## Table A.2.h. Prosocial behaviour and sedentary behaviour, children and adolescents

**Questions:** What is the association between **sedentary behaviour** and health-related outcomes? Is there a dose response association (total volume and the frequency, duration and intensity of interruption)? Does the association vary by type and domain of sedentary behaviour?

Population: Children aged 5-under 18 years of age

**Exposure:** Greater volume, decreased frequency, duration or intensity of interruption of sedentary behaviour **Comparison**: Lesser volume, increased frequency, duration or intensity of interruption of sedentary behaviour

Outcome: Prosocial behaviour (e.g., conduct problems, peer relations, social inclusion)

\*Importance: IMPORTANT

Black font is from original GRADE Evidence Profiles from Australian 24-Hour Movement Guidelines for Children (5-12 years) and Young People (12-17 years).(26) Red font denotes additions based on WHO update using review of existing systematic reviews.

	Quality Assessment							
No. of studies/ Study design No. of participants	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectne ss	Imprecision	Other	Summary of findings	Certainty	US PAGAC evidence (27)
Mean baseline age ranged between 5 and 14 years; where mean age was not reported, baseline age ranged from 4 to 18 years and grades 6 to 10. One study did not report age or grade, rather that								
the sample was male guidance school students. Data were collected by randomized controlled trial (n=1), cross-over trial (n=1), longitudinal (n=10), and cross-sectional (n=12) study designs with up to								
21 years follow up. Behavioural conduct/pro-social behaviour was assessed as ADHD symptoms (parent- and teacher-reported ADHD-IV Rating Scale, parental reported Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire), time on task (direct observation), conduct problems (parent-reported Strength and Difficulties								
Questionnaire), pro-social behaviour (parental-reported Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire), pro-social behaviour (parental-reported Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire), criminal conviction (computer system), antisocial personality (modified Diagnostic Interview Schedule,								
self-reported Negative Life Events instrument), personality traits (self-reported Multidimensional Personality Questionnaire), behavioural problems (parental-reported Behavioural Problems Index,								
parental-reported 11-item symptomology checklist, self-reported Achenbach's Youth Questionnaire), aggression/violence (teacher-reported, self-report questionnaire, self-reported Buss and Perry's								

Aggression Questionnaire, parental-reported Child Behavior Checklist, self-reported State-Trait Anger and the Anger Expression Scale), attention/inattention/hyperactivity problems (teacher-reported questionnaire, self- and parental-reported Child Behavior Checklist, parental-reported Strength and Difficulties Questionnaire, self-reported ADHD symptoms scale, parental-reported ADHD Rating

Scale-IV and parent and child attention symptomology checklist), impulsiveness (self-reported Barratt Impulsiveness Scale - II), serious and covert conduct (self-report questionnaire), bullying parent strain (self-reported Kidseana Questionnaire), social problem (withdrawn Idelinguent behaviour (parental reported Child Behavior Checklist)

perpetration (self-reported Kidscape Questionnaire), social problem/withdrawn/delinquent behaviour (parental reported Child Behavior Checklist).								
1	No	Unable to	Serious	No serious	None	Smaller decrease in unfavourable measures of behavioural conduct/pro-social	LOW <sup>c</sup>	Outcome not
Randomize	serious	assess	indirect-	imprecision		behaviour for the sedentary art group compared to the physical activity group		included
d controlled	risk of		ness <sup>b</sup>			for:		
Trial <sup>a</sup>	bias					1) Non-Screen time - 1/1 study (not for parental- or teacher-reported		
						hyperactivity/impulsivity, oppositional behaviour, moodiness, behaviour toward		
n = 202						peers, and reputation with peers and not for teacher-reported inattention).		
No eligible								
reviews								
identified.								
1 Cross-	No	Unable to	No	No serious	None	Unfavourable measures of behavioural conduct/pro-social behaviour for the	VERY	
over Trial <sup>d</sup>	serious	assess	serious	imprecision		sedentary group compared to the physical activity group for:	LOW <sup>e</sup>	
n = 96	risk of		indirect-			1) Non-Screen time - 1/1 study (only for 10-minute exercise break group).		
	bias		ness					
No eligible								
reviews								
identified.								

		1	•	1				
14	Serious	No serious	No	No serious	Dose-	For longitudinal findings, higher sedentary behaviour was associated with	LOW	
Longitudinal	risk of	inconsistency	serious	imprecision	respons	unfavourable measures of behavioural conduct/pro-social behaviour for:		
f	bias <sup>g</sup>		indirect-		е	1) Screen time4/4 studies (not for emotional symptoms,		
			ness		gradient	hyperactivity/inattention, peer relationship problems or pro-social behaviour in		
n = 43,784					h	1 study).		
						2) TV - 5/6 studies (not for violent conviction by age 26yr in 1 study, not for		
No eligible						emotional symptoms, hyperactivity/ inattention, peer relationship problems, or		
reviews						pro-social behaviour for 1 study, only in females for 1 study).		
identified.						3) Video games - 6/9 studies (not for serious or covert conduct problems in 1		
						study).		
						For longitudinal findings, higher sedentary behaviour was associated with		
						favourable measures of behavioural conduct/pro-social behaviour for:		
						1) Computer - 1/2 studies (only in females for 1 study).		
12 Cross-	Serious	No serious	No	No serious	None	Higher sedentary behaviour was associated with unfavourable measures of	VERY	
sectional <sup>j</sup>	risk of	inconsistency	serious	imprecision		behavioural conduct/pro-social behaviour for:	LOW	
0001101101	bias <sup>k</sup>		indirect-			1) Screen time - 1/3 studies.		
n = 95,287	2.00		ness			2) TV - 4/6 studies (not for withdrawn in 1 study, not for parental-reported		
11 00,201			11000			attention problems, or antisocial personality in 1 study).		
No eligible						3) Computer - 3/5 studies (not for anger in and anger control in 1 study).		
reviews						4) <u>Video game</u> - <i>3/4 studies</i> (not for behavioural problems or attention		
identified.						problems in 4 to 8 and 13 to 18 yr olds in 1 study, not for parental-reported		
identified.						attention problems, or antisocial personality in 1 study).		
						5) Higher tech time - 1/1 study each (not for behavioural problems in 4 to 8 yr		
						olds or attention and behavioural problems for 9 to 12 yr olds).		
						olus of attention and benavioural problems for 9 to 12 yr olus).		

Abbreviations: ADHD = attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder; TV = television viewing.

## \*As determined by WHO

<sup>a</sup>Includes 1 randomized controlled trial (245).

blt is unclear if children were engaging in sedentary time during the whole before school period and whether the art class was just replacing other sedentary time.

The quality of evidence for the randomized controlled trial was downgraded to "low" from "high" due to serious indirectness and inability to assess inconsistency (1 study).

dIncludes 1 cross-over trial (246).

eThe quality of evidence for the cross-over trial was downgraded to "very low" from "low" due to inability to assess consistency (1 study).

Includes 14 longitudinal studies (79, 232, 247-254); Allen et al. 2015; Roser et al. 2016; Chaelin et al. 2018; Wu et al. 2018).

<sup>9</sup>Apart from 2 studies (247, 249) information on psychometric properties of the sedentary behaviour items were not provided.

hA dose-response gradient was for higher TV, screen time, computer, and video games with unfavourable behavioural conduct/pro-social behaviour was observed in 69 studies (232, 249-253); Allen et al. 2015; Wu et al. 2018; Chaeli et al. 2018).

<sup>1</sup>The quality of evidence for the longitudinal studies was not upgraded from "low" to "moderate" due to serious risk of bias but was upgraded to "moderate" from "low" for dose-response gradient. <sup>1</sup>Includes 12 cross-sectional studies (41, 125, 236, 240, 255-262).

Apart from 4 studies (41, 236, 240, 260) information on psychometric properties of the sedentary behaviour items were not provided.

<sup>k</sup>Two studies used the German Health Interview and Examination Survey for Children and Adolescents (41, 262).

<sup>1</sup>The quality of evidence for cross-sectional studies was downgraded to "very low" from "low" due to serious risk of bias.