

1 How can digital citizen science approaches improve ethical smartphone use surveillance
2 among youth: traditional surveys versus ecological momentary assessments.

3

4

5

6 Sarah Al-Akshar¹, Sheriff Tolulope Ibrahim¹, Tarun Reddy Katapally^{1,2,3*}

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 ¹ DEpTh Lab, School of Health Studies, Faculty of Health Sciences, Western
18 University, London, Ontario, N6A 3K7, Canada; tarun.katapally@uwo.ca
19 (T.R.K.).

20

21 ² Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Schulich School of Medicine and Dentistry,
22 Western University, London, Ontario, N6A 3K7, Canada; tarun.katapally@uwo.ca.

23

24 ³ Children's Health Research Institute, Lawson Health Research Institute, 750 Base Line
25 Road East, Suite 300, London, Ontario, Canada N6C 2R5

26

27

28

29

30

***Corresponding author**

31

32

Email: tarun.katapally@uwo.ca (TRK)

33

34

35 **Abstract**

36 **Background**

37 Ubiquitous use of smartphones among youth poses significant challenges related to non-
38 communicable diseases, including poor mental health. Although traditional survey measures
39 can be used to assess smartphone use among youth, they are subject to recall bias. This study
40 aims to compare self-reported smartphone use via retrospective modified traditional recall
41 survey and prospective Ecological Momentary Assessments (EMAs) among youth.

42 **Methods**

43 This study uses data from the Smart Platform, which engages with youth as citizen scientists.
44 Youth (N=436) aged 13-21 years in two urban jurisdictions in Canada (Regina and Saskatoon)
45 engaged with our research team using a custom-built application via their own smartphones to
46 report on a range of behaviours and outcomes on eight consecutive days. Youth reported
47 smartphone use utilizing a traditional validated measure, which was modified to capture
48 retrospective smartphone use on both weekdays and weekend days. In addition, daily EMAs
49 were also time-triggered over a period of eight days to capture prospective smartphone use.
50 Demographic, behavioural, and contextual factors were also collected. Data analyses included
51 t-test and linear regression using SPSS statistical software.

52 **Results**

53 There was a significant difference between weekdays, weekends and overall smartphone use
54 reported retrospectively and prospectively (p-value= <0.001), with youth reporting less
55 smartphone use via EMAs. Overall retrospective smartphone use was significantly associated
56 with not having a part-time job ($\beta=0.342$, 95%[CI]=0.146-1.038, p-value =0.010) and

57 participating in a school sports team ($\beta=0.269$, 95%[CI]= 0.075-0.814, p-value=0.019).
58 However, prospective smartphone use reported via EMAs was not associated with any
59 behavioural and contextual factors.

60 **Conclusion**

61 The findings of this study have implications for appropriately understanding and monitoring
62 smartphone use in the digital age among youth. EMAs can potentially minimize recall bias of
63 smartphone use among youth, and other behaviours. More importantly, digital citizen science
64 approaches that engage large populations of youth using their own smartphones can transform
65 how we ethically monitor and mitigate the impact of excessive smartphone use.

66 **Keywords**

67 Digital epidemiology, digital health, digital citizen science, ecological momentary
68 assessments, smartphone use, screentime, youth health

69 **Author Summary**

70 Use of ubiquitous digital devices, particularly smartphones, has experienced an exponential
71 increase among youth, a phenomenon that continues to influence youth health. Although
72 retrospective measures have been used to understand smartphone use among youth, they are
73 prone to measurement and compliance biases. There has been a growing interest in using
74 ecological momentary assessments (EMAs) to assess smartphone use to minimize biases associated
75 with retrospective measures. This study uses the smart framework, which integrates citizen
76 science, community based participatory research and systems science to ethically engage with
77 youth citizen scientists using their own smartphones to understand smartphone use behaviours
78 – reported by the same cohort of youth using both retrospective and prospective measures. The
79 findings show a significant difference between smartphone use reported through retrospective
80 and prospective EMAs, with youth reporting more smartphone use via retrospective measures.
81 Furthermore, there were differences in contextual and behavioural factors that were associated
82 with smartphone use reported via retrospective and prospective measures. The findings have
83 implications for appropriately understanding and monitoring smartphone use in the digital age
84 among youth. More importantly, digital citizen science approaches that engage large
85 populations of youth using their own smartphones can transform how we ethically monitor and
86 mitigate the impact of excessive smartphone use.

87

88

89

90

92 **Background**

93 The prevalence of smartphone usage among the younger population has experienced a
94 significant surge in recent years on a global scale, as evidenced by the fact that 84% of
95 smartphone users fall within the young adult demographic. [1]. Nonetheless, there is still
96 ambiguity regarding how youth use their smartphones and the potential implications of using
97 ubiquitous digital tools such as smartphones [2].

98 In understanding smartphone use among youth, thus far, traditional self-report measures
99 have been predominantly used [3], which pose issues such as recall bias and measurement
100 errors [4,5] . Moreover, smartphone use includes a range of activities that encompass
101 communication, e-learning, entertainment, and social media, among others, which are not
102 captured by traditional survey measures [5].

103 Advanced population health measurement techniques such as ecological momentary
104 assessments (EMAs), can potentially address measurement bias and capture the entire range of
105 smartphone activities [6,7]. EMAs “capture brief, repeated assessments in natural environments
106 with a high degree of ecological validity relative to laboratory-based investigations” [8]. EMAs
107 are prospective measures that provide an advantage in assessing behaviours with respect to the
108 context and the environment of the participants [9]. While traditional surveys are important in
109 understanding behaviour retrospectively, EMAs have the advantage of minimizing recall bias
110 and improving the validity of results [10]. Moreover, EMAs reduce the burden of responding
111 to surveys and improve rates of compliance and feasibility for participants [11], as well as
112 minimize social desirability bias [12].

113 Although current research examines the screentime of youth, including watching TV
114 and playing video games, there is a scarcity of evidence focusing on smartphone use [13]. It is
115 critical to appropriately understand smartphone use among youth to not only inform potential
116 smartphone use recommendations [14], but also to determine appropriate use for digital health
117 interventions [15]. In addition, currently no studies exist that compare retrospectively reported
118 smartphone use using traditional survey measures and prospectively reported smartphone use
119 using EMAs within the same cohort of youth. The objective of this study is to compare
120 smartphone use reported via retrospective surveys and prospective EMAs by engaging with
121 youth citizen scientists via their own smartphones. The study also investigates the demographic,
122 behavioural, and contextual factors that are associated with smartphone use reported via
123 retrospective surveys compared to prospective EMAs.


124 **Methodology**

125 **Study Design**

126 This study is a part of the Smart Platform, which is a citizen science and digital
127 epidemiological initiative for ethical population health surveillance, knowledge translation, and
128 real-time interventions [16]. Smart Platform integrates community-based participatory research
129 and digital citizen science to ethically obtain big data from citizen-owned smartphones[16].
130 The study uses a combination of cross sectional and temporal longitudinal design [17]. The
131 Research Ethics Boards at the Universities of Regina and Saskatchewan approved the Smart
132 Platform's application for research ethics approval (REB # 2017-029).

133 The research team engaged with youth citizen scientists via their smartphones over the
134 course of eight days through the Smart Platform smartphone custom-built application.
135 Youth citizen scientists could download the application through the iOS or Android operating

136 systems. [17]. To understand the retrospective smartphone use behaviours, a modified
137 traditional retrospective recall survey was deployed using a one-time triggered notification on
138 day one, which also collected demographic characteristics, including gender, age, and
139 socioeconomic status (**Figure 1**). The retrospective survey investigated the habits of youth
140 citizen scientists' smartphone use. Later, during a period of eight days, the app triggered daily
141 EMAs to capture prospective smartphone use including weekdays and weekends (**Figure 1**).
142 In addition, youth citizen scientists reported on their school environment, including available
143 facilities and resources at their school, as well as the level of family and friends' involvement
144 and encouragement to perform physical activities[18].



145
146 Figure 1: Deployment structure of prosepective and retrospective surveys

147

148

149 **Participants**

150 To achieve 90% confidence level and a 5% margin of error, a sample size calculation
151 resulted in the sample size to be at least 161. Regina Public and Catholic School Boards were
152 contacted for recruitment of youth citizen scientists, and in-person recruitment sessions were
153 initiated August 31st, 2018, until December 31st of the same year. As a result, a total of 808
154 youth citizen scientists were recruited from five schools (aged 13-21). During the recruitment
155 sessions, researchers demonstrated how to use the smartphone application, youth citizen
156 scientists were able to download and join the study anytime during the recruitment period
157 (August 31st -December 31st, 2018). Informed consent was provided to all youth citizen
158 scientists through the application. However, youth citizen scientists between the ages of 13-16
159 years were required to provide implied inform consent obtained from either their caregiver(s)
160 or parent(s) before the scheduled recruitment sessions [18].

161 **Measures**

162 **Smartphone Use (dependent variables)**

163 Dependent variables were mean on weekdays, weekends, and overall retrospective and
164 prospective (EMAs) smartphone use per day. The retrospective survey questions were deployed
165 on day one of engagement via a custom-built application, while EMAs were deployed daily
166 (8:00 pm-11:30 pm) and were set to expire by 12:00 am.

167 The 9-questions Sedentary Behaviour Questionnaire Survey questions, which is a
168 retrospective traditional data collection tool, was modified to enable the questions to be
169 digitally deployed on citizen scientists smartphones [17]. The retrospective modified survey
170 asked questions such as: “On a typical weekday during the school year, how much time do you
171 spend on your smartphone for internet surfing (e.g., Facebook, Snapchat, Instagram, YouTube,

172 Reddit, reading news, etc.)?”. From youth responses, weekday mean minutes of retrospective
173 smartphone use was derived. Further the retrospective survey asked: “On a typical weekend
174 during the school year, how much time do you spend on your smartphone for internet surfing
175 (e.g., Facebook, Snapchat, Instagram, YouTube, Reddit, reading news, etc.)?”. From youth
176 responses, weekend mean minutes of retrospective smartphone use was derived. The sum of
177 mean weekday and weekend smartphone use was derived and averaged to obtain overall
178 retrospective smartphone use.

179 To ascertain prospective smartphone use, EMA questions asked: “Which of the
180 following did you do yesterday?” With response options to include: “Watched television”,
181 “Internet surfing using desktop/laptop/gaming device/television screen”, “Used smartphone for
182 internet surfing”, “Texted using a phone”, “Played games on smartphones”, “Listened to
183 musing while sitting”, “Played a musical instrument while sitting”, “Did arts and crafts while
184 sitting”, and “Drove or sat in a car/bus.” , “How many minutes did you spend doing this
185 activity?”, and “With whom did you do this activity?” From these responses, weekend mean
186 minutes of prospective smartphone use was derived. To derive overall smartphone use
187 prospectively, a sum of weekday mean minutes of prospective smartphone use and weekend
188 mean minutes of prospective smartphone use was derived and averaged. Both retrospective and
189 prospective overall, weekday, and weekend mean minutes of smartphone use were the primary
190 dependent variables of this study.

191 **School PA environment (independent variable)**

192 To capture School PA environment, the following question was asked: “Do you
193 participate in competitive school sports teams that compete against other schools (e.g., junior
194 varsity or varsity sports)?”, with the three response options being: “Yes”, “No” or “None

195 offered”. Responses were dichotomized into “Disagree”, corresponding to the response options
196 “No” or “None offered”, and “Agree”, corresponding to the response option “Yes”.

197 **Physical Activity Strength training (independent variable)**

198 The retrospective survey captured strength training using the question: “On how many
199 days in the last 7 days did you do exercise to strengthen or tone your muscles (e.g., push-ups,
200 sit-ups, or weight-training)?” with the eight response options being: “0 days,” “1”, “2”, “3”,
201 “4”, “5”, “6”, or “7 days”. The responses were recoded to “less than four days”, and “four days
202 or more”. Another question deployed to capture physical activity was “how many minutes did
203 you spend performing moderate to vigorous physical activity on each day of the week?”.

204 **Social support for PA (independent variables)**

205 Social support for physical activity included family and friends’ support. To capture
206 family involvement with physical activities, the following questions were asked. “How much
207 do your parents, stepparents, or guardians encourage you to be physically active?” with the five
208 response options being: “Strongly encourage”, “Encourage”, “Do not encourage nor
209 discourage”, “Discourage”, or “Strongly discourage”. Responses were dichotomized into
210 “Discourage/neutral”, which combined the response options “Do not encourage nor
211 discourage”, “Discourage”, or “Strongly discourage”, and “Encourage”, which included the
212 response options “Strongly encourage”, or “Encourage”. Finally, youth were asked: “How
213 much do your parents, stepparents, or guardians support you in being physically active (e.g.,
214 driving you to team games, buying you sporting equipment)?” with the four response options
215 being: “Very supportive”, “Supportive”, “Unsupportive”, or “Very unsupportive”. Responses
216 were dichotomized as “Unsupportive/Neutral”, which combined the response options

217 “Unsupportive” and “Very unsupportive”, and “supportive”, which included the response
218 options “Very supportive” and “Supportive”.

219 Peer support for PA was captured by asking youth to think about their friends during
220 the past 12 months when providing answer to this question: “How many of your closest friends
221 are physically active?” with the six response options being: “None of my friends”, “1”, “2”,
222 “3”, “4”, or “5 of my friends.” Responses were dichotomized as “Three or less of my friends”,
223 corresponding to the response option “None of my friends”, “1”, “2”, “3 of my friends” and
224 “Four or more of my friends”, corresponding to “4”, or “5 of my friends.”

225 **Socio-demographic Covariates**

226 The survey asked demographic questions that included parent education level, identity,
227 gender, and age. Question deployed to collect information about parent education level was:
228 “what is the highest education level for your parents?”. Responses were: “elementary”, “high
229 school diploma”, “college”, “university”. Responses were recoded into the following
230 categories: “below Secondary education level” corresponding to “elementary” and “Secondary
231 and above education level” corresponding to “high school diploma”, “college”, “university”.
232 Youth identity was captured by asking the question: “How would you describe your identity?
233 Select all that apply” for which there were 13 response options: “First Nations”, “Dene”,
234 “Cree”, “Metis”, “Inuit”, “African”, “Asian”, “Canadian”, “Caribbean/West Indian”, “Eastern
235 European”, “European”, “South Asian” or “Other (please specify)”. Response options were
236 recoded to result in the following categories due to low count values: “Indigenous Canadians”
237 corresponding to “First Nations”, “Dene”, “Cree”, “Metis”, “Inuit”, “Non-Indigenous
238 Canadians” corresponding to “Canadian” and “Other” corresponding to “Caribbean/West
239 Indian”, “Eastern European”, “European”, “South Asian” or “Other. Further gender was

240 captured by asking: “What is your gender?” which had five response options: “Male”,
241 “Female”, “Transgender”, “Other (please specify)”, or “Prefer not to disclose”. Gender was
242 recoded into three categories: “Female”, “Male”, or “Transgender/other (please specify)/prefer
243 not to disclose”. Age was captured by asking citizen scientists the question “How old are you?
244 (Age in years)”. Part-time job was captured by asking the question “do you have a part-time
245 job?” with response options “yes” and “no”.

246 **Data and risk management**

247 Data were encrypted before being saved on smartphones and sent to servers when a
248 device established a Wi-Fi connection to protect confidentiality. The app's permissions were
249 controlled to avoid accessing any personal data on their smartphones (e.g., contact list or
250 network sites visited). Media Access Control (MAC), which is based on a basic encryption
251 method that is impossible to reverse, was used for anonymization, and to secure the information
252 of citizen scientists. During the process of obtaining informed consent, risks and privacy
253 management alternatives were clearly communicated to the citizen scientists [18].

254 **Data Analysis**

255 Characteristics of the youth citizen scientists were reported using descriptive statistics.
256 Pearson correlation was used to look at the association between smartphone use reported
257 retrospectively and prospectively on weekdays and weekends. A paired sample t-test was
258 conducted to explore if there exists a difference in mean minutes/day of retrospective
259 smartphone use, and mean minutes/day of prospective smartphone use reported on weekday
260 and weekend. Further, this study investigates if there exists a difference in mean minutes of
261 smartphone use per day retrospectively and prospectively based on gender of youth citizen

262 scientists. Multiple linear regression models were conducted to explore the contextual and
 263 behavioural factors associated with retrospective and prospective smartphone use among youth
 264 citizen scientists. Statistical analyses were conducted using IBM SPSS 29.0.0.0 Statistics
 265 Software with a significance level of $p < 0.05$.

266 Results

267 A total of 808 youth citizen scientists participated in the study. However, after excluding
 268 youth citizen scientists who did not provide complete information on key dependent and
 269 independent variables, a total of 436 youth scientists constituted the final sample size. Around
 270 56% of the youth citizen scientists were female, 5% identified as Indigenous and 64.1% did not
 271 have a part-time job (**Table 1**).

272 **Table 1: Summary of characteristics of youth citizen scientists (n=436).**

Variable	
Dependent Variables	Mean [minutes/day] (SD)
Overall retrospective survey smartphone use	250.55 (208.0)
Overall Prospective EMA smartphone use	106.80 (173.4)
Weekday retrospective survey smartphone use	239.20 (205.3)
Weekday Prospective EMA smartphone use	156.21 (177.8)
Weekend retrospective survey smartphone use	297.99 (234.1)
Weekend Prospective EMA smartphone use	157.99 (228.6)
Independent Variables	
Sociodemographic variables	Mean (SD)
Age in years	15.5 (1.6)
Gender	Frequency (%)
Male	161 (38.5)
Female	233 (55.7)
Transgender / Other / Prefer not to disclose	24 (5.7)
Total	418 (100)
Identity	
Indigenous People of Canada	21 (5.0)
Non- Indigenous (Canadian and others)	396 (95)
Total	417 (100)
Part time Job	
Yes	147 (35.9)
No	262 (64.1)
Total	409 (100)

273	Parent Education Level	
	Elementary school	12 (2.8)
	Secondary school and above	421 (97.2)
274	Total	433 (100)
	School PA environment	
	Participating in sports team at school	
275	No	157 (37.9)
	Yes	257 (62.1)
	Total	414 (100)
276	Physical Activity Strength	
	Muscle training in past 7 days	
	Less than 4 days	265 (64.3)
277	4 days or more	147 (35.7)
	Total	412 (100)
	Social support for PA	
278	Family members in household encourages PA	
	Discourage/neutral	142 (33.4)
	Encourage	283 (66.6)
279	Total	425 (100)
	Family support for PA	
	Unsupportive/neutral	49(11.8)
280	Supportive	366(88.2)
	Total	415(100)
	Friends who are physically active	
	Three or less	47 (11.3)
	Four or more	368 (88.7)
	Total	415 (100)

281

282 There was a significant difference between overall (weekdays+weekend days) mean
283 minutes of smartphone use/day reported retrospectively (250.55 minutes/day) and
284 prospectively (106.80 minutes/day) (**Table 2**). Similarly, youth also reported more smartphone
285 use on both weekdays and weekend days using retrospective surveys (239.20 minutes/day;
286 297.99 minutes/day), compared to smartphone use reported prospectively via EMAs (156.21
287 minutes/day; 157.99 minutes/day). This pattern continued among females, but not males (**Table**
288 **3**). There was a significant difference between overall (weekdays+weekend days), and
289 weekdays mean smartphone use reported retrospectively (270 minutes, 257.92 minutes) and
290 prospectively (88.12 minutes, 138.91) among female youth citizen scientists ($p<0.001$).

291 However, there was no significant difference between weekend mean smartphone use reported
 292 retrospectively and prospectively among female citizen scientists.

293 **Table 2: Paired sample t-test result showing the differences between smartphone use**
 294 **retrospectively and prospectively.**

Overall	Mean	t-value	df	N	p-value
Minutes of smartphone use reported retrospectively	250.55	6.460	90	91	<0.001
Minutes of smartphone use reported prospectively	106.80				
Weekday					
Minutes of smartphone use reported retrospectively	239.20	3.087	55	56	<0.001
Minutes of smartphone use reported prospectively	156.21				
Weekend					
Minutes of smartphone use reported retrospectively	297.99	4.202	66	67	<0.001
Minutes of smartphone use reported prospectively	157.99				

295

296 **Table 3: Paired sample t-test result showing the differences between smartphone use**
 297 **retrospectively and prospectively based on gender.**

Overall	Female					Male				
	Mean	t-value	df	N	p-value	Mean	t-value	df	N	p-value
Overall smartphone use reported retrospectively	270.00	8.308	58	59	<0.001	219.44	1.556	30	31	0.130
Overall smartphone use reported prospectively	88.12					144.28				
Weekday										
Weekday smartphone use reported retrospectively	257.92	3.983	35	36	<0.001	212.37	0.319	18	19	0.753
Weekday smartphone use reported prospectively	138.91					195.37				
Weekend										
Weekend smartphone use reported retrospectively	318.29	5.865	40	41	0.022	274.20	0.975	24	25	0.339
Weekend smartphone use reported prospectively	131.63					205.14				

298

299 After controlling for demographic characteristics (age, gender, and identity), results of
 300 the multiple linear regression models exploring social and contextual factors associated with
 301 overall, weekday, and weekend smartphone use reported via retrospectively surveys and
 302 prospective EMAs are portrayed in tables 4, 5, and 6, respectively. Within the overall

303 retrospective model (**Table 4 – Model 1**), youth citizen scientists who reported having a part-
 304 time job ($\beta=0.342$, 95% confidence interval [CI]=0.146, 1.038, p-value = 0.010) reported more
 305 smartphone use compared to youth citizen scientists who did not have part-time jobs. Similarly,
 306 youth citizen scientist who reported participating in a school sports team ($\beta=0.269$, 95%[CI]=
 307 0.075, 0.814, p-value=0.019) reported more smartphone use in comparison to youth who did
 308 not participate in a school sports team. However, none of these relationships was found to be
 309 significant in the prospective EMA model (**Table 4-Model 2**).

310 **Table 4: Linear Regression models of overall smartphone use reported retrospectively**
 311 **vs. prospectively.**

Variables	Retrospective (Model 1)		Prospective (Model 2)	
	Standardized Co efficients Beta	(95% CI) p- value	Standardized Co efficient Beta	(95% CI) p-value
(constant)		(-0.856-5.221) 0.156		(-0.402-9.789) 0.070
Sociodemographic variables				
Parent Education level: Below secondary school (Ref)				
Secondary school and above	0.175	(-0.063-0.678) 0.103	0.149	(-0.231-1.009) 0.214
Part-time job: Yes (Ref)				
Not having a part time job	0.342	(0.146-1.038) 0.010***	-0.010	(-0.780-0.731) 0.948
Physical Activity Strength				
Moderate to vigorous physical activity per day	0.222	(-0.017-0.475) 0.068	0.166	(-0.155-0.667) 0.218
Muscle training: less than 4 days (Ref)				
Muscle Training- 4 days or more	0.129	(-0.145-0.568) 0.241	-0.214	(-1.119-0.076) 0.086
School PA environment				
Participating in a sports team: No (Ref)				
Participating in a sports team	0.269	(0.075-0.814) 0.019***	-0.076	(-0.806-0.430) 0.546
Family and Friends involvement in PA				
Family support for physical activity: Unsupportive/neutral (Ref)				
Family support for physical activity: Supportive	0.221	(-0.021-0.976) 0.060	0.035	(-0.719-0.943) 0.789
Family encouragement for physical activity: Discourage/neutral (Ref)				
Family encouragement for physical activity: Encourage	-0.062	(-0.517-0.295) 0.586	-0.140	(-1.054-0.313) 0.283
Number of physically active friends: Three or less (Ref)				

Four or more physically active friends	-0.046	(-0.444-0.299) 0.698	0.050	(-0.509-0.743) 0.711
*** $p < 0.05$ all regression models controlled for: age, gender, and identity				

312

313 In the weekday retrospective regression model (**Table 5 – Model 3**), youth who reported their
 314 parents had attained education levels at Secondary school and above ($\beta= 0.223$, 95%[CI]=
 315 0.030, 0.785, p -value=0.035) were significantly associated with more minutes of smartphone
 316 use compared to youth whose parents had only elementary school education. Similarly, youth
 317 who reported having family support for physical activity ($\beta=0.246$, 95%[CI]= 0.021, 1.037, p -
 318 value=0.042) reported more smartphone use, compared to youth who do not have family
 319 support for physical activity. In addition, youth who did not have a part-time job ($\beta= 0.313$,
 320 95%[CI]= 0.086, 0.995, p -value=0.020) were significantly associated with more weekday
 321 smartphone use compared to youth who had a part-time job. These associations were not found
 322 to be significant in the prospective model (**Table 5 – Model 4**)

323 **Table 5: Linear regression models of weekday smartphone use reported retrospectively**
 324 **vs. prospectively.**

	Retrospective (Model 3)		Prospective (Model 4)	
	Standardized Coefficients Beta	(95% CI) P-value	Standardized Coefficient Beta	(95% CI) P-value
(constant)		(-1.305-4.890) 0.252		(-1.588- 10.778) 0.140
Sociodemographic variables				
Parent Education level: Below secondary school (Ref)				
Secondary school and above	0.233	(0.030-0.785) 0.035***	0.135	(-0.398- 0.983) 0.396
Part-time job: Yes (Ref)				
Not having a part time job	0.313	(0.086-0.995) 0.020***	0.150	(-0.490- 1.111) 0.437
Physical Activity Strength				
Moderate to vigorous physical activity per day	0.158	(-0.088-0.414) 0.200	0.218	(-0.209- 0.805) 0.241
Muscle training: less than 4 days (Ref)				

Muscle Training- 4 days or more	0.150	(-0.118-0.609) 0.182	-0.204	(-1.176-0.307) 0.242
School PA environment				
Participating in a sports team: No (Ref)				
Participating in a sports team	0.197	(-0.053-0.701) 0.090	-0.044	(-0.804-0.622) 0.798
Family and friends' involvement in PA				
Family support for physical activity: Unsupportive/neutral (Ref)				
Family support for physical activity: Supportive	0.246	(0.021-1.037) 0.042***	-0.025	(-1.082-0.933) 0.882
Family encouragement for physical activity: Discourage/neutral (Ref)				
Family encouragement for physical activity: encourage	-0.073	(-0.543-0.285) 0.535	-0.187	(-1.306-0.431) 0.314
Number of physically active friends: Three or less (Ref)				
Four or more physically active friends	-0.088	(-0.516-0.240) 0.469	-0.039	(-0.867-0.702) 0.832
*** $p < 0.05$ all regression models controlled for: age, gender, and identity				

325

326 In the weekend retrospective model (**Table 6 - Model 5**), youth citizen scientists who did not
 327 have a part-time job ($\beta=0.333$, 95%[CI]= 0.133, 1.182, p-value=0.015) reported significantly
 328 greater smartphone use in comparison with had a part-time job. Similarly, youth who reported
 329 participating in a school sports team was found to be associated with more smartphone use
 330 ($\beta=0.261$, 95%[CI]= 0.057, 0.927, p-value=0.027) as compared to youth who did not report
 331 participating in school sports team. However, these significant associations were not found in
 332 the prospective EMA model (**Table 6 – Model 6**).

333 **Table 6: Linear regression models of weekends smartphone use reported retrospectively**
 334 **vs. prospectively.**

	Retrospective (Model 5)		Prospective (Model 6)	
	Standardized Coefficients Beta	(95% CI) p-value	Standardized Co efficient Beta	(95% CI) p-value
(constant)		(-2.463-4.686) 0.537		(-2.055-10.685) 0.180
Sociodemographic variables				
Parent Education level: Below secondary school (Ref)				
Secondary school and above	0.122	(-0.192-0.680) 0.268	0.147	(-0.328-1.050) 0.298

Part-time job: Yes (Ref)				
Not having a part time job	0.333	(0.133-1.182) 0.015***	-0.115	(-1.197-0.604) 0.511
Physical Activity Strength				
Moderate to vigorous physical activity per day	0.220	(-0.030-0.550) 0.078	0.209	(-0.151-0.711) 0.197
Muscle training: less than 4 days (Ref)				
Muscle Training- 4 days or more	0.099	(-0.235-0.605) 0.382	-0.156	(-1.034-0.330) 0.304
School PA environment				
Participating in a sports team: No (Ref)				
Participating in a sports team	0.261	(0.057-0.927) 0.027***	-0.088	(-0.870-0.466) 0.547
Family and Friends involvement in PA				
Family support for physical activity: Unsupportive/neutral (Ref)				
Family support for physical activity: Supportive	0.166	(-0.177-0.996) 0.168	0.025	(-0.852-0.989) 0.881
Family encouragement for physical activity: Discourage/neutral (Ref)				
Family encouragement for physical activity: encourage	-0.043	(-0.566-0.389) 0.713	-0.116	(-0.973-0.424) 0.433
Number of physically active friends: Three or less (Ref)				
Four or more physically active friends	0.015	(-0.410-0.463) 0.904	-0.061	(-0.830-0.570) 0.711
*** $p < 0.05$ all regression models controlled for: age, gender, and identity				

335 Discussion

336 The objective of this study was to compare smartphone use reported via retrospective
337 surveys and prospective EMAs by engaging with youth citizen scientists via their own
338 smartphones. The study also investigated the behavioural, and contextual factors that are
339 associated with smartphone use reported via retrospective surveys and prospective EMAs. The
340 primary findings of this study show that there is a significant difference in smartphone use
341 reported retrospectively (via validated surveys) and prospectively (via EMAs). While evidence
342 generally indicates that retrospective data collection is prone to bias irrespective of over- or
343 under-estimation [19–21], to our knowledge, no research has been carried out to compare
344 retrospective recall surveys and prospective EMAs to assess smartphone use within the same
345 cohort of participants.

346 While there is some evidence of over-estimation of sedentary behaviours when
347 reporting retrospectively [19], and discrepancies between reporting smartphone use between
348 males and females [22], our study is the first digital epidemiological investigation that
349 compared smartphone use reporting retrospectively and prospectively among the same cohort
350 of youth. There is some evidence that individuals who are more socially engaged might over-
351 estimate their smartphone use, while individuals who under-estimate their smartphone use may
352 have lost track of time [20]. In general, evidence indicates that prospective measurement of
353 behaviours using EMAs is more accurate due to less susceptibility to recall bias [17,23].

354 Although the World Health Organization guidelines indicate that youth aged 15-18
355 should not spend more than two hours of screentime per day [24], current evidence indicates
356 that youth across the world spend significantly more time than two hours/day on screens
357 [25,26]. The uncontrolled screentime has detrimental effects on both physical and mental health
358 leading to increased risk of non-communicable chronic diseases such as obesity, diabetes, heart
359 diseases, reduced sleep quality as well as stress, anxiety, and depression [27]. More
360 importantly, the screentime guidelines do not specify the time that youth should spend on
361 mobile devices, particularly smartphones, which most youth have access to in this digital age
362 [28,29]. This gap in guidelines needs to be addressed, particularly because smartphones are the
363 primary devices of day-to-day functioning, yet ironically excessive smartphone use is also
364 associated with poor youth health outcomes [4,14,30]

365 However, to understand associations between smartphone use and youth health
366 outcomes, it is imperative to obtain valid and reliable data, which, again ironically is possible
367 via smartphones themselves due to their near universal usage among youth [4,31]. This study
368 utilized the Smart platform [18], a digital citizen science platform that engaged youth as citizen

369 scientists to obtain both retrospective and prospective smartphone use via their own
370 smartphones [6].

371 This approach also enabled our team to obtain relevant data on behavioral, contextual,
372 and demographic factors to investigate the association of these variables with both retrospective
373 and prospective smartphone use among youth. Moreover, as evidence indicates that
374 smartphone use and screentime in general varies between weekdays and weekend days [4,30]
375 this study explored the association of behavioural and contextual factors with overall
376 (weekday+weekend day) youth smartphone use, as well as weekday and weekend day
377 smartphone use reported by both retrospective surveys and prospective EMAs.

378 One consistent finding was that there were no significant associations between socio-
379 demographic and contextual factors with overall, weekday, and weekend day smartphone use
380 reported via EMAs.

381 However, retrospective models showed some common associations between
382 sociodemographic and contextual factors with overall, weekday and weekend day smartphone
383 use. Youth who reported that they did not have a part-time job also reported significantly more
384 overall, and weekend day smartphone use in comparison with youth who had a part-time job -
385 a finding that is consistent with some existing evidence [33], and potentially an indication that
386 youth, due to the nature of part-time work they do, do not have access to smartphones
387 consistently.

388 Interestingly, youth who participated in sports teams also reported greater overall and
389 weekend day smartphone use. This finding contradicts existing evidence that shows lower
390 smartphone use among students that participate in school sports teams [34]. However, some
391 studies also report increased social media engagement among students during school sporting

392 events, which may explain increased smartphone use association with participation in school
393 sports teams [35].

394 The findings of this study also showed that youth whose parents had at least secondary
395 school education reported higher smartphone use on weekdays, another contradictory finding
396 because current evidence indicates that higher parental education is associated with lower
397 smartphone use among children and youth [36]. Likewise, youth who reported family support
398 for physical activity also reported higher smartphone use, another unexpected association that
399 could potentially be attributed to social desirability bias, where individuals report more support
400 for physical activity [37].

401 Irrespective of the direction of association of contextual and sociodemographic
402 variables, there are some important aspects that need to be highlighted in understanding
403 smartphone use in general, and in particular among youth. First, all significant findings were
404 depicted in the retrospective smartphone use reporting models, and no significant findings were
405 depicted in the prospective smartphone use reporting (EMAs). This in itself is a major finding
406 that emphasizes the rationale for conducting this study – it is critical that more accurate
407 measures of reporting be standardized to understand smartphone use because retrospective self-
408 reporting data collection tools are prone to bias and misclassification [14,32,38].

409 Second, it is imperative to appreciate the complexity of smartphone use, which includes
410 various behaviours and motivations, such as social media use, gaming, and texting, among
411 others, which have varying associations with health outcomes [40–43]. To capture these
412 effectively and accurately, it is critical to move towards prospective measures such as EMAs
413 that minimize recall bias, particularly when the reporting is complicated by the range of
414 behaviours [44]. Objective measures provide accurate overall smartphone use estimates [6],

415 however, to capture the variation of smartphone use ethically, while preserving privacy can be
416 challenging [45]. Finally, the contextual and sociodemographic associations of smartphone use
417 also have to be captured prospectively to minimize bias, while again, appreciating the
418 complexity of smartphone access itself [11]. For instance, youth from affluent households with
419 more educated parents might have easier and earlier access to smartphones, which could in
420 itself contradict accepted patterns that associate higher socioeconomic status with more positive
421 health behaviours and outcomes [46,47].

422 Perhaps more importantly, the approaches we use to capture digital data ethically from
423 citizens need to be revisited. In scientific research settings, power often lies with those who
424 have knowledge such as researchers, which has been an obstacle for meaningful data
425 collection, particularly if the data are sensitive and need to be obtained via citizen devices [48].
426 Digital citizen science is an approach that can democratize science through engagement with
427 citizens ethically and directly to obtain prospective big data [49,50]– an approach that was
428 utilized in collected data from youth in this study via their own smartphones [6,51].

429 Appropriate measurement of smartphone use among youth is critical to not only inform
430 potential smartphone use recommendations [14], but also to determine appropriate use for
431 digital health interventions [15] that have the potential to address mental health illnesses at
432 reduced cost and improve access to resources [31], a measurement that could potentially be
433 improved via digital citizen science approaches [14,18].

434 **Strengths and limitations**

435 No studies have compared smartphone use among youth using validated retrospective
436 traditional surveys and prospective EMAs. The strengths of this study include utilizing citizen
437 science approaches, where youth used their own devices to engage with the researchers. The

438 key limitation is that the smartphone use reported in this study does not delineate between the
439 different types of smartphone use informed by varied motivations – social media, texting,
440 gaming, among others. Another limitation is that data were collected during one season even
441 though there is evidence that screentime and sedentary behaviours are influenced by changes
442 in weather [56,57]. Future studies should not only measure different types of smartphone use,
443 but also aim to capture objective data to improve accuracy of reporting, while taking seasonality
444 into consideration [58].

445 **Conclusion**

446 The findings of this study have implications for appropriately understanding and
447 monitoring smartphone use in the digital age among youth. EMAs can potentially minimize
448 recall bias of smartphone use among youth, and other behaviours. More importantly, digital
449 citizen science approaches that engage large populations of youth using their own smartphones
450 can transform how we ethically monitor and mitigate the impact of excessive smartphone use.

451

453 **References**

- 454 1. Ratan ZA, Parrish A-M, Alotaibi MS, Hosseinzadeh H. Prevalence of Smartphone
455 Addiction and Its Association with Sociodemographic, Physical and Mental Well-Being: A
456 Cross-Sectional Study among the Young Adults of Bangladesh. *Int J Environ Res Public*
457 *Health*. 2022;19:16583.
- 458 2. LeBlanc AG, Gunnell KE, Prince SA, Saunders TJ, Barnes JD, Chaput J-P. The Ubiquity
459 of the Screen: An Overview of the Risks and Benefits of Screen Time in Our Modern World.
460 *Translational Journal of the American College of Sports Medicine*. 2017;2:104.
- 461 3. Ryding FC, Kuss DJ. Passive objective measures in the assessment of problematic
462 smartphone use: A systematic review. *Addictive Behaviors Reports*. 2020;11:100257.
- 463 4. Brodersen K, Hammami N, Katapally TR. Is excessive smartphone use associated with
464 weight status and self-rated health among youth? A smart platform study. *BMC Public*
465 *Health*. 2023;23:234.
- 466 5. Hale L, Guan S. Screen time and sleep among school-aged children and adolescents: a
467 systematic literature review. *Sleep Med Rev*. 2015;21:50–8.
- 468 6. Katapally TR, Hammami N, Chu LM. A randomized community trial to advance digital
469 epidemiological and mHealth citizen scientist compliance: A smart platform study. *PLOS*
470 *ONE*. 2021;16:e0259486.
- 471 7. Dunton GF. Ecological Momentary Assessment in Physical Activity Research. *Exercise*
472 *and Sport Sciences Reviews*. 2017;45:48.
- 473 8. Russell MA, Gajos JM. Annual Research Review: Ecological momentary assessment
474 studies in child psychology and psychiatry. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry*. 2020;61:376–94.
- 475 9. Perski O, Keller J, Kale D, Asare BY-A, Schneider V, Powell D, et al. Understanding
476 health behaviours in context: A systematic review and meta-analysis of ecological momentary
477 assessment studies of five key health behaviours. *Health Psychol Rev*. 16:576–601.
- 478 10. Asselbergs J, Ruwaard J, Ejdys M, Schrader N, Sijbrandij M, Riper H. Mobile Phone-
479 Based Unobtrusive Ecological Momentary Assessment of Day-to-Day Mood: An Explorative
480 Study. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*. 2016;18:e5505.
- 481 11. Romanzini CLP, Romanzini M, Batista MB, Barbosa CCL, Shigaki GB, Dunton G, et al.
482 Methodology Used in Ecological Momentary Assessment Studies About Sedentary Behavior
483 in Children, Adolescents, and Adults: Systematic Review Using the Checklist for Reporting
484 Ecological Momentary Assessment Studies. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*.
485 2019;21:e11967.

- 486 12. Katapally TR, Chu LM. Digital epidemiological and citizen science methodology to
487 capture prospective physical activity in free-living conditions: a SMART Platform study.
488 *BMJ Open*. 2020;10:e036787.
- 489 13. Atkin AJ, Sharp SJ, Corder K, van Sluijs EMF. Prevalence and Correlates of Screen Time
490 in Youth: An International Perspective. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*.
491 2014;47:803–7.
- 492 14. Brodersen K, Hammami N, Katapally TR. Smartphone Use and Mental Health among
493 Youth: It Is Time to Develop Smartphone-Specific Screen Time Guidelines. *Youth*.
494 2022;2:23–38.
- 495 15. Katapally TR. Smart Indigenous Youth: The Smart Platform Policy Solution for Systems
496 Integration to Address Indigenous Youth Mental Health. *JMIR Pediatrics and Parenting*.
497 2020;3:e21155.
- 498 16. Katapally TR. The SMART Framework: Integration of Citizen Science, Community-
499 Based Participatory Research, and Systems Science for Population Health Science in the
500 Digital Age. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth*. 2019;7:e14056.
- 501 17. Ibrahim ST, Hammami N, Katapally TR. Traditional surveys versus ecological
502 momentary assessments: digital citizen science approaches to improve ethical physical
503 activity surveillance among youth [Internet]. *medRxiv*; 2023 [cited 2023 Aug 7]. p.
504 2023.06.06.23291067. Available from:
505 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2023.06.06.23291067v1>
- 506 18. Katapally TR, Bhawra J, Leatherdale ST, Ferguson L, Longo J, Rainham D, et al. The
507 SMART Study, a Mobile Health and Citizen Science Methodological Platform for Active
508 Living Surveillance, Integrated Knowledge Translation, and Policy Interventions:
509 Longitudinal Study. *JMIR Public Health and Surveillance*. 2018;4:e8953.
- 510 19. Andorko ND, Rakhshan-Rouhakhtar P, Hinkle C, Mittal VA, McAllister M, DeVlyder J,
511 et al. Assessing validity of retrospective recall of physical activity in individuals with
512 psychosis-like experiences. *Psychiatry Research*. 2019;273:211–7.
- 513 20. Hodes LN, Thomas KGF. Smartphone Screen Time: Inaccuracy of self-reports and
514 influence of psychological and contextual factors. *Computers in Human Behavior*.
515 2021;115:106616.
- 516 21. Wang X, Li Y, Fan H. The associations between screen time-based sedentary behavior
517 and depression: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Public Health*. 2019;19:1524.
- 518 22. Andone I, Błaszkiwicz K, Eibes M, Trendafilov B, Montag C, Markowitz A. How age
519 and gender affect smartphone usage. *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM International Joint*
520 *Conference on Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing: Adjunct* [Internet]. New York, NY,
521 USA: Association for Computing Machinery; 2016 [cited 2023 Sep 11]. p. 9–12. Available
522 from: <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/2968219.2971451>

- 523 23. Degroote L, DeSmet A, De Bourdeaudhuij I, Van Dyck D, Crombez G. Content validity
524 and methodological considerations in ecological momentary assessment studies on physical
525 activity and sedentary behaviour: a systematic review. *International Journal of Behavioral*
526 *Nutrition and Physical Activity*. 2020;17:35.
- 527 24. Chaput J-P, Willumsen J, Bull F, Chou R, Ekelund U, Firth J, et al. 2020 WHO guidelines
528 on physical activity and sedentary behaviour for children and adolescents aged 5–17 years:
529 summary of the evidence. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*. 2020;17:141.
- 530 25. Alosaimi FD, Alyahya H, Alshahwan H, Mahyijari NA, Shaik SA. Smartphone addiction
531 among university students in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. *Saudi Med J*. 2016;37:675–83.
- 532 26. Kelly S, Stephens J, Hoying J, McGovern C, Melnyk BM, Militello L. A systematic
533 review of mediators of physical activity, nutrition, and screen time in adolescents:
534 Implications for future research and clinical practice. *Nursing Outlook*. 2017;65:530–48.
- 535 27. Stiglic N, Viner RM. Effects of screentime on the health and well-being of children and
536 adolescents: a systematic review of reviews. *BMJ Open*. 2019;9:e023191.
- 537 28. Bull FC, Al-Ansari SS, Biddle S, Borodulin K, Buman MP, Cardon G, et al. World
538 Health Organization 2020 guidelines on physical activity and sedentary behaviour. *Br J*
539 *Sports Med*. 2020;54:1451–62.
- 540 29. Sampasa-Kanyinga H, Colman I, Goldfield GS, Janssen I, Wang J, Podinic I, et al.
541 Combinations of physical activity, sedentary time, and sleep duration and their associations
542 with depressive symptoms and other mental health problems in children and adolescents: a
543 systematic review. *The International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*
544 [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2023 Nov 29];17. Available from:
545 https://journals.scholarsportal.info/details/14795868/v17inone/nfp_copastcaaasr.xml
- 546 30. Tang S, Werner-Seidler A, Torok M, Mackinnon AJ, Christensen H. The relationship
547 between screen time and mental health in young people: A systematic review of longitudinal
548 studies. *Clinical Psychology Review*. 2021;86:102021.
- 549 31. Liverpool S, Mota CP, Sales CMD, Čuš A, Carletto S, Hancheva C, et al. Engaging
550 Children and Young People in Digital Mental Health Interventions: Systematic Review of
551 Modes of Delivery, Facilitators, and Barriers. *J Med Internet Res*. 2020;22:e16317.
- 552 32. Katapally TR, Chu LM. Methodology to Derive Objective Screen-State from
553 Smartphones: A SMART Platform Study. *International Journal of Environmental Research*
554 *and Public Health*. 2019;16:2275.
- 555 33. Kalenkoski CM, Pabilonia SW. Time to Work or Time to Play: The Effect of Student
556 Employment on Homework, Sleep, and Screen Time [Internet]. Rochester, NY; 2010 [cited
557 2023 Sep 12]. Available from: <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=1530670>
- 558 34. Tükel Y. Investigation of the Relationship between Smartphone Addiction and Leisure
559 Satisfaction of University Students. *IJTES*. 2020;4:218–26.

- 560 35. Kim Y, Wang Y, Oh J. Digital Media Use and Social Engagement: How Social Media
561 and Smartphone Use Influence Social Activities of College Students. *Cyberpsychology,*
562 *Behavior, and Social Networking.* 2016;19:264–9.
- 563 36. Pons M, Bennasar-Veny M, Yañez AM. Maternal Education Level and Excessive
564 Recreational Screen Time in Children: A Mediation Analysis. *International Journal of*
565 *Environmental Research and Public Health.* 2020;17:8930.
- 566 37. Adams SA, Matthews CE, Ebbeling CB, Moore CG, Cunningham JE, Fulton J, et al. The
567 Effect of Social Desirability and Social Approval on Self-Reports of Physical Activity.
568 *American Journal of Epidemiology.* 2005;161:389–98.
- 569 38. Katapally T. It is time to integrate citizen science, community- based participatory
570 research, and systems science through ubiquitous digital tools to inform active, healthy
571 planetary policies.
- 572 39. Lee PH, Macfarlane DJ, Lam T, Stewart SM. Validity of the international physical
573 activity questionnaire short form (IPAQ-SF): A systematic review. *International Journal of*
574 *Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity.* 2011;8:115.
- 575 40. Paulus FW, Ohmann S, von Gontard A, Popow C. Internet gaming disorder in children
576 and adolescents: a systematic review. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology.*
577 2018;60:645–59.
- 578 41. Kuss DJ, Griffiths MD. Internet gaming addiction: A systematic review of empirical
579 research. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction.* 2012;10:278–96.
- 580 42. Hussain Z, Griffiths MD. Problematic Social Networking Site Use and Comorbid
581 Psychiatric Disorders: A Systematic Review of Recent Large-Scale Studies. *Frontiers in*
582 *Psychiatry [Internet].* 2018 [cited 2023 Dec 19];9. Available from:
583 https://journals.scholarsportal.info/details/16640640/v9inone/nfp_psnuasrorls.xml
- 584 43. Katapally TR, Laxer RE, Qian W, Leatherdale ST. Do school physical activity policies
585 and programs have a role in decreasing multiple screen time behaviours among youth?
586 *Preventive Medicine.* 2018;110:106–13.
- 587 44. Katapally TR, Audur Sjöfn T, Rachel L, Wei Q, Scott T. L. Original quantitative research
588 The association of school connectedness and bullying involvement with multiple screen-time
589 behaviours among youth in two Canadian provinces: a COMPASS study. *Health Promot*
590 *Chronic Dis Prev Can.* 2018;38:368–79.
- 591 45. Lustgarten SD, Garrison YL, Sinnard MT, Flynn AW. Digital privacy in mental
592 healthcare: current issues and recommendations for technology use. *Current Opinion in*
593 *Psychology.* 2020;36:25–31.
- 594 46. Marttila-Tornio K, Männikkö N, Ruotsalainen H, Miettunen J, Kääriäinen M. Lower
595 parental socioeconomic status in childhood and adolescence predicts unhealthy health

- 596 behaviour patterns in adolescence in Northern Finland. *Scandinavian Journal of Caring*
597 *Sciences*. 2021;35:742–52.
- 598 47. Curtis ME, Clingan SE, Guo H, Zhu Y, Mooney LJ, Hser Y-I. Disparities in digital access
599 among American rural and urban households and implications for telemedicine-based
600 services. *The Journal of Rural Health*. 2022;38:512–8.
- 601 48. Groot B, Abma T. Ethics framework for citizen science and public and patient
602 participation in research. *BMC Medical Ethics*. 2022;23:23.
- 603 49. Kullenberg C, Kasperowski D. What Is Citizen Science? – A Scientometric Meta-
604 Analysis. *PLOS ONE*. 2016;11:e0147152.
- 605 50. Tauginienė L, Butkevičienė E, Vohland K, Heinisch B, Daskolia M, Suškevičs M, et al.
606 Citizen science in the social sciences and humanities: the power of interdisciplinarity.
607 *Palgrave Commun*. 2020;6:1–11.
- 608 51. Rosas LG, Rodriguez Espinosa P, Montes Jimenez F, King AC. The Role of Citizen
609 Science in Promoting Health Equity. *Annual Review of Public Health*. 2022;43:215–34.
- 610 52. Uhlhaas P, Torous J. Digital tools for youth mental health. *npj Digit Med*. 2019;2:1–3.
- 611 53. Walker S, Kannan P, Bhawra J, Foulds H, Katapally TR. The Impact of Culture, Identity
612 and Intergenerational Connections on Indigenous Youth Mental Health: Qualitative Findings
613 from a Longitudinal Digital Health Community Trial [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2023 Sep 12].
614 Available from: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-956256/v1>
- 615 54. Tan Y-R, Agrawal A, Matsoso MP, Katz R, Davis SLM, Winkler AS, et al. A call for
616 citizen science in pandemic preparedness and response: beyond data collection. *BMJ Glob*
617 *Health*. 2022;7:e009389.
- 618 55. Nations U. Capacity-Building [Internet]. United Nations. United Nations; [cited 2023 Sep
619 12]. Available from: <https://www.un.org/en/academic-impact/capacity-building>
- 620 56. Katapally TR, Rainham D, Muhajarine N. The Influence of Weather Variation, Urban
621 Design and Built Environment on Objectively Measured Sedentary Behaviour in Children.
622 *AIMS Public Health*. 2016;3:663–81.
- 623 57. Zheng C, Feng J, Huang W, Wong SH-S. Associations between weather conditions and
624 physical activity and sedentary time in children and adolescents: A systematic review and
625 meta-analysis. *Health & Place*. 2021;69:102546.
- 626 58. Katapally TR, Rainham D, Muhajarine N. A methodology to leverage cross-sectional
627 accelerometry to capture weather’s influence in active living research. *Can J Public Health*.
628 2016;107:e30–6.
- 629