

Digital Media Use and Child Health and Development

A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Samantha Teague, PhD; Klaire Somoray, PhD; Adrian Shatte, PhD; Daniel Miller, PhD; Kristian Moss, BPsych; Andrew Crawford, BPsych(Hons); Harrison Wildman, BPsych(Hons); Diana Kayal, GradDip(Psych); Delyse Hutchinson, MCLinPsych, PhD

 Supplemental content

IMPORTANCE This systematic review and meta-analysis synthesized global longitudinal studies to estimate associations between social media, video games, and other digital media use with health and developmental outcomes in children and adolescents.

OBJECTIVE To provide a meta-analytic synthesis of evidence on digital media use and health and developmental outcomes among individuals aged 0 to 18 years.

DATA SOURCES This review was preregistered with PROSPERO, MEDLINE, PsycINFO, EMBASE, and ERIC databases and gray literature were searched from 2000 to 2024.

STUDY SELECTION Inclusion criteria were English-language longitudinal studies of participants aged 0 to 18 years reporting quantitative associations between digital media use and health or developmental outcomes.

DATA EXTRACTION AND SYNTHESIS Following PRISMA guidelines, 153 studies (115 cohorts, 1072 effect sizes) from 18 933 articles met criteria for quantitative synthesis. Random-effects meta-analyses estimated pooled correlations (r) with 95% CIs. Heterogeneity and moderators (age, sex, measurement method, follow-up duration, year of exposure) were examined. Study quality was assessed using the National Institutes of Health's Quality Assessment Tool. These data were analyzed from February 2025 to August 2025.

MAIN OUTCOMES AND MEASURES Primary outcomes were socialemotional, cognitive, physical and motor health, and development associations.

RESULTS A total of 153 studies (115 cohorts, 1072 effect sizes) with 18 933 participants met criteria for quantitative synthesis. Study participant ages ranged from 2 to 19 (mean [SD], 12.81 [2.79]) years, with 53.8% female and 46.2% male. Most studies were conducted in Europe (62 [40.5%]) and North America (60 [39.2%]), followed by Asia (22 [14.4%]), Australia (5 [3.3%]), and Latin America (1 [0.7%]). Social media use was associated with higher depression, externalizing and internalizing behaviors, self-injurious thoughts, problematic internet use, and substance use ($r = 0.09$; 95% CI, 0.06-0.12 to $r = 0.21$; 95% CI, 0.13-0.29) and also with lower academic achievement, poorer self-perception, and less positive development ($r = -0.14$; 95% CI, -0.26 to -0.01 to $r = -0.07$; 95% CI, -0.11 to -0.02). Video gaming was associated with higher aggression and externalizing behaviors ($r = 0.16$; 95% CI, 0.09-0.23 and $r = 0.17$; 95% CI, 0.07-0.26, respectively) and higher attention/executive functioning ($r = 0.10$; 95% CI, 0.03-0.16). Other digital media use, including digital device use and messaging/communication media, was associated with depression ($r = 0.05$; 95% CI, 0.00-0.09 to $r = 0.12$; 95% CI, 0.02-0.22). Associations between social media and depression were stronger in early adolescence ($\beta = 0.09$) and with self or parent-reported outcomes ($\beta = 0.09$); associations between social media and positive development were stronger with objective exposure measurement ($\beta = 0.08$). More recent social media exposure years showed stronger associations with substance use ($\beta = 0.10$).

CONCLUSIONS AND RELEVANCE In this systematic review and meta-analysis, digital media use was consistently associated with risks to child and adolescent health and development, particularly for social media. These findings highlight the need for targeted, multifaceted policies and interventions to mitigate potential harms from digital media exposure.

JAMA Pediatr. 2026;180(5):510-517. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2026.0085
Published online March 9, 2026.

Author Affiliations: Author affiliations are listed at the end of this article.

Corresponding Author: Samantha Teague, PhD, Department of Psychology, College of Healthcare Sciences, James Cook University, 1 James Cook Dr, Townsville, QLD 4811 Australia (sam.teague@jcu.edu.au).

Digital media use has become a defining feature of contemporary childhood, with screen-based activities embedded in daily life from infancy through adolescence.^{1,2} Over the past decade, use has risen steadily across all age groups,^{1,2} with a 52% increase reported during the COVID-19 pandemic.^{3,4} Most children now exceed recommended daily screen time guidelines issued by leading health authorities across every developmental age and stage globally.^{5,6}

Importantly, the nature of children's media engagement is also shifting. While traditional broadcast media, such as television, remains widely used,^{1,2} children increasingly engage with digital media featuring interactive or social elements, including video games, educational and fitness applications, and social media.⁷ These formats differ in pace, interactivity, content, algorithms, and regulatory oversight compared with broadcast media, blurring the distinction between consumers and creators of content.⁷ Additionally, developmental stage further shapes exposure and vulnerability: a toddler's often parent-mediated and screen limited media use differs markedly from an adolescent's engagement in online platforms while navigating their social identity.^{8,9}

These shifts have prompted growing concerns among parents, educators, clinicians, and global leaders about the potential benefits and harms of digital media. While some view it as a tool for learning, creativity, and connection, many worry about links with disrupted sleep, reduced physical activity, and mental health difficulties.^{1,2,10} Consistent with these perspectives, prior research reports mixed findings. Some studies link digital media use to negative outcomes in children and young people; yet, others suggest potential cognitive or psychosocial benefits, or no effects.¹¹⁻¹³

Despite a growing body of research, the evidence base remains fragmented. Prior reviews frequently aggregate all media into broad measures of screentime,¹⁴⁻¹⁷ or focus narrowly on specific digital media types.^{18,19} Outcomes are often similarly restricted to specific domains (eg, academic performance,¹⁶ externalizing and internalizing symptoms^{14,17,20-22}), with fewer reviews spanning socioemotional, cognitive, physical, and motor outcomes, or considering how associations vary by digital media types. Developmental coverage has also been varied, with many reviews limited to specific ages,^{8,14,15,20-23} while others rely heavily on cross-sectional data,^{15,16,19,20} restricting the ability to make inferences about directionality or map developmental trends.

To address these gaps, we conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis of longitudinal studies examining associations between digital media use and child health and developmental outcomes from infancy to age 18 years. Our aims were to (1) quantify the strength and direction of associations for different digital media types across a comprehensive range of outcomes, including socialemotional, cognitive, physical, and motor domains and (2) examine potential moderators, including age, gender, and year of publication. In doing so, this review provides a clearer understanding of the patterns and potential links between digital media use and child outcomes, providing evidence to inform policy, clinical practice, education, and parenting in an increasingly digital world.

Key Points

Question How is digital media use, including social media and video games, associated with child health and development?

Findings In this systematic review and meta-analysis of up to 153 longitudinal studies, poorer developmental outcomes were associated with digital media use in children and adolescents. Social media use was associated with higher depression, behavioral problems, self-injury, and substance use, and lower self-perception and academic achievement; video gaming was linked to greater aggression and externalizing behavior, but modestly higher attention and executive functioning.

Meaning These results demonstrate that digital media use shows modest but consistent links with poorer developmental outcomes, highlighting the need for nuanced, developmentally informed guidance and policy.

Method

Search Strategy

This review adhered to Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) reporting guidelines²⁴ and had a preregistered PROSPERO protocol (CRD42020200446).²⁵ We searched MEDLINE, PsycINFO, EMBASE, and ERIC databases, and gray literature for studies published up to August 2024. Search constructs included “children,” “digital media,” and “observational research” (full terms in eTable 1 in Supplement 1). We included studies published after January 1, 2000, to capture contemporary digital technologies. Gray literature sources included (1) ProQuest Dissertations and Theses, (2) the first 100 Google search results ranked by relevance, and (3) backward citation analyses of included studies using Web of Science.

Selection Criteria

Eligibility criteria are presented in Table 1. Title and abstracts were independently screened by authors (S.T., K.M., B.H., D.K., J.K., M.H., A.C., H.W.), followed by full-text review with disagreements resolved through discussion. A double-blind reviewer (S.T.) conducted on 5% of titles and abstracts yielded a 97.8% agreement rate (Fleiss κ = 0.85; 95% CI, 0.79-0.92; P < .001) and 50% of full-text yielded 94.6% agreement (Fleiss κ = 0.86; 95% CI, 0.79-0.94; P < .001). Full text exclusions are presented in eTable 2 in Supplement 1.

Data Extraction and Study Quality

Three authors (S.T., A.C., and H.W.) extracted data using a standardized pro forma, cross-checked by 2 of the authors (S.T. or K.S.). Discrepancies were resolved with the lead data analyst (K.S.). Extracted data included publication metadata (authors, year, title, and whether the study was part of a larger or related study), recruitment (method, representativeness, and inclusion/exclusion criteria), study characteristics (design, number of waves, period, country, sample size), participant characteristics (child age [mean (SD) range], sex distribution, sample category), digital media type and measures (quantitative estimates or binary/presence indicators), data source/

**Table 1. Systematic Meta-Analytic Review
Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria**

Criterion type	Description
Inclusion criteria	
Language	Available in English
Population	Human samples of children aged 0–18 y at exposure assessment
Study design	Quantitative studies reporting original empirical findings
Exposure	Reports a measure of children's digital media use, defined as media in which users can consume and create content ⁷
Outcomes	Reports a measure of child health or development in at least 1 category: (1) Socioemotional outcomes: composite measures, externalizing and internalizing behaviors, peer problems, prosocial behavior, attachment, temperament and personality traits (positive and negative affect, emotional reactivity, regulation, surgency/extraversion), and positive development (self-esteem, resilience, coping, well-being) (2) Cognitive outcomes: composite, executive function/planning, decision-making, working memory, inhibition and flexibility, visual-spatial reasoning, verbal IQ, quantitative IQ, learning and memory, free recall, cued recall, recognition memory, semantic and autobiographical long-term memory, implicit learning, complex attention, sustained attention, divided attention, selective attention, and processing speed IQ, expressive and receptive language, and academic achievement (3) Physical health and developmental indicators: composite growth and anthropometric growth (eg, body mass index), physical activity and fitness, sleep patterns and quality, nutrition and dietary habits, motor development, health behaviors and risk factors (smoking, alcohol, substance use), reproductive health, and physiological development (eg, blood pressure, cholesterol levels)
Temporal sequence	Longitudinal design in which digital media use precedes the health/developmental outcome
Effect estimates	Reports (or provides on request) a bivariate association between digital media use and later child health or development outcomes
Exclusion criteria	
Clinical/medical selection	Samples recruited due to a medical condition or use of medication, alcohol, or other drugs
Intervention	Samples involved in an intervention
Exposure construct	Studies assessing digital media use exclusively as problematic or addictive use, rather than frequency or duration

informant and timing, child outcomes and measures (including informant), and reported associations (effect sizes, direction, 95% CIs, *P* values, and covariate adjustments). Study quality was assessed using the National Institutes of Health (NIH) Quality Assessment Tool for Observational Cohort and Cross-Sectional Studies,²⁶ aligned with Cochrane Collaboration criteria.

Data Synthesis

Random-effects meta-analyses estimated associations between digital media use across specific developmental subdomains (eg, aggression within socioemotional domain). These subdomains were mapped into 4 overarching developmental domains (socioemotional, cognitive, physical, and motor) based on established criterion-standard child development frameworks.^{27,28} Subdomains were analyzed when 2 or more studies reported relevant effect sizes. Analyses were conducted using R²⁹ version 4.5.1 (R Project). To account for

dependence from multiple or overlapping samples, we used robust variance estimation (robumeta package version 2.1).^{30–32} Moderator analyses were performed using metafor version 4.8 with random-effects and studies were clustered using clubSandwich version 0.6.^{33,34} Data and code are available via Open Science Framework.³⁵

We reported I^2 to assess heterogeneity.³⁶ Values were interpreted as follows: 0% to 25% had low, 25% to 50% had moderate, 50% to 75% had substantial, and 75% to 100% had high heterogeneity. Effects were interpreted as very small (0.05), small (0.1), moderate (0.2), large (0.3), and very large (0.4), per Cohen guidelines.³⁷ Meta-regressions examined whether age at exposure (infancy, early childhood, preschool, school age, early adolescence, late adolescence), gender (percentage female), year of first exposure (pre-2012 vs post-2012, reflecting when smartphones and social media platforms became widespread),³⁸ informant source (self, parent/caregiver, teacher, objective measure, researcher), and time lag (short [<1 year], medium [1–3 years], and long-term [>3 years]) moderated associations. For studies presenting multiple exposure frequency comparisons (eg, low vs moderate vs high), relevant comparisons were extracted as distinct effect sizes. Sensitivity analyses were conducted for associations with 10 or more studies,^{39,40} including publication bias (funnel plots, multi-level Egger test) and outlier diagnostics (leave-one-out).

Pearson correlation coefficients (*r*) were extracted or calculated from the available effect sizes (eTable 3 in Supplement 1),⁴¹ transformed to Fisher *z* scores⁴² for analysis and back-transformed for interpretation. When 2 or more effect sizes were available for the same relationship, effects with more adjustments were analyzed.⁴³ Low-precision estimates ($\kappa < 10$; wide CIs) should be interpreted with caution. Results were interpreted using the meta-analytic estimate and precision indicated by 95% CIs, aligning with recommendations from the American Statistical Association.⁴⁴

Results

Study Selection, Characteristics, and Quality

Of 18 933 articles screened, 1384 underwent full-text review (eFigure 1 in Supplement 1). In total, 153 studies met eligibility criteria, including 115 unique cohorts and 1072 effect sizes. Thirteen studies lacked sufficient data for meta-analysis (eg, no descriptive statistics to convert into Pearson *r*). Study characteristics are detailed in eTable 4 in Supplement 1. Sample sizes ranged from 26 to 54 908 (mean [SD], 2774.71 [4565.53]), with participants' ages spanning 2 to 19 (mean [SD], 12.81 [2.79]) years, and approximately equal proportions of boys and girls (53.8% female and 46.2% male). Most studies were conducted in Europe (62 [40.5%]) and North America (60 [39.2%]), followed by Asia (22 [14.4%]), Australia (5 [3.3%]), and Latin America (1 [0.7%]). Two spanned multiple regions. Study duration ranged from 1 day to 22 years (mean [SD], 2.48 [3.63] years).

Risk of bias was generally acceptable (eTables 6 and 7 in Supplement 1): 40.5% (*n* = 64) were rated good, 48.5% fair (*n* = 76), and 11.1% poor (*n* = 17). Most studies used adequate

Table 2. Overview of Developmental Domains and Subdomains and the Corresponding Number of Meta-Analyses by Media Exposure Type

Subdomain	Social media	Video games	Other media
Socialemotional 16 Subdomains analyzed: aggression, anxiety, depression, eating disorder and body image issues, externalizing behavior, internalizing behavior, combined externalizing and internalizing behavior, negative affect, peer problems, peer relationships, positive development, problematic internet use, prosocial behavior, self-injurious thoughts and behaviors, and self-perception	15 Meta-analyses	14 Meta-analyses	14 Meta-analyses
Physical and motor domain 7 Subdomains analyzed: body composition, general health, metabolic syndrome, sleep problems, sleep quality, substance use, and fine motor	4 Meta-analyses	4 Meta-analyses	4 Meta-analyses
Cognitive domain 3 Subdomains analyzed: academic achievement, attention and executive functioning, and working memory	1 Meta-analysis	3 Meta-analyses	2 Meta-analysis

follow-up durations, temporal ordering, and appropriate confounders and covariates (eg, age, gender/sex, race and ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and parental factors). However, only 21.25% ($n = 34$ studies) of extracted effect sizes controlled for baseline outcomes. Attrition and limited sample size justification were common limitations.

Studies were relatively balanced across exposure categories: social media ($k = 69$), video games ($k = 65$) and other media ($k = 60$), where k indicates the number of studies included. The heterogeneous other media category included digital devices (computers, smartphones, tablets), messaging and communication platforms (instant messaging, email, SMS, videochatting), digital learning (online courses/homework), health and fitness applications (fitness apps), and general internet use. Outcomes were grouped into 16 socialemotional, 3 cognitive, and 7 physical and motor subdomains (Table 2).

Social Media

Social media use was associated with multiple socialemotional development difficulties (Table 3), including depression ($r = 0.09$; 95% CI, 0.06-0.12), externalizing behaviors ($r = 0.13$; 95% CI, 0.07-0.19), internalizing behaviors ($r = 0.14$; 95% CI, 0.03-0.25), self-injurious thoughts and behaviors ($r = 0.11$; 95% CI, 0.01-0.27), and problematic internet use ($r = 0.21$; 95% CI, 0.13-0.29). Negative associations were observed with positive development ($r = -0.06$; 95% CI, -0.11 to -0.02) and self-perception ($r = -0.14$; 95% CI, -0.26 to -0.01). Heterogeneity was high ($I^2 > 70\%$ -96%).

In the cognitive domain (Table 4), social media use was associated with lower academic achievement ($r = -0.07$; 95% CI, -0.11 to -0.02 ; $I^2 = 34\%$). In the physical domain (Table 5), it was associated with substance use ($r = 0.14$; 95% CI, 0.08-0.19; $I^2 = 96\%$) with no moderation by substance type (alcohol, cannabis, tobacco, electronic cigarettes).

Video Games

Video game use was associated with socialemotional development difficulties (Table 3), including aggression ($r = 0.16$; 95% CI, 0.09-0.23) and externalizing behaviors ($r = 0.17$; 95% CI, 0.07-0.26). These effects had high heterogeneity ($I^2 > 80\%$). A small positive association was observed with attention and executive functioning ($r = 0.10$; 95% CI, 0.03-0.16) with moderate heterogeneity ($I^2 = 52\%$). No associations were observed for any of the physical domain (Table 5).

Other Media

Other digital media use was associated with depression ($r = 0.12$; 95% CI, 0.02-0.22; $I^2 = 99\%$) and poorer general health ($r = -0.04$; 95% CI, -0.08 to -0.01 ; $I^2 = 34\%$). Given the heterogeneous nature of this category, subtype analyses showed positive associations with depression for general digital device use ($r = 0.11$; 95% CI, 0.01-0.21) and messaging and communication media ($r = 0.05$; 95% CI, 0.00-0.09). Full results are presented in eTable 8 in Supplement 1.

Moderator Analysis

Moderator analyses were limited by small effect counts (see eTables 9-15 in Supplement 1 for full analyses).

Age

For social media and depression, effects were weaker in school-aged children (6-11 years) than early adolescence (12-15 years) ($F_{1,6.42} = 13.57$; $\beta = -0.09$; $P = .009$).

Exposure Informant

For social media and positive development, associations varied by exposure informant ($F_{1,4.96} = 12.4$; $P = .02$). Objective device-based reporting showed stronger associations ($\beta = 0.08$) than child self-report.

Outcome Informant

For social media and depression, outcome source moderated effects ($F_{1,5.34} = 15.22$; $P = .01$). Clinician/research staff-administered tools yielded weaker effects ($\beta = -0.10$) than child self-report and parent report.

Year of Exposure

For social media and substance use, post-2012 exposure showed stronger associations ($\beta = 0.10$) than pre-2012 ($F_{1,2.25} = 18.47$; $P = .04$).

Time Lag

For social media and depression, effect sizes were larger for short follow-up durations (≤ 1 year; $\beta = 0.12$) compared with medium (1-3 years; $\beta = 0.04$) and long-term follow-up (> 3 years; $\beta = 0.03$; $F_{3,4.75} = 8.78$; $P = .02$). For social media use and substance use, short follow-up ($\beta = 0.15$) had larger effect sizes than medium ($\beta = 0.10$), with larger effect sizes again observed for long-term follow-ups ($\beta = 0.18$; $F_{3,1.11} = 258.25$; $P = .03$). Results should be interpreted cautiously due to small degrees of freedom.

Table 3. Associations Between Different Media Types and Socioemotional Outcomes

Socioemotional outcome	No. of studies (No. of effect sizes)	<i>r</i> (95% CI)	<i>P</i> value	<i>I</i> ² , %
Social media				
Anxiety	12 (51)	0.05 (0.00 to 0.11)	.06	91.2
Depression	24 (81)	0.09 (0.06 to 0.12)	<.001	91.0
Eating disorder and body image issues	3 (5)	0.08 (−0.13 to 0.29)	.22	93.6
Externalizing behavior	8 (37)	0.13 (0.07 to 0.19)	.001	94.0
Internalizing behavior	5 (27)	0.14 (0.03 to 0.25)	.03	96.2
Internalizing and externalizing behavior	3 (6)	0.19 (0.10 to 0.27)	.01	90.0
Self-injurious thoughts and behaviors	4 (13)	0.11 (0.01 to 0.21)	.04	95.9
Dysregulation	3 (4)	0.09 (−0.02 to 0.19)	.07	85.8
Negative affect	2 (5)	0.05 (−0.21 to 0.30)	.25	0.0
Prosocial behavior	3 (8)	−0.03 (−0.09 to 0.04)	.18	32.6
Peer problems	3 (3)	0.06 (−0.08 to 0.20)	.17	71.4
Peer relationships	4 (13)	0.06 (−0.08 to 0.19)	.28	94.3
Positive development	10 (30)	−0.06 (−0.11 to −0.02)	.01	91.9
Self-perception	3 (4)	−0.14 (−0.26 to −0.01)	.05	89.8
Problematic internet use	4 (12)	0.21 (0.13 to 0.29)	.004	70.7
Video games				
Anxiety	5 (14)	0.02 (−0.09 to 0.12)	.70	98.4
Depression	10 (18)	0.09 (−0.02 to 0.20)	.10	97.9
Eating disorder and body image issues	3 (4)	0.02 (−0.13 to 0.16)	.64	83.6
Externalizing behavior	11 (28)	0.17 (0.07 to 0.26)	.004	99.0
Internalizing behavior	2 (6)	0.20 (−0.03 to 0.42)	.06	90.9
Internalizing and externalizing behavior	2 (4)	0.10 (−0.79 to 0.85)	.50	70.0
Self-injurious thoughts and behaviors	2 (5)	0.14 (−0.83 to 0.90)	.40	99.2
Dysregulation	4 (8)	−0.01 (−0.17 to 0.15)	.90	91.6
Negative affect	2 (4)	0.06 (−0.05 to 0.17)	.09	0.0
Prosocial behavior	9 (22)	−0.13 (−0.25 to 0.00)	.05	96.6
Peer problems	5 (11)	0.04 (−0.07 to 0.15)	.33	84.6
Positive development	7 (11)	−0.04 (−0.09 to 0.02)	.12	67.8
Self-perception	2 (3)	0.03 (−0.44 to 0.48)	.60	76.3
Aggression	14 (42)	0.16 (0.09 to 0.23)	<.001	94.0

Study Quality

For social media and internalizing behaviors, poor-quality studies showed larger effect sizes ($\beta = 0.21$) than good-quality studies ($F_{1,2.05} = 112.28$; $P = .008$). Limiting analyses to fair/good-quality studies attenuated most associations, except social media and academic achievement became nonsignificant. When analyses were limited to good-quality studies only,

associations remained for social media and substance abuse, depression, externalizing behavior, internalizing behavior, and lower self-perception (eTable 16 in Supplement 1).

Sensitivity Analyses

While funnel plots suggested potential asymmetry (eTable 17 in Supplement 1), the Egger test indicated publication bias only for social media and substance use ($P = .04$) and video games and aggression ($P = .04$). Most findings were robust to outlier removal, although the association between social media and anxiety was sensitive to 1 study⁴⁵; removing this case shifted the nonsignificant finding ($P = .06$) to significance ($P = .006$).

Discussion

This meta-analysis of longitudinal studies provides, to our knowledge, the first comprehensive synthesis of evidence on associations between children's and adolescents' digital media use and socioemotional, cognitive, physical, and motor development. Across 115 cohorts, digital media use was predominantly associated with poorer outcomes, including depression symptoms, internalizing and externalizing behaviors, and lower positive development. Social media shows the most consistent adverse associations, while video gaming was associated with aggression and externalizing behavior, but also modestly higher attention/executive functioning. Given the ubiquity of digital media in children's lives, these findings have important public health implications and highlight the need for evidence-based approaches to support healthier digital engagement.

Consistent effects were observed across digital media types, with most forms associated with small but meaningful differences over time in internalizing and externalizing problems, particularly depression. Digital media use may act as a low-level transdiagnostic risk factor for socioemotional difficulties,^{14,20} especially with frequent use and limited supervision or regulatory oversight.^{8,46} Importantly, effect sizes were comparable with other modifiable lifestyle factors, such as physical inactivity⁴⁷ and unhealthy diets.⁴⁸ Prior cross-sectional meta-analyses have reported similar associations between digital media use and depression^{49,50} and our findings extend these by demonstrating temporal ordering. Substantial heterogeneity suggests that content, purpose, family and peer environment, and measurement strategies influence observed effects, underscoring the need for more nuanced longitudinal research.

Social media use was associated with poorer outcomes for all domains examined, including depression, externalizing and internalizing difficulties, substance use, lower self-perception, self-injurious thoughts and behaviors, lower academic achievement, and less positive development. The association with later problematic internet use, may suggest that early exposure could be linked with later digital media problems. The interpersonal nature of social media, emphasizing peer visibility, self-presentation, and social comparison,^{9,51} may heighten feelings of inadequacy and distress, especially during early adolescence, a sensitive period for social-evaluative

Table 4. Associations Between Different Media Types and Cognitive Outcomes

Cognitive outcome	No. of studies (No. of effect sizes)	r (95% CI)	P value	I ² , %
Social media				
Academic achievement	3 (19)	−0.07 (−0.11 to −0.02)	.03	34.4
Video games				
Academic achievement	7 (14)	−0.02 (−0.12 to 0.08)	.65	93.2
Attention and executive functioning	3 (16)	0.10 (0.03 to 0.16)	.03	52.0
Working memory	2 (13)	−0.09 (−1.00 to 1.00)	.78	97.4

processes.^{52–54} Exposure to self-harm and substance use content on social media may further normalize and promote these harmful behaviors, rather than protect against them.^{55,56}

In contrast, video gaming showed no association with internalizing difficulties but was linked with aggression and externalizing behavior, consistent with theories of media violence and behavioral disinhibition.^{14,57} A positive association with attention and executive functioning was observed, potentially reflecting the cognitive demands of gaming,^{58,59} although this was based on few studies and was not accompanied by higher academic achievement.

Moderation analyses revealed few differences by sex, age, respondent type, study duration, exposure year, or time lag. Associations between social media and depression had larger effect sizes in early adolescence, consistent with heightened peer sensitivity and peak onset for mental disorders during this developmental period.^{60,61} Associations were also observed in studies using device-logged exposure and self-reported outcomes, highlighting the importance of precise and ecologically valid measurement.⁶² Evidence of moderation by exposure year for social media and substance use suggests that effect sizes may change as platforms evolve and become more immersive.

Limitations

Several limitations warrant consideration. Although all studies were longitudinal, causality cannot be inferred and residual confounding and reverse causality remain possible, particularly as many studies did not adjust for baseline outcomes. Few studies explicitly addressed bidirectionality or unmeasured confounding. Follow-up periods were typically around 1 year, limiting conclusions about long-term or nonlinear effects. Heterogeneity reflected variation in design, samples, measurement tools, and exposure (eg, mature-rated, risk-glorifying games⁶³ vs video games). Too few studies investigated other digital media beyond social media and video gaming, including emerging technologies like generative artificial intelligence chatbots and virtual reality, to meta-analyze their effect sizes across all outcomes. Socioemotional outcomes were more frequently assessed than physical, cognitive or

Table 5. Associations Between Different Media Types and Physical Outcomes

Physical outcomes	No. of studies (No. of effect sizes)	r (95% CI)	P value	I ² , %
Social media				
Sleep problems	3 (9)	0.06 (−0.09 to 0.20)	.24	91.5
Sleep quality	2 (3)	0.07 (−0.32 to 0.45)	.26	59.3
Substance use	10 (31)	0.14 (0.08 to 0.19)	<.001	96.3
Body composition	2 (3)	−0.41 (−1.00 to 1.00)	.51	99.9
Video games				
Sleep problems	2 (5)	−0.17 (−0.99 to 0.98)	.54	99.8
Substance use	4 (13)	0.04 (−0.11 to 0.19)	.40	93.5
Body composition	9 (24)	−0.11 (−0.38 to 0.18)	.42	99.7
Metabolic syndrome	3 (6)	−0.28 (−0.91 to 0.74)	.43	99.5

motor outcomes, limiting conclusions across the spectrum of development. Early childhood exposures, trajectories into emerging adulthood, and objective measures were underrepresented. Most cohorts (83.7%) were from upper-middle income countries, limiting generalizability to more diverse populations. Future longitudinal research addressing these gaps is needed and future reviews should aim to investigate bidirectionality and the influence of factors, such as race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status, to inform the generalizability of research findings.

Despite these limitations, the consistency of findings underscores growing global public health concerns regarding children's and adolescents' digital media use. Several countries are implementing age-based restrictions and considering limits on addictive design elements, such as infinite scrolling and autoplay,^{64–66} with our findings providing longitudinal context for these policy discussions. Although effect sizes were small to moderate, small effects can accumulate over time and at scale, contributing to meaningful shifts in population well-being, particularly when observed consistently across time and cohorts.⁶⁷

Conclusions

These findings also align with the bioecological model of child development, emphasizing dynamic interactions between children and their environment, including digital contexts.^{68,69} Policy and clinical responses should be developmentally informed and consider sensitive periods of brain development.^{61,70} Promoting healthier digital engagement will require coordinated efforts across ecological levels, including family practices (eg, covieing media), school-based digital literacy, regulatory oversight of industry, and attention to cultural values and the evolving platforms. Future research should also prioritize precise, ecologically valid measurement of digital media engagement, early developmental exposures, trajectories into adulthood, and emerging media to inform timely, evidence-based responses.

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Accepted for Publication: January 14, 2026.

Published Online: March 9, 2026.

doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2026.0085

Author Affiliations: Department of Psychology, College of Healthcare Sciences, James Cook University, Townsville, Australia (Teague, Somoray, Miller, Moss, Crawford, Wildman, Kayal); Margaret Roderick Centre for Mental Health Research, James Cook University, Townsville, Australia (Teague, Somoray, Shatte, Miller); Deakin University, SEED-Lifespan Strategic Research Centre, School of Psychology, Faculty of Health, Burwood, Victoria, Australia (Teague, Hutchinson); Department of Information Technology, College of Science and Engineering, James Cook University, Townsville, Australia (Shatte); Murdoch Children's Research Institute, Centre for Adolescent Health, Melbourne, Australia (Hutchinson); University of Melbourne, Department of Paediatrics, Royal Children's Hospital, Melbourne, Australia (Hutchinson); The University of New South Wales, National Drug and Alcohol Research Centre, New South Wales, Australia (Hutchinson).

Author Contributions: Drs Teague and Somoray had full access to all of the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Concept and design: Teague, Shatte, Crawford, Hutchinson.

Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data: All authors.

Drafting of the manuscript: Teague, Somoray, Miller, Moss, Crawford, Hutchinson.

Critical review of the manuscript for important intellectual content: Teague, Somoray, Shatte, Miller, Crawford, Wildman, Kayal, Hutchinson.

Statistical analysis: Teague, Somoray, Miller, Crawford, Wildman, Kayal.

Obtained funding: Teague.

Administrative, technical, or material support: Teague, Somoray, Moss, Hutchinson.

Supervision: Teague, Somoray, Hutchinson.

Conflict of Interest Disclosures: Dr Teague reported grants from the Australian Government National Health and Medical Research Council Investigator Grant (GNT2025839) during the conduct of the study. Prof Hutchinson reported grants from the Australian National Health and Medical Research Council Investigator Grant and Medical Research Future Fund Grant (APP1197488 and MRF2044506). No other disclosures were reported.

Data Sharing Statement: See Supplement 2.

Additional Contribution: We thank all members of the research team and participating institutions for their support of this work. We are particularly grateful to the students who contributed to data collection, including Bronwyn Hemer, Mia Haffeejee, and Jake Kelly, for their valuable efforts in supporting this study.

REFERENCES

- Mann S, Calvin A, Lenhart A, Robb MB. *The Common Sense Census: Media Use by Kids Zero to Eight*, 2025. Common Sense Media; 2025.
- Rideout V, Peebles A, Mann S, Robb MB. *Common Sense Census: Media Use by Tweens and Teens*, 2021. Common Sense; 2022.
- Madigan S, Eirich R, Pador P, McArthur BA, Neville RD. Assessment of changes in child and adolescent screen time during the COVID-19 pandemic: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2022;176(12):1188-1198. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2022.4116
- Olive LS, Sciberras E, Berkowitz TS, et al. Child and parent physical activity, sleep, and screen time during COVID-19 and associations with mental health: implications for future psycho-cardiological disease? *Front Psychiatry*. 2022;12:774858. doi:10.3389/fpsyt.2021.774858
- McArthur BA, Volkova V, Tomopoulos S, Madigan S. Global prevalence of meeting screen time guidelines among children 5 years and younger: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2022;176(4):373-383. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2021.6386
- Tapia-Serrano MA, Sevil-Serrano J, Sánchez-Miguel PA, López-Gil JF, Tremblay MS, García-Hermoso A. Prevalence of meeting 24-Hour Movement Guidelines from pre-school to adolescence: a systematic review and meta-analysis including 387,437 participants and 23 countries. *J Sport Health Sci*. 2022;11(4):427-437. doi:10.1016/j.jshs.2022.01.005
- Reid Chasiakos YL, Radesky J, Christakis D, Moreno MA, Cross C; COUNCIL ON COMMUNICATIONS AND MEDIA. Children and adolescents and digital media. *Pediatrics*. 2016;138(5):e20162593. doi:10.1542/peds.2016-2593
- Taylor G, Sala G, Kolak J, Gerhardtstein P, Lingwood J. Does adult-child co-use during digital media use improve children's learning aged 0-6 years? a systematic review with meta-analysis. *Educ Res Rev*. 2024;44:100614. doi:10.1016/j.edurev.2024.100614
- Firth J, Torous J, López-Gil JF, et al. From "online brains" to "online lives": understanding the individualized impacts of internet use across psychological, cognitive and social dimensions. *World Psychiatry*. 2024;23(2):176-190. doi:10.1002/wps.21188
- Chong SC, Teo WZ, Shorey S. Exploring the perception of parents on children's screentime: a systematic review and meta-synthesis of qualitative studies. *Pediatr Res*. 2023;94(3):915-925. doi:10.1038/s41390-023-02555-9
- Orben A, Przybylski AK. The association between adolescent well-being and digital technology use. *Nat Hum Behav*. 2019;3(2):173-182. doi:10.1038/s41562-018-0506-1
- Twenge JM. Why increases in adolescent depression may be linked to the technological environment. *Curr Opin Psychol*. 2020;32:89-94. doi:10.1016/j.copsyc.2019.06.036
- Charani B, Ortigara J, Yuan D, Loso H, Potter A, Garavan HP. Association of video gaming with cognitive performance among children. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2022;5(10):e2235721. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.35721
- Eirich R, McArthur BA, Anhorn C, McGuinness C, Christakis DA, Madigan S. Association of screen time with internalizing and externalizing behavior problems in children 12 years or younger: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2022;79(5):393-405. doi:10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2022.0155
- Madigan S, McArthur BA, Anhorn C, Eirich R, Christakis DA. Associations between screen use and child language skills: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2020;174(7):665-675. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2020.0327
- Adelantado-Renau M, Moliner-Urdiales D, Caverio-Redondo I, Beltran-Valls MR, Martínez-Vizcaino V, Álvarez-Bueno C. Association between screen media use and academic performance among children and adolescents: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2019;173(11):1058-1067. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2019.3176
- Dickson K, Richardson M, Kwan I, et al. *Screen-Based Activities and Children and Young People's Mental Health and Psychosocial Wellbeing: A Systematic Map of Reviews*. EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, UCL Institute of Education. University College London; 2019.
- Männikkö N, Mendels L, Barbosa F, Reis LP. Health determinants related to digital game playing: a systematic review. *J Health Sci*. 2014;4(3):53-63. doi:10.5923/j.health.20140403.02
- Galea S, Buckley GJ, Wojtowicz A. *Social Media and Adolescent Health*. National Academies Press; 2024. doi:10.17226/27396.
- Fassi L, Thomas K, Parry DA, Leyland-Craggs A, Ford TJ, Orben A. Social media use and internalizing symptoms in clinical and community adolescent samples: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2024;178(8):814-822. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2024.2078
- Tang S, Werner-Seidler A, Torok M, Mackinnon AJ, Christensen H. The relationship between screen time and mental health in young people: A systematic review of longitudinal studies. *Clin Psychol Rev*. 2021;86:102021. doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2021.102021
- Chen Z, Liao X, Yang J, et al. Association of screen-based activities and risk of self-harm and suicidal behaviors among young people: a systematic review and meta-analysis of longitudinal studies. *Psychiatry Res*. 2024;338:115991. doi:10.1016/j.psychres.2024.115991
- Dibben GO, Martin A, Shore CB, et al. Adolescents' interactive electronic device use, sleep and mental health: a systematic review of prospective studies. *J Sleep Res*. 2023;32(5):e13899. doi:10.1111/jsr.13899
- Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*. 2021;372:n71. doi:10.1136/bmj.n71
- Teague SJ, Hutchinson DM. Digital media exposure and child development: a systematic review. Accessed February 2, 2026. https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display_record.php?ID=CRD42020200446
- National Institutes of Health. *Quality Assessment Tool for Observational Cohort and Cross-Sectional Studies*. National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute; 2014.
- Le Bas G, Aarsman SR, Rogers A, et al. Paternal perinatal depression, anxiety, and stress and child development: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2025;179(8):903-917. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2025.0880

28. Rogers A, Obst S, Teague SJ, et al. Association between maternal perinatal depression and anxiety and child and adolescent development: a meta-analysis. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2020;174(11):1082-1092. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2020.2910
29. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Accessed February 2, 2026. <https://cran.r-project.org/doc/manuals/r-release/fullrefman.pdf>
30. Tipton E. Small sample adjustments for robust variance estimation with meta-regression. *Psychol Methods*. 2015;20(3):375-393. doi:10.1037/met0000011
31. Hedges LV, Tipton E, Johnson MC. Robust variance estimation in meta-regression with dependent effect size estimates. *Res Synth Methods*. 2010;1(1):39-65. doi:10.1002/jrsm.5
32. Fisher Z, Tipton E, Zhipeng H. robumeta: Robust variance meta-regression. Accessed February 2, 2026. <https://cran.r-project.org/package=robumeta>
33. Pustejovsky J, Pekofsky S, Zhang J. clubSandwich: Cluster-robust (sandwich) variance estimators with small-sample corrections. Accessed February 2, 2026. <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/clubSandwich/index.html>
34. Viechtbauer W. metafor: Meta-Analysis Package for R. Accessed February 2, 2026. <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/metafor/index.html>
35. Teague S, Somoray K, Shatte A, et al. Digital media use, child health, and development. Accessed February 2, 2026. <https://osf.io/h3rm9/overview>
36. Higgins JPT, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ*. 2003;327(7414):557-560. doi:10.1136/bmj.327.7414.557
37. Funder DC, Ozer DJ. Evaluating effect size in psychological research: sense and nonsense. *Adv Methods Pract Psychol Sci*. 2019;2(2):156-168. doi:10.1177/2515245919847202
38. Twenge JM, Joiner TE, Rogers ML, Martin GN. Increases in depressive symptoms, suicide-related outcomes, and suicide rates among US adolescents after 2010 and links to increased new media screen time. *Clin Psychol Sci*. 2018;6(1):3-17. doi:10.1177/2167702617723376
39. Rodgers MA, Pustejovsky JE. Evaluating meta-analytic methods to detect selective reporting in the presence of dependent effect sizes. *Psychol Methods*. 2021;26(2):141-160. doi:10.1037/met0000300
40. Page M, Higgins J, Sterne J. Chapter 13: Assessing risk of bias due to missing evidence in a meta-analysis. In: *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions*. 2024. <https://www.cochrane.org/authors/handbooks-and-manuals/handbook/current/chapter-13>
41. Borenstein M, Hedges LV, Higgins JPT, Rothstein HR. *Introduction to Meta-Analysis*. Wiley; 2009. doi:10.1002/9780470743386.
42. Fisher RA. Frequency distribution of the values of the correlation coefficient in samples from an indefinitely large population. *Biometrika*. 1915;10(4):507. doi:10.2307/2331838
43. Mathur MB, VanderWeele TJ. Methods to address confounding and other biases in meta-analyses: review and recommendations. *Annu Rev Public Health*. 2022;43(1):19-35. doi:10.1146/annurev-publhealth-051920-114020
44. Wasserstein RL, Schirm AL, Lazar NA. Moving to a World Beyond "p < 0.05." In: *The American Statistician*. 2019;73(sup1):1-19. doi:10.1080/00031305.2019.1583913
45. Winstone L, Mars B, Haworth CMA, Heron J, Kidger J. Adolescent social media user types and their mental health and well-being: results from a longitudinal survey of 13-14-year-olds in the United Kingdom. *JCPP Adv*. 2022;2(2):e12071. doi:10.1002/jcv2.12071
46. Liu M, Kamper-DeMarco KE, Zhang J, Xiao J, Dong D, Xue P. Time spent on social media and risk of depression in adolescents: a dose-response meta-analysis. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2022;19(9):5164. doi:10.3390/ijerph19095164
47. Rodríguez-Ayllón M, Cadenas-Sánchez C, Estévez-López F, et al. Role of physical activity and sedentary behavior in the mental health of preschoolers, children and adolescents: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Sports Med*. 2019;49(9):1383-1410. doi:10.1007/s40279-019-01099-5
48. Orlando L, Savel KA, Madigan S, Colasanto M, Korczak DJ. Dietary patterns and internalizing symptoms in children and adolescents: a meta-analysis. *Aust N Z J Psychiatry*. 2022;56(6):617-641. doi:10.1177/00048674211031486
49. Cunningham S, Hudson CC, Harkness K. Social media and depression symptoms: a meta-analysis. *Res Child Adolesc Psychopathol*. 2021;49(2):241-253. doi:10.1007/s10802-020-00715-7
50. Keles B, McCrae N, Grealish A. A systematic review: The influence of social media on depression, anxiety and psychological distress in adolescents. *Int J Adolesc Youth*. 2019;25(1):79-93. doi:10.1080/02673843.2019.1590851
51. Nesi J, Prinstein MJ. Using social media for social comparison and feedback-seeking: gender and popularity moderate associations with depressive symptoms. *J Abnorm Child Psychol*. 2015;43(8):1427-1438. doi:10.1007/s10802-015-0020-0
52. Valkenburg P, Beyens I, Pouwels JL, Van Driel II, Keijsers L. Social media use and adolescents' self-esteem: heading for a person-specific media effects paradigm. *J Commun*. 2021;71(1):56-78. doi:10.1093/joc/jqaa039
53. Lee HY, Jamieson JP, Reis HT, et al. Getting fewer "likes" than others on social media elicits emotional distress among victimized adolescents. *Child Dev*. 2020;91(6):2141-2159. doi:10.1111/cdev.13422
54. Gillespie KM, Branjerdporn G, Woerwag Mehta S, Glegg J, Porter M, Bartlett SE. The impact of screen time and social media on youth self-harm behaviour and suicide: a protocol for a systematic reviews. *PLoS ONE*. 2024;19(12):e0314621. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0314621
55. Susi K, Glover-Ford F, Stewart A, Knowles Bevis R, Hawton K. Research review: viewing self-harm images on the internet and social media platforms: systematic review of the impact and associated psychological mechanisms. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry*. 2023;64(8):1115-1139. doi:10.1111/jcpp.13754
56. Russell AM, Davis RE, Ortega JM, Colditz JB, Primack B, Barry AE. #Alcohol: portrayals of alcohol in top videos on TikTok. *J Stud Alcohol Drugs*. 2021;82(5):615-622. doi:10.15288/jsad.2021.82.615
57. Burkhardt J, Lenhard W. A meta-analysis on the longitudinal, age-dependent effects of violent video games on aggression. *Media Psychol*. 2022;25(3):499-512. doi:10.1080/15213269.2021.1980729
58. Pallavicini F, Ferrari A, Mantovani F. Video games for well-being: a systematic review on the application of computer games for cognitive and emotional training in the adult population. *Front Psychol*. 2018;9:2127. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02127
59. Choi E, Shin SH, Ryu JK, Jung KI, Kim SY, Park MH. Commercial video games and cognitive functions: video game genres and modulating factors of cognitive enhancement. *Behav Brain Funct*. 2020;16(1):2. doi:10.1186/s12993-020-0165-z
60. Solmi M, Radua J, Olivola M, et al. Age at onset of mental disorders worldwide: large-scale meta-analysis of 192 epidemiological studies. *Mol Psychiatry*. 2022;27(1):281-295. doi:10.1038/s41380-021-01161-7
61. Orben A, Przybylski AK, Blakemore SJ, Kievit RA. Windows of developmental sensitivity to social media. *Nat Commun*. 2022;13(1):1649. doi:10.1038/s41467-022-29296-3
62. Jarman HK, McLean SA, Griffiths S, et al. Critical measurement issues in the assessment of social media influence on body image. *Body Image*. 2022;40:225-236. doi:10.1016/j.bodyim.2021.12.007
63. Hull JG, Brunelle TJ, Prescott AT, Sargent JD. A longitudinal study of risk-glorifying video games and behavioral deviance. *J Pers Soc Psychol*. 2014;107(2):300-325. doi:10.1037/a0036058
64. Norwegian Government. Norway moves forward with age limit for social media. Accessed February 2, 2026. <https://www.regjeringen.no/en/whats-new/norway-moves-forward-with-age-limit-for-social-media/id3108682>
65. European Commission. Guidelines on measures to ensure a high level of privacy, safety and security for minors online, pursuant to Article 28(4) of Regulation (EU) 2022/2065. Accessed February 2, 2026. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/C/2025/5519/oj>
66. Australian Government's Department of Infrastructure. Transport, Regional Development, Communications, Sports and the Arts. Online safety amendment (social media minimum age) bill 2024-fact sheet. Accessed February 2, 2026. <https://www.infrastructure.gov.au/departments/media/publications/online-safety-amendment-social-media-minimum-age-bill-2024-fact-sheet>
67. Carey EG, Ridler I, Ford TJ, Stringaris A. Editorial perspective: when is a 'small effect' actually large and impactful? *J Child Psychol Psychiatry*. 2023;64(11):1643-1647. doi:10.1111/jcpp.13817
68. Navarro JL, Tudge JRH. Technologizing bronfenbrenner: neo-ecological theory. *Curr Psychol*. 2022;42(22):1-17. doi:10.1007/s12144-022-02738-3
69. Bronfenbrenner U, Ceci SJ. Nature-nurture reconceptualized in developmental perspective: a bioecological model. *Psychol Rev*. 1994;101(4):568-586. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.101.4.568
70. Madigan S, Reich SM. Consideration of developmental stage and the debate on the effects of screens use-not all things are created equal. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2023;177(11):1123-1124. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2023.3670