized score) assessed using the hyperactivity subscale of the Behavioral Problems Index (BPI).	with attentional problems at age ~7 yr (OR = 1.09, 95% CI: 1.03, 1.15). A 1 SD increase in TV hr/day at age ~1 yr was associated with a 28% increase in the probability of attentional problems at age ~7 yr. TV time at age ~3 yr was unfavourably associated with attentional problems at age ~7 yr (OR = 1.09, 95% CI: 1.02, 1.16).	interview; gestational age at birth; factors at or near ages 1 and 3: measures of cognitive stimulation and emotional support in the home environment, number of children in the household, presence of 2 parents in the household ; maternal factors: use of alcohol or tobacco during pregnancy, self-esteem as of 1987, age at index, 1 education at index; and calendar year at index.
Blankson et al. 2015 [91]; USA	Longitudinal (~0.5 and 1.5 yr follow-up)	N = 228 Approximate Ages: T1, 3.5 yr T2, 4 yr Pre-schoolers T3, 5 yr School-age	TV time (hr/week) at ages ~3.5 and ~4 yr assessed by parent-report questionnaire ["Watching Television, Reading, and Computers at Home measure" (TVRC); adapted from items by [92].	Vocabulary (scores ranging from 0 to 204; higher scores are better) assessed by trained examiner using the PPVT- III. Cognitive inhibitory control (scores ranging from 0-16; higher scores	In unadjusted analyses, TV time at age ~3.5 was unfavourably associated with vocabulary ($r = -$ 0.28, p < 0.01), working memory capacity ($r = -$ 0.18, p<0.01), and executive function ($r = -$ 0.19, p < 0.01), but not with cognitive inhibitory	Socioeconomic status (SES), non-European American, home learning environment, parental scaffolding.

Reference; Country; Larger Study or Cohort Name	Study Design	Sample	Exposure	Outcome	Main Findings	Covariates included in model (if applicable)
				indicate stronger	control (<i>r</i> = -0.12, p >	
				inhibitory control)	0.05) at age ~5 yr.	
				assessed using the Animal		
				Stroop Task.	In unadjusted analyses,	
					TV time at age ~4 yr was	
				Working Memory	unfavourably associated	
				Capacity (no units	with vocabulary $(r = -$	
				indicated; higher scores	0.20, p < 0.01) and	
				are better) assessed using	executive function (<i>r</i> = -	
				the Animal Stroop Task	0.13, p < 0.05), but not	
				(STROOP) and the	with its components,	
				Kaufman Assessment	cognitive inhibitory	
				Battery for Children (K-	control (<i>r</i> = -0.11, p >	
				ABC; [93]) number recall	0.05) and working	
				test.	memory capacity $(r = -$	
					0.10, p > 0.05) at age ~5	
				Executive function	yr.	
				(standardized scores from		
				two sub-tests; higher	After adjusting for	
				scores are better) assessed	covariates, TV time at age	
				as a composite of	~3.5 yr was not associated	
				cognitive inhibitory	with vocabulary ($\beta = -$	
				control and working	0.13; B = -0.25, SE =	
				memory capacity.	0.13), cognitive	
					inhibitory control (β = -	
					0.08; B = -0.04, SE =	
					0.04), working memory	
					capacity (β = -0.11; B = -	
					0.03, SE = 0.02), or	
					executive function ($\beta = -$	
					0.12; B = -0.03, SE =	
					0.02) (all p > 0.05).	
					After adjusting for	
					covariates, TV time at age	

Reference; Country; Larger Study or Cohort Name	Study Design	Sample	Exposure	Outcome	Main Findings	Covariates included in model (if applicable)
Study Design:					~4 yr was not associated with vocabulary (β = - 0.03; B = -0.06, SE = 0.12), cognitive inhibitory control (β = - 0.07; B = -0.03, SE = 0.04), working memory capacity (β = -0.01; B = - 0.004, SE = 0.02), or executive function (β = - 0.01; B = -0.05, SE = 0.01) (all p > 0.05).	
Case-Control Chonchaiya et al. 2008 [94]; Thailand	Case-Control	N = 166; Cases, n = 56; Controls, n = 110 Age range: 15-48 mo Mean age: Cases, 2.11 yr Controls, 2.23 yr Toddlers	TV time (hr/day) assessed by parent-report interview (interview protocol unpublished).	Delayed language development (cases) and normal language development (controls). Delayed language development determined by medical diagnosis, and developmental assessment using Denver-II test by trained developmental pediatricians. Language developmental level (years) was determined by the age at 75 th percentile of language development milestones, which the child could attain in Denver-II.	Children with language delay (cases) had significantly greater TV time than those normal language development (mean TV time: cases, 3.05 hr/day, SD = 1.90; controls, 1.85 hr/day, SD = 1.18; mean difference between groups = 1.2 hr/day, 95% CI: 0.726, 1.6737; t = 5.0016; df =1 64; SE of difference = 0.240). Compared with $\leq 2 \text{ hr/day}$ TV time, children with >2 hr/day TV time had increased odds of language delay (OR = 3.94, 95% CI: 2.00, 7.76, p < 0.001).	N/A

Reference; Country; Larger Study or Cohort Name	Study Design	Sample	Exposure	Outcome	Main Findings	Covariates included in model (if applicable)
Study Design:						
Cross-sectional Zimmerman et al. 2007 [95]; USA	Cross- sectional	N = 729; Infants, n = 384; Toddlers, n = 345 Age range: Infants, 8-16 mo (~0.7 to 1.3 yr) Toddlers, 17-24 mo (~1.4 to 2 yr)	Reading (≥ once per day, <once and<br="" day)="" per="">storytelling (≥ once per day, <once day)<br="" per="">assessed by parent-report interview (interview protocol unpublished).</once></once>	Language development (percentile norms) assessed by the short-form Communicative Development Inventory (CDI).	Reading with parents at least once per day, compared with less than once per day, was associated with more favourable language development scores in infants (B = 7.07, 95% CI: 0.53, 13.60, p < 0.05) and toddlers (B = 11.72, 95% CI: 1.86, 21.59, p < 0.05). Storytelling with parents at least once per day, compared with less than once per day, was associated with more favourable language development scores in infants (B = 6.47, 95% CI: 0.23, 12.71, p < 0.05), but was not associated with language development scores in toddlers (B = 7.13, 95% CI: -0.11, 14.37, p < 0.10).	Sex, age, number of siblings, premature birth, premature birth by age interaction, hours per week in daycare, whether both parents are present, maternal and paternal education, parental income, child race/ethnicity, state of birth (Minnesota or Washington).
Ferguson and	Cross-	N = 750	Total media exposure	Receptive language	No media exposure was	No media exposure: Age,
Donnellan 2014 [96]; USA	sectional	6 to 16 mo, n = 392 17 to 27 mo, n = 358	(min/day, and categories: no exposure, any exposure; baby DVDs or	development (understanding words; scale from 0 to 89 for	unfavourably associated with receptive language development ($r = -0.22$, p	gender. Reading and storytelling:
<i>NOTE:</i> This study used the same data set as Zimmerman		Approximate age: 6 to 16 mo (0.5 to 1.3 yr)	movies, adult TV, children's educational TV, children's educational	those aged 6 to 16 mo, and 0 to 100 for those aged 17 to 27 mo), expressive	$< 0.01; \beta = -0.13, p =$ 0.001) and expressive language development (<i>r</i>	age, gender, listening to music with parents, income, maternal

Reference; Country; Larger Study or Cohort Name	Study Design	Sample	Exposure	Outcome	Main Findings	Covariates included in model (if applicable)
et al. 2007 [95].		Infants to Toddlers 17 to 27 mo (1.4 to 2.3 yr) Toddlers	DVDs or videos, children's noneducational TV, and children's DVDs or videos of movies) assessed by parent-report questionnaire (unpublished). Reading and storytelling with parents (categories: never, once a month, a few times a month, once a week, a few times a week, once a day, more than once a day) assessed by parent-report interview (interview protocol unpublished).	language development (using words; scale from 0 to 100), and total language development (receptive and expressive language development; higher scores indicate greater language development) assessed using the Communicative Development Inventory (CDI).	= -0.19, p < 0.01; β = - 0.12, p = 0.007) in children aged 6 to 16 mo, but was not associated with total language development (r = -0.08, p > 0.05; β = -0.03, p > 0.05) in children aged 17 to 27 mo. Reading with parents was favourably associated with receptive language development (β = 0.11, p < 0.01) but not expressive language development (β = 0.05, p > 0.05) at age 6 to 16 mo, or total language development at age 17 to 27 mo (β = 0.08, p > 0.05). Storytelling with parents was favourably associated with receptive language development (β = 0.12, p < 0.01) but not expressive language development (β = 0.03, p > 0.05) at age 6 to 16 mo, and was favourably associated with total language development (β = 0.12, p < 0.01) but not expressive language development (β = 0.03, p > 0.05) at age 6 to 16 mo, and was favourably associated with total language development at age 17 to 27 mo (β = 0.18, p < 0.01).	education, baby DVDs/video, adult TV, child educational TV, race (Caucasian vs ethnic minority).

Reference; Country; Larger Study or Cohort Name	Study Design	Sample	Exposure	Outcome	Main Findings	Covariates included in model (if applicable)
Byeon and Hong 2015 [97]; Korea Panel Study on Korean Children (2010)	Cross- sectional	N = 1778 Age range: 24 to 30 mo (~2 to 2.5 yr) Toddlers	TV time (hr/day) assessed by parent-report questionnaire (unpublished).	Language development (categorized as "normal" or "delayed") assessed by the Korean-Ages and Stages Questionnaire (K- ASQ). "Delayed" language development was defined as a score <2 SD below the mean on the communication domain of the K-ASQ.	There was a dose-response relationship; the risk of delayed language development increased proportionately with the increase in toddlers' TV watching time (all compared to <1hr/day; 1-2 hr/day: RR = 1.43, 95% CI: 0.59, 3.45, p > 0.05; 2- 3 hr/day: RR = 2.74, 95% CI: 1.13, 6.65, p < 0.05; >3 hr/day: RR = 3.03, 95% CI: 1.12, 8.21, p < 0.05; p-value for trend, p=0004).	Environmental factors (main fosterer, household income, size of home city), maternal factors (level of education, economic activities, level of satisfaction with marriage, communication pattern with children), paternal factors (level of education, occupation, communication pattern with children), child factors (gender, sociability, hospitalization experience within the past year due to disease or accident).
Lin et al. 2015 [71]; Taiwan	Cross- sectional	N = 150; TV exposure, n = 75; Control, n = 75 Mean age: 24.8 mo (~2.1 yr) Toddlers	TV time (min/day) assessed by parent-report interview. Children were divided into categories based on their average TV time: frequently exposed (>0 hr/day TV for children <2 yr, and >2 hr/day TV for children ≥2 yr), or infrequently exposed (no TV for children <2 yr, and ≤2 hr/day for children ≥2 yr).	Overall cognitive development and language development [categorized as "typical" (score ≥ 85) or "delayed" (score <85)] assessed using Bayley Scales of Infant Development- second edition (BSID-II).	Children with delayed overall cognitive development spent more time watching TV compared to children with typical overall cognitive development (129.3 vs 60.7 min/day; t = 3.1, p < 0.01). Children who were frequently exposed to TV were more likely to have delayed cognitive development than those who were infrequently exposed (OR = 3.9, 95%	Analyses were multivariate, but covariates were not specified.

Reference; Country; Larger Study or Cohort Name	Study Design	Sample	Exposure	Outcome	Main Findings	Covariates included in model (if applicable)
					CI: 1.4, 5.9).	
					% of sample with typical	
					and delayed cognitive	
					development in those	
					frequently vs	
					infrequently exposed	
					respectively: typical (66.7	
					vs 86.7%), delayed (33.3	
					vs 13.3%) ($X^2 = 8.4, p <$	
					0.01).	
					Children with delayed	
					language development	
					spent more time watching	
					TV than children with	
					typical language	
					development (117.3 vs	
					53.2 min/day; t = 3.8,	
					p<0.001).	
					Children who were	
					frequently exposed to TV	
					were more likely to have	
					delayed language	
					development than those	
					who were infrequently	
					exposed (OR = 3.3, 95%	
					CI: 1.5, 7.3).	
					% of sample with typical	
					and delayed language	
					development in those	
					frequently vs	
					infrequently exposed	
					respectively: typical (50.7	
					vs 76.0%), delayed (49.3	

Reference; Country; Larger Study or Cohort Name	Study Design	Sample	Exposure	Outcome	Main Findings	Covariates included in model (if applicable)
					vs 24.0%) (<i>X</i> ² = 10.4, p < 0.01).	
Pagani et al. 2010 [9]; Canada QLSCD	Cross- sectional	N = 1314 Approximate age: 29 mo (~2.4 yr) Toddlers	TV time (hr/week) assessed by parent-report questionnaire (unpublished).	Cognitive ability (no units; higher scores are better) assessed using the Imitation Sorting Task.	TV time at age 29 mo was not associated with cognitive ability at age 29 mo (β = -0.02, SE = 0.2, p > 0.05).	N/A
Cheng et al. 2010 [72]; Japan Japan Children's Study	Cross- sectional	N = 302 Approximate age: 30 mo (~2.5 yr) Toddlers	TV time (hr/day) assessed by parent-report questionnaire (unpublished).	Hyperactivity- inattention (measured on a scale from 0 to 10; higher numbers are unfavourable) assessed by parent-report using the SDQ.	There was an unfavourable dose- response relationship between TV time at age and hyperactivity- inattention in <i>unadjusted</i> but not <i>adjusted</i> analyses (scores by TV time categories: <i>unadjusted</i> , <1hr/day, 3.31; 95% CI: 2.6, 4.1; \geq 1 to <3 hr/day, 3.99, 95% CI: 3.7, 4.3; \geq 3 to <4 hr/day, 4.28, 95% CI: 3.8, 4.8; \geq 4 hr/day, 4.53, 95% CI: 4.1, 4.9; p- value for group mean differences, p = 0.031; p- value for linear trend for means, p = 0.004; <i>adjusted</i> , <1hr/day, 3.64; 95% CI: 2.8, 4.4; \geq 1 to <3 hr/day, 3.94, 95% CI: 3.6, 4.3; \geq 3 to <4 hr/day, 4.18, 95% CI: 3.5, 4.7; \geq 4 hr/day, 4.48, 95% CI: 4.0, 5.0; p-value for group	Child sex, birth weight, gestational age, birth order, maternal education and family income and maternal stimulation.

Reference; Country; Larger Study or Cohort Name	Study Design	Sample	Exposure	Outcome	Main Findings	Covariates included in model (if applicable)
					mean differences, p = 0.224; p-value for linear trend for means, p = 0.071).	
Duch et al. 2013 [98]; USA	Cross- sectional	N = 119 Mean age: 21.09 mo (~1.8 yr) Toddlers	Screen time (hr/day; TV, cellphones, DVDs, computers) assessed by parent-report 24-hour recall questionnaire (unpublished).	Communication development (scores range from 25 to 60; scores >36.5 indicate typical development) assessed by the Ages and Stages Questionnaire: A Parent-Completed Child Monitoring System, Third Edition (ASQ3).	>2 hr/day screen time was unfavourably associated with communication development (unadjusted: $\beta = -1.71$, p = 0.03; adjusted: $\beta = -1.65$, p = 0.04).	Child's gender, parent education.
Zimmerman et al. 2009 [99]; USA The Language Environment Analysis (LENA) Natural Language Study	Cross- sectional	N = 275 Mean age: 21.2 mo (~1.8 yr) Toddlers	TV time (hr/day) measured objectively using LENA (a vest-worn voice recorder that can differentiate foreground TV, adult voices and child voices; worn for 12 hr/day, 1 day/mo, for 6 mo).	Language capacity (units not indicated) assessed by a speech language pathologist using the PLS- 4.	TV time was not associated with language capacity (B = -1.4, 95% CI: -3.97, 1.14, p>0.05).	Child's age, gender, race/ethnicity, mother's and father's education, household income, and number of LENA recording sessions, adult word count, adult-child conversational turns.
Ruangdaraganon et al. 2009 [100]; Thailand Prospective Cohort Study of Thai Children	Cross- sectional	N = 203 Approximate age: 2 yr Toddlers	TV time (hr/day) assessed by parent-report questionnaire (unpublished).	Language development [categorized as "pass" or "delayed" (if the child failed all items)] assessed using a modified (translated to Thai language) Clinical Linguistic Auditory Milestone Scale (CLAMS).	TV time was not associated with delayed language development (compared to <2 hr/day, \geq 2 hr/day OR = 0.5, 95% CI: 0.2, 1.6, p > 0.05).	Gender, maternal education, monthly family income, number of children in family, number of televisions in households, television in child's bedroom.

Reference; Country; Larger Study or Cohort Name	Study Design	Sample	Exposure	Outcome	Main Findings	Covariates included in model (if applicable)
Rajchanovska and	Cross-	N = 1607	Computer use (yes, no)	Speech disorders	The prevalence of speech	N/A
Ivanovska 2015	sectional		and mobile phone use	(categories: yes, no)	disorders was not	
[101]; Macedonia		Age range: 3 to 5 yr	(yes, no) assessed by	assessed via	different between those	
		Toddlers to Pre-	parent-report	questionnaires for	who used a computer and	
		schoolers	questionnaire (unclear	children's behaviour	those who did not [used a	
			what questionnaire).	(Chuturik test and Child	computer: speech	
				Behavior Checklist by	disorders, $n = 239$	
				Achenbach), conversation	(35.41%), no speech	
				with parents, and clinical	disorders, $n = 436$	
				examination.	(64.59%); did not use a	
					computer: speech	
					disorders, $n = 366$	
					(39.27%), no speech	
					disorders, $n = 566$	
					(60.73%), p = 0.11].	
					The prevalence of speech	
					disorders was greater in	
					those who used a mobile	
					phone compared to those	
					who did not [used a	
					mobile phone: speech	
					disorders, $n = 291$	
					(42.05%), no speech	
					disorders, $n = 401$	
					(57.95%); did not use a	
					mobile phone: speech	
					disorders, $n = 314$	
					(34.32%), no speech	
					disorders, $n = 601$	
					(65.68%), p = 0.001].	
					Computer use was not	
					associated with speech	
					disorders (compared with	

Reference; Country; Larger Study or Cohort Name	Study Design	Sample	Exposure	Outcome	Main Findings	Covariates included in model (if applicable)
McKean et al. 2015 [86]; Australia Early Language in Victoria Study (ELVS)	Cross- sectional	N = 763 Approximate age: 4 yr Pre-schoolers	TV time (hr/day) assessed by parent-report questionnaire (unpublished).	Language development (SD) assessed by the Australian adaptation of the Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals- Preschool, Second Edition (CELF-P2).	no computer use: $OR =$ 0.848, 95% CI: 0.690, 1.041, p = 0.115). Mobile phone use was unfavourably associated speech disorders (compared with no mobile phone use: $OR = 1.389$, 95% CI: 1.133, 1.702, p = 0.002). TV time at age 4 yr was not associated with language development scores at age 4 yr; compared to the lowest Quartile (Q1; <2.71 hr/day): Q2 (>2.71 to < 3 hr/day): Coefficient = -0.08, 95% CI: -0.22, 0.06 Q3 (>3 to <3.71 hr/day): Coefficient = -0.09, 95% CI: -0.26, 0.06 Q4 (>3.71 hr/day): Coefficient = -0.11, 95% CI: -0.29, 0.07	Gender, birth weight, non- verbal IQ, family history, developmental disorder, shy/approach-withdrawal, language background, social disadvantage index, low income, maternal age, birth position, maternal education, family literacy, conduct score, peer score, pro-social score, emotional score, hyperactivity/inattention, speech development, frequency of reading to child, number of children's books in the home.
Irwin et al. 2015 [84]; Canada Learning Environments' Activity Potential for Preschoolers	Cross- sectional	N = 216 Age range: 2.5-5 yr Pre-schoolers	Total sedentary time (min/day; collected during the preschool day only; <50 counts/15 sec epoch) measured by accelerometer (Actical).	Attention span (units not indicated) assessed by parent-report using the Child Temperament Questionnaire (CTQ).	Total sedentary time was not associated with attention span ($r = -0.14$, 95% CI: -0.27, 0.00).	N/A

Reference; Country; Larger Study or Cohort Name	Study Design	Sample	Exposure	Outcome	Main Findings	Covariates included in model (if applicable)
(LEAPP) study						
Linebarger et al. 2014 [102]; USA	Cross- sectional	N = 788 Mean age: 47.22 mo (~3.9 yr) Pre-schoolers	Reading time (hr/day; time that the child read or was read to) assessed by 24-hour parent-report time diary (School Readiness Survey of the National Household Education Surveys Program, 2007).	Executive function (T-scores; higher scores indicate poorer executive function) assessed using the Behavior Assessment System for Children (BASC-2; parent-report).	Reading time was not associated with executive function (values not provided).	Birth order, in-home care, center care, language, cumulative risk status (high or low based on these factors: child minority, maternal age at birth, single parent, maternal education, income-to-needs, more than 3 siblings), parenting style, background TV and music, foreground educational and non- educational TV.
Linebarger 2015 [103]; USA	Cross- sectional	N = 788 Mean age: 47.22 mo (~3.9 yr) Pre-schoolers	Time playing video games (hr/day) assessed by parent-report 24-hour recall diary (adapted from the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID) format).	Hyperactivity (<i>T</i> scores; higher scores are unfavourable) and attention problems (<i>T</i> scores; higher scores are unfavourable) assessed by parent-report using the Behaviour Assessment System for Children (BASC-2).	Time playing video games was not associated with hyperactivity ($\beta =$ 0.06, CI: -0.09, 0.60; B = 1.38; p <0.10) or attention problems ($\beta =$ - 0.03, 95% CI: -5.06, 0.31; B = -0.62; p > 0.10).	Birth order, child grade, literacy, demographic risk, responsive parenting, inconsistent parenting.
Miller et al. 2007 [104]; USA	Cross- sectional	N = 170 Mean age: 4.31 yr Pre-schoolers	TV time (hr/day) assessed by parent-report questionnaire in a semi- structured interview (method published by Christakis et al. 2004 [88]).	Parent- and teacher- reported attention- deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) symptoms (over the last 6 months; scale from 0 to 50; lower scores indicate fewer ADHD symptoms)	TV time was unfavourably associated with teacher-reported $(\beta=0.235, p = 0.002)$ but not parent-reported $(\beta=0.146, p = 0.06)$ ADHD symptoms.	Sex, age, SES.

Reference; Country; Larger Study or Cohort Name	Study Design	Sample	Exposure	Outcome	Main Findings	Covariates included in model (if applicable)
				measured by checklists		
				based on the Diagnostic		
				and Statistical Manual		
				of Mental Disorders-4		
				(DSM-IV).		
Nathanson and	Cross-	N = 107	TV time (min/day)	Executive function (no	TV time was	Child's age, household
Fries 2014 [105];	sectional		assessed by parent-report	units; standardized	unfavourably associated	income, parent education.
USA		Mean age: 53.37 mo	questionnaire	composite score) assessed	with executive function	
		(~4.4 yr)	(unpublished).	by four tasks (grass/snow,	(partial <i>r</i> = -0.26, p <	
		Pre-schoolers		whisper, backward digit	0.01).	
				span, tower) taken from		
				[106].		

ADHD, attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder; ASQ3, Ages and Stages Questionnaire: A Parent-Completed Child Monitoring System, third edition; B, unstandardized beta; β, standardized beta; BASC-2, Behavior Assessment System for Children, second edition; BELLE, Bellevue Project for Early Language, Literacy, and Education Success; BPI, Behavioral Problems Index; BSID-II and BSID-III, Bayley Scales of Infant Development-second and third edition; CDI, Communicative Development Inventory; CELF-4, Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals, fourth edition; CELF-P2, Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals. Preschool, second edition; CI, confidence interval; CLAMS, Clinical Linguistic Auditory Milestone Scale; CTQ, Child Temperament Questionnaire; DSM-IV, Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders-4; ELVS, Early Language in Victoria Study; IQ, intelligent quotient; K-ABC, Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children; K-ASQ, Korean-Ages and Stages Questionnaire; LEAPP, Learning Environments' Activity Potential for Preschoolers study; LENA, Language Environment Analysis; NKT, Number Knowledge Test; NLSY, National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth study; NLSY-Child, National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1979 Children and Youth Adults; OR, odds ratio; PIAT, Peabody Individual Achievement Test; PLS-4, Preschool Language Scale-4; PPVT, Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test; PPVT-III, Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, third edition; Q1-Q4, Quartile 1 to Quartile 4; QLSCD, Quebec Longitudinal Study of Child Development; RR, relative risk; SD, standard deviation; SE, standard error; SES, socioeconomic status; STROOP, Animal Stroop Task; T1-T4, Time 1 to Time 4; TV, television; TVRC, Watching Television, Reading, and Computers at Home measure; WISC, Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children.

Table S5. Summary of findings for bone and skeletal health outcomes

Reference; Country; Larger Study/Cohort Name	Study Design	Sample	Exposure	Outcome	Main Findings	Covariates included in model (if applicable)
Study Design:						•
Cross-sectional						
Herrmann et al.	Cross-	N = 1512	Total sedentary time	Bone stiffness index (no	After adjusting for	Total sedentary time: age,
2015 [107];	sectional		(hr/day; ≤100 cpm, 60 sec	units) measured on the left	moderate-to-vigorous-	sex, country, FFM,
Sweden, Germany,		Mean age: 4.4 yr	epochs) measured by	and right calcaneus using	intensity physical activity	consumption of milk and
Hungary, Italy,		Pre-schoolers	accelerometer (Actigraph	quantitative ultrasound	(MVPA), accelerometer-	dairy products, daylight
Cyprus, Spain,			uniaxial, ActiTrainer or	(Achilles Lunar Insight TM	derived sedentary time	duration, MVPA
Belgium, Estonia			GT1M).	GE Healthcare)	was not significantly	
					associated with bone	Screen time: age, sex,
Identification and			Screen time (hr/week; TV,		stiffness index (β = -0.37;	country, FFM,
prevention of			videos, DVDs, computer,		R^{2} (%) = 19; p = 0.28).	consumption of milk and
dietary- and			game console) assessed by			dairy products, daylight
lifestyle-induced			parent-report questionnaire		There was no association	duration, leisure time PA
health effects in			(unpublished).		between screen time and	
children and infants					bone stiffness index (β = -	
(IDEFICS)					$0.04; R^2 (\%) = 18.4; p =$	
					0.50).	

 β , standardized beta; FFM, fat free mass; IDEFICS, Identification and prevention of dietary- and lifestyle-induced health effects in children and infants; MVPA, moderate-tovigorous-intensity physical activity; PA, physical activity; R², correlation coefficient; TV, television.

Table S6. Summary of findings for cardiometabolic health outcom

Reference; Country; Larger Study/Cohort Name	Study Design	Sample	Exposure	Outcome	Main Findings	Covariates included in model (if applicable)
Crispim et al. 2014	Cross-	N = 276	TV time (hr/day) assessed	Blood pressure	Watching TV for ≥ 2	N/A
[108]; Brazil	sectional		by parent-report	(categorized based on	hr/day was not associated	
		Mean age: 3.1 yr	questionnaire	National High Blood	with high blood pressure	
		Pre-schoolers	(unpublished)	Pressure Education	(compared to <2 hr/day;	
				Program in Pediatrics	PR = 0.9, 95% CI = 0.5,	
				(2004) criteria as	1.4, p = 0.568).	
				"normal": SBP and/or		
				DBP values <90 th		
				percentile; or "high" SBP		
				and/or DBP values $\geq 95^{\text{th}}$		
				percentile) measured using		
				the second of two		
				automatic blood pressure		
				monitor measurements in		
				sitting position (OMRON-		
				HEM 705 CP).		

CI, confidence interval; DBP, diastolic blood pressure; PR, prevalence ratio; SBP, systolic blood pressure; TV, television.

Reference; Country; Larger Study/Cohort Name	Study Design	Sample	Exposure	Outcome	Main Findings	Covariates included in model (if applicable)
Study Design:						
Longitudinal Fitzpatrick et al.	Longitudinal	N = 1314	TV time (hr/day) at age	Lower body explosive	Higher TV time at age	Sex, family income,
2012 [8]; Canada	(6 yr follow-up)	11 - 1511	~29 mo assessed by	strength (cm) assessed	~29 mo was unfavourably	weight for gestational age,
		Approximate	parent-report	via standing long jump.	associated with standing	overeating and <i>weekly</i>
Quebec		age:	questionnaire		long jump performance	participation in physical
Longitudinal Study		T1, 29 mo (~2.4	(unpublished).		at age 97.8 mo (B = -	activity at 29 mo (T1), age
of Child		yr)			0.361; 95% CI: -0.576, -	in mo at T3, and weight
Development		Toddlers	Change in TV time		0.145; p < 0.001).	status at T3.
(QLSCD)			(hr/week) from age ~29			
		T2, 53 mo (~4.4	mo to ~53 mo.		A greater increase in TV	
		yr)			time between age ~29 and	
		Pre-schoolers			~53 mo was unfavourably	
					associated with standing	
		Mean age:			long jump performance	
		T3, 97.8 mo (~8.2 yr)			at age 97.8 months (B = - 0.285; 95% CI: -0.436,-	
		(~8.2 yr) School-age			0.283; 95% C1: -0.430,- 0.134; p < 0.01).	
Pagani et al. 2010	Longitudinal	N = 1314	TV time (hr/week) at age	Physical fitness levels	Higher TV time at age	TV time : Change in TV
[9]; Canada	(8 yr follow-up)	11 - 1514	~29 mo assessed by	[scale ranged from -2	~29 mo was unfavourably	time, concurrent TV time,
[5]; Cunada	(o ji iono up)	Approximate	parent-report	(much less) to 2 (much	associated with physical	sex, temperament,
QLSCD		age:	questionnaire	more) relative to other	fitness in Grade 4 (β = -	cognitive ability,
		T1, 29 mo (~2.4	(unpublished)	children] assessed via	0.09, SE = 0.0004; B = -	impulsivity, emotional
		yr)		parent-report	0.01, 95% CI: -0.002, -	distress, physical
		Toddlers	Change in TV time	questionnaire.	0.02; p < 0.01).	aggression, hours of sleep,
			(hr/week) from age ~29			maternal education, family
		T2, 53 mo (~4.4	mo to ~53 mo.		A greater increase in TV	makeup, family
		yr)			time between ~29 mo and	functioning, BMI
		Pre-schoolers			~53 mo of age was	
					unfavourably associated	Change in TV time:
		T3, Grade 4 (in			with physical fitness in	Same as above, except
		Grade 4 in			the Grade 4 (β = -0.10, SE	inclusion of "baseline TV
		Quebec, children			= 0.0003, p < 0.01).	time" instead of "change
		are aged 9 to 10				in TV time".

yr)		
School-age		

CI, confidence interval; B, unstandardized beta; β, standardized beta; BMI, Body Mass Index; QLSCD, Quebec Longitudinal Study of Child Development; SE, standard error; T1-T4, Time 1 to Time 4; TV, television.

References

- 1 Yilmaz G, Demirli CN, Karacan CD. An intervention to preschool children for reducing screen time: a randomized controlled trial. Child Care Health Dev 2015;41:443-449. 24571538.
- 2 Sijtsma A, Sauer PJ, Stolk RP, et al. Infant movement opportunities are related to early growth--GECKO Drenthe cohort. Early Hum Dev 2013;89:457-461. 23631950.
- 3 Gooze RA, Anderson SE, Whitaker RC. Prolonged bottle use and obesity at 5.5 years of age in US children. J Pediatr 2011;159:431-436. 21543085.
- 4 Kuczmarski RJ, Ogden CL, Grummer-Strawn LM, et al. CDC growth charts: United States. Adv Data 2000;1-27. PM:11183293.
- 5 Griffiths LJ, Hawkins SS, Cole TJ, et al. Risk factors for rapid weight gain in preschool children: Findings from a UK-wide prospective study. Int J Obes (Lond) 2010;34:624-632.
- 6 Schmidt ME, Rich M, Rifas-Shiman SL, et al. Television viewing in infancy and child cognition at 3 years of age in a US cohort. Pediatrics 2009;123:e370e375. 19254972.
- 7 Fuller-Tyszkiewicz M, Skouteris H, Hardy LL, et al. The associations between TV viewing, food intake, and BMI. A prospective analysis of data from the Longitudinal Study of Australian Children. Appetite 2012;59:945-948. 23000277.
- 8 Fitzpatrick C, Pagani LS, Barnett TA. Early childhood television viewing predicts explosive leg strength and waist circumference by middle childhood. Int 2012;9:87. 22793018.
- 9 Pagani LS, Fitzpatrick C, Barnett TA, et al. Prospective associations between early childhood television exposure and academic, psychosocial, and physical well-being by middle childhood. Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med 2010;164:425-431. 20439793.
- 10 Reilly JJ, Armstrong J, Dorosty AR, et al. Early life risk factors for obesity in childhood: cohort study. BMJ 2005;330:1357. 15908441.
- 11 Leary SD, Lawlor DA, Davey SG, et al. Behavioural early-life exposures and body composition at age 15 years. Nutr Diabetes 2015;5:e150. 25664839.
- 12 Flores G, Lin H. Factors predicting overweight in US kindergartners. Am J Clin Nutr 2013;97:1178-1187. 23553169.
- 13 Olafsdottir S, Berg C, Eiben G, et al. Young children's screen activities, sweet drink consumption and anthropometry: results from a prospective European study. Eur J Clin Nutr 2014;68:223-228. 24253759.
- 14 Cole TJ, Bellizzi MC, Flegal KM, et al. Establishing a standard definition for child overweight and obesity worldwide: international survey. BMJ 2000;320:1240. http://www.bmj.com/content/320/7244/1240.abstract.

- 15 Wheaton N, Millar L, Allender S, et al. The stability of weight status through the early to middle childhood years in Australia: a longitudinal study. BMJ Open 2015;5:e006963. 25922101.
- 16 De C, V, De B, I, Verbestel V, et al. Risk factors for childhood overweight: a 30-month longitudinal study of 3- to 6-year-old children. Public Health Nutr 2014;17:1993-2000. 24172063.
- 17 Koleilat M, Harrison GG, Whaley S, et al. Preschool enrollment is associated with lower odds of childhood obesity among WIC participants in LA County. Matern Child Health J 2012;16:706-712. 21431308.
- 18 Kain J, Andrade M. Characteristics of the diet and patterns of physical activity in obese Chilean preschoolers. Nutrition Research 1999;19:203-215.
- 19 Wen LM, Baur LA, Rissel C, et al. Correlates of body mass index and overweight and obesity of children aged 2 years: findings from the healthy beginnings trial. Obesity (Silver Spring) 2014;22:1723-1730. 24415528.
- 20 Li MW, Van der Ploeg HP, Kite J, et al. A Validation Study of Assessing Physical Activity and Sedentary Behavior in Children Aged 3 to 5 Years. Pediatr Exerc Sci 2010;22:408-420. <u>http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=s3h&AN=54565173&site=ehost-live</u>.
- 21 Johansson E, Hagstromer M, Svensson V, et al. Objectively measured physical activity in two-year-old children-Levels, patterns and correlates. [References]. The International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity 2015;12 Jan 2015, ArtID 3.
- 22 Wijtzes AI, Kooijman MN, Kiefte-de Jong JC, et al. Correlates of physical activity in 2-year-old toddlers: the generation R study. J Pediatr 2013;163:791-799. 23523279.
- 23 Williams HG, Pfeiffer KA, O'Neill JR, et al. Motor skill performance and physical activity in preschool children. Obesity (Silver Spring) 2008;16:1421-1426. 18388895.
- 24 Chiasson M. Predictors of obesity in a cohort of children enrolled in WIC as infants and retained to 3 years of age. [References]. Journal of Community Health: The Publication for Health Promotion and Disease Prevention 2016;41:127-133.
- 25 Dennison BA, Erb TA, Jenkins PL. Television viewing and television in bedroom associated with overweight risk among low-income preschool children. Pediatrics 2002;109:1028-1035. 12042539.
- 26 Twarog JP, Politis MD, Woods EL, et al. Daily television viewing time and associated risk of obesity among U.S. preschool aged children: An analysis of NHANES 2009-2012. Obesity Research and Clinical Practice 2015;9:636-638.
- 27 Manios Y, Kourlaba G, Kondaki K, et al. Obesity and television watching in preschoolers in Greece: the GENESIS study. Obesity (Silver Spring) 2009;17:2047-2053. 19282823.
- 28 Asplund KM, Kair LR, Arain YH, et al. Early Childhood Screen Time and Parental Attitudes Toward Child Television Viewing in a Low-Income Latino Population Attending the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children. Child 2015;11:590-599. 26390321.

- 29 Nelson JA, Carpenter K, Chiasson MA. Diet, activity, and overweight among preschool-age children enrolled in the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC). Prev Chronic Dis 2006;3:A49. 16539790.
- 30 LaRowe TL, Adams AK, Jobe JB, et al. Dietary intakes and physical activity among preschool-aged children living in rural American Indian communities before a family-based healthy lifestyle intervention. J Am Diet Assoc 2010;110:1049-1057. 20630162.
- 31 Fulton JE, Wang X, Yore MM, et al. Television viewing, computer use, and BMI among U.S. children and adolescents. J Phys Act Health 2009;6 Suppl 1:S28-S35. 19998847.
- 32 Chen LP, Ziegenfuss JY, Jenkins SM, et al. Pediatric obesity and self-reported health behavior information. Clin Pediatr (Phila) 2011;50:872-875. 21357199.
- 33 Kourlaba G, Kondaki K, Liarigkovinos T, et al. Factors associated with television viewing time in toddlers and preschoolers in Greece: the GENESIS study. J Public Health (Oxf) 2009;31:222-230. 19224946.
- 34 Burdette HL, Whitaker RC. A national study of neighborhood safety, outdoor play, television viewing, and obesity in preschool children. Pediatrics 2005;116:657-662. 16140705.
- 35 Dolinsky DH, Brouwer RJ, Evenson KR, et al. Correlates of sedentary time and physical activity among preschool-aged children. Prev Chronic Dis 2011;8:A131. 22005624.
- 36 Barlow SE. Expert committee recommendations regarding the prevention, assessment, and treatment of child and adolescent overweight and obesity: summary report. Pediatrics 2007;120 Suppl 4:S164-S192. PM:18055651.
- 37 Minh Do LM, Tran TK, Eriksson B, et al. Preschool overweight and obesity in urban and rural Vietnam: differences in prevalence and associated factors. Glob Health Action 2015;8:28615. 26452338.
- 38 Hajian-Tilaki K, Heidari B. Childhood Obesity, Overweight, Socio-Demographic and Life Style Determinants among Preschool Children in Babol, Northern Iran. Iran J Public Health 2013;42:1283-1291. 26171341.
- 39 Mendoza JA, Zimmerman FJ, Christakis DA. Television viewing, computer use, obesity, and adiposity in US preschool children. Int 2007;4:44. 17894878.
- 40 Sijtsma A, Koller M, Sauer PJ, et al. Television, sleep, outdoor play and BMI in young children: the GECKO Drenthe cohort. Eur J Pediatr 2015;174:631-639. 25367053.
- 41 Proctor MH, Moore LL, Gao D, et al. Television viewing and change in body fat from preschool to early adolescence: The Framingham Children's Study. Int J Obes Relat Metab Disord 2003;27:827-833. 12821969.
- 42 Byun W, Liu J, Pate RR. Association between objectively measured sedentary behavior and body mass index in preschool children. Int J Obes (Lond) 2013;37:961-965. 23318716.

- 43 Pate RR, Almeida MJ, McIver KL, et al. Validation and Calibration of an Accelerometer in Preschool Children. Obesity (Silver Spring) 2006;14:2000-2006. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/oby.2006.234.
- 44 VAN CAUWENBERGHE EVEL, LABARQUE VALE, Trost SG, et al. Calibration and comparison of accelerometer cut points in preschool children. Int J Pediatr Obes 2011;6:e582-e589. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.3109/17477166.2010.526223</u>.
- 45 Brown JE, Broom DH, Nicholson JM, et al. Do working mothers raise couch potato kids? Maternal employment and children's lifestyle behaviours and weight in early childhood. Soc Sci Med 2010;70:1816-1824. 20299142.
- 46 Taverno RS, Dowda M, Saunders R, et al. Double dose: the cumulative effect of TV viewing at home and in preschool on children's activity patterns and weight status.[Erratum appears in Pediatr Exerc Sci. 2014 Feb;26(1):120]. Pediatr Exerc Sci 2013;25:262-272. 23502043.
- 47 Turer CB, Stroo M, Brouwer RJ, et al. Do high-risk preschoolers or overweight mothers meet AAP-recommended behavioral goals for reducing obesity? Acad Pediatr 2013;13:243-250. 23491583.
- 48 Collings PJ, Brage S, Ridgway CL, et al. Physical activity intensity, sedentary time, and body composition in preschoolers. Am J Clin Nutr 2013;97:1020-1028. 23553158.
- 49 Espana-Romero V, Mitchell JA, Dowda M, et al. Objectively measured sedentary time, physical activity and markers of body fat in preschool children. Pediatr Exerc Sci 2013;25:154-163. 23406703.
- 50 Lioret S, Maire B, Volatier JL, et al. Child overweight in France and its relationship with physical activity, sedentary behaviour and socioeconomic status. Eur J Clin Nutr 2007;61:509-516. 16988644.
- 51 Koubaa AA, Younes K, Gabsi Z, et al. [Risk factors of children overweight and obesity]. [French]. Tunis Med 2012;90:387-393. 22585646.
- 52 Bonvin A, Barral J, Kakebeeke TH, et al. Weight status and gender-related differences in motor skills and in child care based physical activity in young children. BMC Pediatr 2012;12:23. 22405468.
- 53 van Stralen MM, te Velde SJ, van NF, et al. Weight status of European preschool children and associations with family demographics and energy balancerelated behaviours: a pooled analysis of six European studies. [Review]. Obes Rev 2012;13 Suppl 1:29-41. 22309063.
- 54 Byun W, Dowda M, Pate RR. Correlates of objectively measured sedentary behavior in US preschool children. Pediatrics 2011;128:937-945. 22007010.
- 55 Tremblay L, Rinaldi CM. The prediction of preschool children's weight from family environment factors: gender-linked differences. Eat 2010;11:266-275. 20850062.
- 56 Sasaki A, Yorifuji T, Iwase T, et al. Is There Any Association between TV Viewing and Obesity in Preschool Children in Japan? Acta Med Okayama 2010;64:137-142. 20424669.
- 57 Anderson SE, Whitaker RC. Household routines and obesity in US preschool-aged children. Pediatrics 2010;125:420-428. 20142280.

- 58 Dubois L, Farmer A, Girard M, et al. Social factors and television use during meals and snacks is associated with higher BMI among pre-school children. Public Health Nutr 2008;11:1267-1279. 18547454.
- 59 Jouret B, Ahluwalia N, Cristini C, et al. Factors associated with overweight in preschool-age children in southwestern France. Am J Clin Nutr 2007;85:1643-1649. 17556704.
- 60 Jiang J, Rosenqvist U, Wang H, et al. Risk factors for overweight in 2- to 6-year-old children in Beijing, China. Int J Pediatr Obes 2006;1:103-108. 17907322.
- 61 Jago R, Baranowski T, Baranowski JC, et al. BMI from 3-6 y of age is predicted by TV viewing and physical activity, not diet. Int J Obes (Lond) 2005;29:557-564. 15889113.
- 62 Levin S, Martin MW, Riner WF. TV viewing habits and body mass index among South Carolina Head Start children. Ethn Dis 2004;14:336-339. 15328934.
- 63 DuRant RH, Baranowski T, Johnson M, et al. The relationship among television watching, physical activity, and body composition of young children. Pediatrics 1994;94:449-455. 7936851.
- 64 Cardon G, De B, I, Iotova V, et al. Health related behaviours in normal weight and overweight preschoolers of a large pan-european sample: The toyboxstudy. PLoS ONE 2016;11.
- 65 Harrison K, Liechty JM. Us preschoolers' media exposure and dietary habits: The primacy of television and the limits of parental mediation. [References]. Journal of Children and Media 2012;6:18-36.
- 66 Vandebosch H, Cleemput KV. Television viewing and obesity among pre-school children: The role of parents. Communications 2007;32:417-446.
- 67 Roelants M, Hauspie R. Groeicurven Vlaanderen 2004 [Flemish Growth Curves]. 2006. Available: <u>http://www.vub.ac.be/groeicurven/</u>.
- 68 Hesketh KD, Crawford DA, Abbott G, et al. Prevalence and stability of active play, restricted movement and television viewing in infants. [References]. Early Child Development and Care 2015;185:883-894.
- 69 Pagani LS, Fitzpatrick C, Barnett TA. Early childhood television viewing and kindergarten entry readiness. Pediatr Res 2013;74:350-355. 23788060.
- 70 De KA, Peersman W, Onderbeke K, et al. New reference values must be established for the Alberta Infant Motor Scales for accurate identification of infants at risk for motor developmental delay in Flanders. Child Care Health Dev 2013;39:260-267. 22676145.
- 71 Lin LY, Cherng RJ, Chen YJ, et al. Effects of television exposure on developmental skills among young children. Infant behav 2015;38:20-26. 25544743.
- 72 Cheng S, Maeda T, Yoichi S, et al. Early television exposure and children's behavioral and social outcomes at age 30 months. J Epidemiol 2010;20 Suppl 2:S482-S489. 20179364.

- 73 Verlinden M, Tiemeier H, Hudziak JJ, et al. Television viewing and externalizing problems in preschool children: the Generation R Study. Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med 2012;166:919-925. 22869354.
- 74 Watt E, Fitzpatrick C, Derevensky JL, et al. Too Much Television? Prospective Associations Between Early Childhood Televiewing and Later Self-reports of Victimization by Sixth Grade Classmates. J Dev Behav Pediatr 2015;36:426-433. 26075581.
- 75 Mistry KB, Minkovitz CS, Strobino DM, et al. Children's television exposure and behavioral and social outcomes at 5.5 years: does timing of exposure matter? Pediatrics 2007;120:762-769. 17908763.
- 76 Verlinden M, Tiemeier H, Veenstra R, et al. Television viewing through ages 2-5 years and bullying involvement in early elementary school. BMC Public Health 2014;14:157. 24520886.
- 77 Zimmerman FJ, Glew GM, Christakis DA, et al. Early cognitive stimulation, emotional support, and television watching as predictors of subsequent bullying among grade-school children. Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med 2005;159:384-388. 15809395.
- 78 Hinkley T, Verbestel V, Ahrens W, et al. Early childhood electronic media use as a predictor of poorer well-being: a prospective cohort study. Jama, Pediatr 2014;168:485-492. 24639016.
- 79 Rideout V, Roberts DF, Foehr UG. GenerationM: media in the lives of 8-18 year olds. Kaiser Family Foundation; 2005. Available: http://www.outdoorfoundation.org/pdf/ExecutiveSummaryGenerationM (accessed 2013 Sep 25).
- 80 Intusoma U, Mo-Suwan L, Ruangdaraganon N, et al. Effect of television viewing on social-emotional competence of young Thai children. Infant behav 2013;36:679-685. 23948636.
- 81 Manganello JA, Taylor CA. Television exposure as a risk factor for aggressive behavior among 3-year-old children. Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med 2009;163:1037-1045. 19884595.
- 82 Teramoto S, Soeda A, Hayashi Y, et al. Problematic behaviours of 3-year-old children in Japan: Relationship with socioeconomic and family backgrounds. Early Hum Dev 2005;81:563-569.
- 83 Miller LE, Grabell A, Thomas A, et al. The associations between community violence, television violence, intimate partner violence, parent-child aggression, and aggression in sibling relationships of a sample of preschoolers. [References]. Psychology of Violence 2012;2:165-178.
- 84 Irwin JD, Johnson AM, Vanderloo LM, et al. Temperament and Objectively Measured Physical Activity and Sedentary Time among Canadian Preschoolers. Prev Med Rep 2015;2:598-601. 26844125.
- 85 Tomopoulos S, Dreyer BP, Berkule S, et al. Infant media exposure and toddler development. Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med 2010;164:1105-1111. 21135338.
- 86 McKean C, Mensah FK, Eadie P, et al. Levers for language growth: Characteristics and predictors of language trajectories between 4 and 7 years. PLoS ONE 2015;10.

- 87 Foster EM, Watkins S. The value of reanalysis: TV viewing and attention problems. Child Dev 2010;81:368-375. 20331673.
- 88 Christakis DA, Zimmerman FJ, DiGiuseppe DL, et al. Early television exposure and subsequent attentional problems in children. Pediatrics 2004;113:708-713. 15060216.
- 89 Pagani LS, Fitzpatrick C, Archambault I, et al. School readiness and later achievement: a French Canadian replication and extension. Dev Psychol 2010;46:984-994. PM:20822217.
- 90 Zimmerman FJ, Christakis DA. Children's television viewing and cognitive outcomes: a longitudinal analysis of national data. Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med 2005;159:619-625. 15996993.
- 91 Blankson A. Do hours spent viewing television at ages 3 and 4 predict vocabulary and executive functioning at age 5? [References]. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly 2015;61:264-289.
- 92 Griffin E, Morrison FJ. The unique contribution of home literacy environment to differences in early literacy skills. Early Child Development and Care 1997;127-128:233-243.
- 93 Kaufman A.S., Kaufman NL. K-ABC: Kaufman assessment battery for children. Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Service; 1983.
- 94 Chonchaiya W, Pruksananonda C. Television viewing associates with delayed language development. Acta Paediatr 2008;97:977-982. 18460044.
- 95 Zimmerman FJ, Christakis DA, Meltzoff AN. Associations between media viewing and language development in children under age 2 years. J Pediatr 2007;151:364-368. 17889070.
- 96 Ferguson CJ, Donnellan M. Is the association between children's baby video viewing and poor language development robust? A reanalysis of Zimmerman, Christakis, and Meltzoff (2007). [References]. Dev Psychol 2014;50:129-137.
- 97 Byeon H, Hong S. Relationship between television viewing and language delay in toddlers: evidence from a Korea national cross-sectional survey. PLoS ONE 2015;10:e0120663. 25785449.
- 98 Duch H, Fisher EM, Ensari I, et al. Association of screen time use and language development in Hispanic toddlers: a cross-sectional and longitudinal study. Clin Pediatr (Phila) 2013;52:857-865. 23820003.
- 99 Zimmerman FJ, Gilkerson J, Richards JA, et al. Teaching by listening: the importance of adult-child conversations to language development. Pediatrics 2009;124:342-349. 19564318.
- 100 Ruangdaraganon N, Chuthapisith J, Mo-Suwan L, et al. Television viewing in Thai infants and toddlers: impacts to language development and parental perceptions. BMC Pediatr 2009;9:34. 19460170.
- 101 Rajchanovska D, Ivanovska BZ. The impact of demographic and socio-economic conditions on the prevalence of speech disorders in preschool children in Bitola. Srp Arh Celok Lek 2015;143:169-173. 26012126.

- 102 Linebarger DL, Barr R, Lapierre MA, et al. Associations between parenting, media use, cumulative risk, and children's executive functioning. J Dev Behav Pediatr 2014;35:367-377. 25007059.
- 103 Linebarger DL. Contextualizing video game play: The moderating effects of cumulative risk and parenting styles on the relations among video game exposure and problem behaviors. [References]. Psychology of Popular Media Culture 2015;4:375-396.
- 104 Miller CJ, Marks DJ, Miller SR, et al. Brief report: Television viewing and risk for attention problems in preschool children. J Pediatr Psychol 2007;32:448-452. 17012738.
- 105 Nathanson AI, Fries PT. Television exposure, sleep time, and neuropsychological function among preschoolers. [References]. Media Psychology 2014;17:237-261.
- 106 Carlson SM. Developmentally Sensitive Measures of Executive Function in Preschool Children. Developmental Neuropsychology 2005;28:595-616. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15326942dn2802_3.
- 107 Herrmann D, Buck C, Sioen I, et al. Impact of physical activity, sedentary behaviour and muscle strength on bone stiffness in 2-10-year-old children-crosssectional results from the IDEFICS study. Int 2015;12:112. 26377674.
- 108 Crispim PA, Peixoto MR, Jardim PC. Risk factors associated with high blood pressure in two-to five-year-old children. Arq Bras Cardiol 2014;102:39-46. 24263779.