

1 **Screen Time is Associated with Cardiometabolic and Cardiovascular Disease Risk in**
2 **Childhood and Adolescence**

3 *David Horner, MD MSc¹, Marie Jahn, MD¹, Klaus Bønnelykke, MD PhD, Bo Chawes, MD PhD DMSc¹,*
4 *Trine Flensburg-Madsen, PhD DMSc², Ann-Marie Malby Schoos PhD¹⁺³, Jakob Stokholm, MD*
5 *PhD¹⁺³⁺⁴, Morten Arendt Rasmussen, PhD¹⁺⁴,*

6 **Affiliations:**

- 7 1) *COPSAC, Copenhagen Prospective Studies on Asthma in Childhood, Herlev and Gentofte Hospital,*
8 *University of Copenhagen*
9 2) *Unit of Medical Psychology, Department of Public Health, University of Copenhagen, 1353*
10 *Copenhagen, Denmark*
11 3) *Department of Pediatrics, Slagelse Hospital, Slagelse, Denmark*
12 4) *Section of Food Microbiology and Fermentation, Department of Food Science, University of*
13 *Copenhagen*

14 **Content type:** Research Article

15 **Word count:** 3879

16 **Tables and figures:** 3 tables, 2 figures

17 **Short title:** Screen time and Cardiovascular risk

18 **Authors Contributions:** DH has written the first draft of the manuscript. All co-authors have provided
19 important intellectual input and contributed considerably to the analyses and interpretation of the data.
20 All authors guarantee that the accuracy and integrity of any part of the work have been appropriately
21 investigated and resolved and all have approved the final version of the manuscript. The
22 corresponding author had full access to the data and had final responsibility for the decision to submit
23 for publication.

24 **Source of Funding:** All funding received by COPSAC is listed on www.copsac.com. The Lundbeck
25 Foundation (Grant no R16-A1694 and R269-2017-5); The Ministry of Health (Grant no 903516);
26 Danish Council for Strategic Research (Grant no 0603-00280B) and The Capital Region Research

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

27 Foundation have provided core support to the COPSAC research centre. This project has received
28 funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020
29 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No. 946228) (BC). MAR is funded by the Novo
30 Nordisk Foundation (Grant no NNF21OC0068517).

31 **Conflicts of interest:**

32 Authors declare no potential, perceived, or real conflict of interest regarding the content of this
33 manuscript. The funding agencies did not have any role in design and conduct of the study; collection,
34 management, and interpretation of the data; or preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript. No
35 pharmaceutical company was involved in the study.

36 **Governance:** We are aware of and comply with recognized codes of good research practice,
37 including the Danish Code of Conduct for Research Integrity. We comply with national and
38 international rules on the safety and rights of patients and healthy subjects, including Good Clinical
39 Practice (GCP) as defined in the EU's Directive on Good Clinical Practice, the International
40 Conference on Harmonisation's (ICH) good clinical practice guidelines and the Helsinki Declaration.
41 Privacy is important to us which is why we follow national and international legislation on General
42 Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), the Danish Act on Processing of Personal Data and the practice
43 of the Danish Data Inspectorate.

44 **Abbreviations:**

45 ADHD = Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder

46 ADHD-RS = ADHD Rating Scale

47 ApoB = Apolipoprotein B

48 ASRS = Adult ADHD Self-Report Scale

49 BIA = Bioelectrical impedance analysis

50 BMI = Body mass index

- 51 CMR = Cardiometabolic risk
- 52 COPSAC2000 = COpenhagen Prospective Studies on Asthma in Childhood mother-child cohort 2000
- 53 COPSAC2010 = COpenhagen Prospective Studies on Asthma in Childhood mother-child cohort 2010
- 54 CVD = Cardiovascular disease
- 55 FFM = Fat-free mass
- 56 FMI = Fat mass index
- 57 FFMI = Fat-free mass index
- 58 FSH = Follicle stimulating hormone
- 59 HDL = High-density lipoprotein
- 60 HOMA-IR = Homeostatic Model Assessment for Insulin Resistance
- 61 hs-CRP = High-sensitivity CRP
- 62 LH = Luteinizing hormone
- 63 n3-LCPUFA = Omega-3 long-chain polyunsaturated fatty acids
- 64 SBP = Systolic Blood Pressure
- 65 sPLS = Sparse partial least square
- 66

67 **ABSTRACT**

68 **Background**

69 Screen time in children and adolescents may be linked to cardiometabolic and cardiovascular risk.

70 This study examines the relationship between screen time and cardiometabolic risk (CMR) factors.

71 **Methods**

72 We analysed data from over 1,000 participants in the Copenhagen Prospective Studies on Asthma in
73 Childhood cohorts (COPSAC2010 and COPSAC2000). This longitudinal study utilised objective
74 measures of physical activity, sleep, pubertal development, and dietary intake as covariates, and
75 assessed mediating and moderating effects of lifestyle factors on parental- and self- and reported
76 discretionary screen time. Our primary outcome of interest was a CMR score which was made from
77 standardised z-scores of metabolic syndrome components (waist circumference, systolic blood
78 pressure, HDL cholesterol, triglycerides, and glucose), adjusted for sex and age. Secondary
79 outcomes were insulin resistance, inflammation, atherogenic lipoproteins, and anthropometric
80 measures. We utilised supervised machine learning modelling of blood NMR metabolomics to identify
81 a unique metabolic signature of screen time. Finally, we assess screen time associations with a
82 predicted Cardiovascular Risk Score derived from Cox proportional hazards models of 10-year CVD
83 events trained in the UK Biobank.

84 **Results**

85 Increased screen time was significantly associated with CMR in children and adolescents, with each
86 additional hour of screen time linked to a higher CMR z-score (children at 10-years: 0.08 [0.01 - 0.14],
87 $p=0.021$; adolescents at 18-years: 0.13 [0.07 - 0.2], $p=0.001$). In childhood, sleep duration ($p=0.029$)
88 and time of onset ($p=0.009$) significantly moderated the relationship between screen time and CMR;
89 less sleep combined with high screen time significantly increased cardiometabolic risk. In
90 adolescence, sleep duration likewise significantly moderated the association between screen time
91 and CMR ($p=0.012$), replicating the findings from childhood. A supervised machine learning model
92 trained in the childhood cohort identified a unique metabolic signature in the blood NMR metabolome
93 associated with screen time, which was validated in the adolescent cohort (0.14 [0.03-0.26], $p=0.014$).

94 CVD-risk scores modelled from CVD-events were directionally associated with screen time in
95 childhood (0.06 [-0.02 - 0.13], p=0.15) and significantly associated with screen time in adolescence
96 (0.07 [0.01 - 0.13], p=0.017) in fully adjusted models.

97 **Conclusion**

98 Increased screen time is significantly associated with higher cardiometabolic risk in children and
99 adolescents, with sleep duration moderating this relationship. A unique metabolic signature of screen
100 time was validated across cohorts, and screen time was associated with higher cardiovascular risk
101 scores in adolescence. These findings underscore the importance of considering screen time and
102 sleep duration in addressing cardiometabolic and cardiovascular risks.

103 INTRODUCTION

104 Cardiovascular disease (CVD) is a leading cause of morbidity and mortality worldwide and has its
105 roots in childhood (1). Key predictors of early onset of CVD are the presence of cardiometabolic risk
106 (CMR) factors (2), such as components of the metabolic syndrome, insulin resistance, inflammation,
107 ApoB-containing lipoproteins and obesity (3,4).

108 As we transition into the digital age, these risks may be exacerbated as children and adolescents are
109 spending an increasing amount of time engaged with screens and digital content, be it for
110 educational, recreational, or social purposes. Emerging research has begun to shed light on the
111 potential health implications of this trend, with several studies noting associations between screen
112 time and CMR factors in childhood and adolescence (5–7). However, the relationship between screen
113 time and CMR is complex and likely multifactorial. Reductions in sleep time (8), increased sedentary
114 time (9), reduced physical activity (10), and unhealthy dietary patterns (11) have all been associated
115 with increased screen time. It is plausible that they may serve as moderators, or mediators, in the
116 relationship between screen time and CMR (12). This interplay is important to investigate as
117 prospective studies show that increased screen time in adolescence is associated with a higher risk of
118 obesity, elevated waist circumference, and diabetes in adulthood (6). Previous studies investigating
119 this relationship have lacked objective measures for contextual lifestyle factors, relying on subjective
120 self-reported measures of diet, sleep, and physical activity, and thus may be subject to bias and
121 inaccuracies (13).

122 In this study, we aim to address these limitations by assessing longitudinal associations between
123 screen time and CMR factors in two mother-child cohorts. By juxtaposing the two cohorts from the
124 Copenhagen Prospective Studies on Asthma in Childhood (COPSAC), we gain valuable insights into
125 how screen time patterns and their potential impact on CMR evolve from childhood through
126 adolescence. We hypothesise that higher screen time during childhood and adolescence is
127 associated with adverse CMR, as defined by the components of the metabolic syndrome. By using
128 targeted blood metabolomics, we identify a metabolic signature of screen time, showing that screen
129 time-associated metabolic disturbances are robust predictors across cohorts. Finally, we link screen
130 time to CVD outcomes using an NMR CVD score trained in a large prospectively followed adult
131 cohort.

132 **METHODS**

133 **Study Design**

134 The Copenhagen Prospective Studies on Asthma in Childhood 2010 mother-child cohort
135 (COPSAC2010) is a prospective general population study that consists of 700 mother-child pairs with
136 extensive phenotyping from 14 clinical visits and exposure assessments since birth, up to the age of
137 10 years (14). COPSAC2000 is likewise a prospective mother-child cohort consisting of 411 children
138 born of asthmatic mothers with extensive phenotyping from 19 clinical visits and exposure
139 assessments since birth, up to the age of 18 years (15). Participants in COPSAC2010 (n=2) and
140 COPSAC2000 (n=1) with type 1 diabetes were excluded from the analysis due to potential
141 confounding (16).

142 **Screen time Measurement**

143 Screen time, the primary exposure, was measured using questionnaire responses from the
144 COPSAC2010 and COPSAC2000 cohorts, focusing on discretionary screen time. In COPSAC2010,
145 parents reported children's average screen time at 6 and 10 years on weekdays and weekends. In
146 COPSAC2000, 18-year-olds detailed screen time from Monday to Thursday and Friday to Sunday,
147 differentiated by type. Total screen time was calculated and weighted averages were derived. *Further*
148 *details are in the Supplementary Methods.*

149 **Cardiometabolic Outcomes**

150 Our primary outcome was a CMR score derived from the components of the metabolic syndrome
151 (17,18). Prior to calculating CMR scores at each clinical visit, the five measures (waist circumference,
152 systolic blood pressure (SBP), high-density lipoprotein (HDL) cholesterol, triglycerides and glucose
153 were adjusted for sex and age, SBP was further adjusted for height (19). The total CMR score was
154 then calculated by adding internally (within each cohort) standardised z-scores of waist
155 circumference, SBP, negative HDL cholesterol, logged triglycerides, and glucose, and then dividing
156 the sum by the square-root of 5 (17,18).

157 Secondary outcomes include other established CMR risk factors including HbA1C, Homeostatic
158 Model Assessment for Insulin Resistance (HOMA-IR), high sensitivity CRP (hs-CRP), GlycA,
159 Apolipoprotein B (ApoB) and numerous measurements of body anthropometrics. Furthermore, we
160 included an NMR Cardiovascular Risk Score based on sex-stratified Cox proportional hazards models
161 for 10-year CVD risk trained in the UK Biobank (20). Our analysis utilised the sex-stratified model
162 coefficients from this work; by internally z-scoring the individual model components in the COPSAC
163 cohorts, multiplying them by the model coefficients, and summing these components into a total CVD-
164 risk score. We subsequently z-scored for each of the respective COPSAC cohorts, to facilitate
165 interpretation of estimates. Nightingale targeted Blood NMR data was available at 10 years for
166 COPSAC2010 and 18 years for COPSAC2000. *Further details are in the Supplementary Methods.*

167 **Body Anthropometrics**

168 Anthropometrics were assessed at each clinical visit. Body composition analysis at age 10 in
169 COPSAC2010 and age 18 in COPSAC2000 was measured by Bioelectrical Impedance Analysis (BIA)
170 using a Tanita scale (Health monitor, version 3.2.7) to derive muscle mass (kg), fat mass (kg) and
171 bone mass (kg). Fat free mass (FFM) (body weight - fat mass), fat mass index (fat mass / (height²))
172 and fat free mass index (fat free mass / (height² (m))) were derived from these measurements. *Further*
173 *details are in the Supplementary Methods.*

174 **Accelerometer-derived sleep and activity data**

175 Activity and sleep information was derived from accelerometry data (Actigraph GT3X+, 30Hz) over 14
176 days using the GGIR package in R (version 2.9.0) (21–24). *Further details are in the Supplementary*
177 *Methods.*

178 **Covariates**

179 Analysis was conducted unadjusted and fully adjusted. Unadjusted analysis covariates included only
180 sex and age, as there are well documented sex and age-dependent effects on our outcome measures
181 (25,26). Fully adjusted multivariable analysis in both cohorts were further adjusted for social
182 circumstances (principal component 1 of a principal component analysis (PCA) of household income,
183 maternal education level, and maternal age), maternal smoking during pregnancy, number of siblings,

184 and accelerometer derived sedentary time, symptoms of attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder
185 (ADHD), light activity time, moderate to vigorous activity time (a sum of moderate and vigorous activity
186 time), sleep duration, time of sleep onset. In COPSAC2010, we included further adjustment for
187 objective markers of pubertal progression using the gonadotropic hormones, luteinizing hormone (LH)
188 and follicle-stimulating hormone (FSH), which increase at puberty onset (27). LH and FSH were
189 included in models as an interaction effect with child sex, to account for potential differences between
190 sexes. Additionally, in COPSAC2010, adjustments were made for dietary patterns assessed at the
191 age of 10 years. *Further details are in the Supplementary Methods.*

192 **Statistical Analysis**

193 Linear regression models were used to assess the associations of screen time on CMR factors and
194 anthropometric outcomes. As we had repeated measurements of outcome data at 6 and 10 years in
195 COPSAC2010, we utilised linear mixed models from the lme4 R package (version '1.1.28') with a
196 fixed slope and variable intercept for our primary outcome analyses (28). All interaction models and
197 mediation models were multivariable. The mediation package in R was used for mediation analysis
198 (version '4.5.0') (29). In our models for CMR outcomes, we a priori decided not to include child's
199 anthropometrics as covariates. This was based on the potential for anthropometrics to act as a causal
200 intermediary between screen time and CMR outcomes.

201 Gaussian graphical models were utilised to illustrate the non-zero relationships (95% CI) between
202 screen time, covariates, and total CMR, controlling for the linear effects of all covariates expressed as
203 partial correlations.

204 To further explore the relationship between screen time and its metabolic associations between
205 cohorts, we employed supervised machine learning modelling - sparse partial least squares (sPLS).
206 The sPLS model was trained in COPSAC2010 using the Nightingale Health Ltd high-throughput
207 targeted NMR-metabolomics platform as the predictor and screen time as the outcome variable (30).
208 Screen time was z-scored relative to each cohort for this analysis, allowing comparison of estimates.

209 A two-sided $P < 0.05$ was considered statistically significant. All statistical analyses were carried out
210 using R (version 4.1.1). *Further details are in the Supplementary Methods.*

211 RESULTS

212 Baseline Characteristics

213 For the COPSAC2010 cohort, screen time was available for 657 children (94.1%) at 6 years, and for
214 630 children (90.3%) at 10 years. For COPSAC2000, screen time was available for 364 adolescents
215 (88.6%). Marked differences in screen time were observed between the cohorts. Average screen time
216 in COPSAC2010 was 2.0 hours (SD=0.9) at 6 years, and 3.2 hours (SD=1.2) at 10 years,
217 representing a significant increase over time ($p<0.001$). COPSAC2000 at 18 years had a significantly
218 higher average screen time of 6.1 hours (SD=2.1) ($p<0.001$) (*Figure S1*). Baseline characteristic
219 differences between the cohorts included parental income, maternal education, maternal age at birth,
220 gestational age, maternal smoking in pregnancy, and number of siblings ($p<0.001$) (*Table S1*).

221 In COPSAC2010, screen time was positively associated with age, male sex, sedentary time, sleep
222 onset, ADHD symptoms, and a Western dietary pattern, and negatively associated with light and
223 moderate activity time and sleep duration (*Table S2, dietary patterns illustrated in Figure S2*).
224 Similarly, in COPSAC2000 screen time had significant positive associations with male sex and
225 maternal smoking during pregnancy, and negatively associated with social circumstances, and sleep
226 duration (*Table S2*). Moreover, with respect to sex differences, males in COPSAC2010 used more
227 screen time at 10 years compared to females (3.4 vs. 3.0, $p<0.001$), whereas no significant difference
228 was noted at 6 years ($p=0.196$). In COPSAC2000, a similar sex difference in screen time was noted
229 (6.6 vs 5.7, $p<0.001$). Both cohorts demonstrated numerous significant sex-related differences across
230 CMR profiles, anthropometrics, and covariates (*Table S3*).

231 Between cohorts, differences in covariates such as age, maternal smoking, sedentary time, physical
232 activity, and sleep patterns were identified ($p<0.001$). All CMR factors were significantly different
233 between cohorts ($p<0.001$), except for ApoB. We computed a total CMR score by summing z-scores
234 of waist circumference, SBP, HDL cholesterol, triglycerides, and glucose levels (18) in both cohorts.
235 Cohort differences were noted for all measures of body anthropometrics ($p<0.001$) (*Table 1*). Within
236 cohorts, correlations between screen time and model covariates (*Figure S3*), and correlations
237 between CMR factors (*Figure S4*) are further visualised in comprehensive heatmaps.

238 Screen Time is associated with Cardiometabolic Risk in COPSAC2010

239 In COPSAC2010, we used mixed models to assess the association between screen time and total
240 CMR, and its constituent components, at 6 and 10 years. After adjusting for relevant confounders,
241 there was a significant positive association between screen time (per hour increase) and CMR (0.08
242 [0.01 - 0.14], $p=0.021$) (*Table 2*). In males, the association for CMR (0.10 [0.02 - 0.19], $p=0.013$) was
243 directionally stronger than in females (0.02 [-0.08 - 0.12], $p=0.694$), but there was no significant
244 interaction between sexes (*Table S4*). Cross-sectionally at 10 years, screen time associations with
245 CMR were stronger than at 6 years (0.16 [0.05 - 0.27], $p=0.007$ vs. 0.06 [-0.06 - 0.17], $p=0.321$)
246 (*Table 2, Table S5*). Further adjustment for the COPSAC2010 prenatal interventions with n3-LCPUFA
247 and high-dose vitamin D did not alter these associations (*Table S6*).

248 To illustrate the relationship between CMR and covariates in the COPSAC2010 cohort, we utilised
249 gaussian graphical models (*Figure 1A*, sex stratified models *Figure S5*). *Figure 1A* highlights the
250 significant partial correlations between screen time and CMR in COPSAC2010, even when
251 accounting for model covariates. These models revealed an association between time of sleep onset
252 and CMR and given the highly co-linear relationship between sleep duration and onset, we assessed
253 if either may act as a potential mediator in the association between screen time and CMR. A
254 mediation analysis indicated that 12.0% ($p=0.030$) of the association between screen time and CMR
255 was mediated through sleep duration, and not by time of sleep onset ($p=0.7$).

256 Using screen time data available from 6 years, we conducted a series of sub-analyses to provide
257 longitudinal insights into the relationship between screen time and CMR factors at 10 years. An
258 increase per hour of screen time from 6 to 10 years was associated with measures of insulin
259 resistance, with an increase in HOMA-IR (0.03 [0.01 - 0.04], $p=0.006$). Moreover, screen time at 10
260 years, adjusted for screen time at 6 years, was significantly associated with total CMR (0.11 [0.02 -
261 0.2], $p=0.020$) (*Table S5*). Associations stratified by weekday and weekend screen time can be seen
262 in *Table S7*.

263 **Screen Time is associated with Cardiometabolic Risk in COPSAC2000**

264 In COPSAC2000 at age 18 years, we likewise identified significant positive associations between
265 screen time and CMR (0.13 [0.07 - 0.2], $p<0.001$). Furthermore, several CMR factors were
266 significantly associated including waist circumference (1.30 [0.76 - 1.84], $p<0.001$), SBP (0.63 [0.15 -

267 1.11], $p = 0.011$), HDL cholesterol (-0.01 [$-0.03 - 0$], $p=0.032$), GlycA (0.01 [$0.01 - 0.02$], $p<0.001$) and
268 ApoB (0.01 [$0.01-0.02$], $p=0.001$) (*Table 2*). Sex-stratified analysis again revealed stronger
269 associations for males, for CMR (0.14 [$0.06-0.22$], $p=0.001$), waist circumference (1.56 [$0.89 - 2.22$],
270 $p<0.001$), and SBP (0.9 [$0.24 - 1.56$], $p=0.008$). However, no statistically significant interaction effects
271 were observed between sexes. Further adjustments for a Western dietary pattern metabolome score,
272 derived from newborn dry blood spots, did not meaningfully change these findings (*Table S6*).

273 To illustrate the relationship between CMR and covariates in the COPSAC2000 cohort, we utilised
274 gaussian graphical models (*Figure 1B*, sex stratified models *Figure S5*). *Figure 1B* highlights the
275 robust association between screen time and total CMR in COPSAC2000, when accounting for model
276 covariates. Sleep onset time also had an independent association with CMR; however, there was no
277 association between sleep onset and screen time, suggesting an independent association.

278 Screen time, whether through phones, TVs, or gaming, consistently demonstrated a positive
279 association with multiple CMR factors (*Table S8*). Associations stratified by weekday and weekend
280 screen time can be seen in *Table S7*.

281 **Screen Time and Body Anthropometry in COPSAC2010 and COPSAC2000**

282 In COPSAC2010, at age 10 years, we found no significant associations between screen time and
283 various body anthropometric measures, including BMI, body weight, fat mass, fat percent, muscle
284 mass, skeletal mass, bone mass, fat-free mass, fat mass index (FMI), and fat-free mass index (FFMI)
285 in both females and males (*Table 3*).

286 In COPSAC2000 at age 18 years, we found several significant associations between screen time and
287 body anthropometrics, but the associations varied by sex. In females, screen time was associated
288 with increased BMI (0.37 [$0.02-0.72$], $p=0.039$) and had borderline associations with increased body
289 weight and fat mass. In contrast, male screen time was associated with all measured body
290 anthropometrics, including BMI, body weight, fat mass, fat percentage, muscle mass, skeletal mass,
291 bone mass, fat-free mass, fat mass index and fat-free mass index ($p\leq 0.015$) (*Table 3*), but with no
292 significant interaction between sexes ($p>0.13$).

293 **Screen Time has a Distinct Blood Metabolome Signature and Associations with CVD Risk**

294 We employed a machine learning prediction model in COPSAC2010, using screen time as the
295 classifier and a targeted NMR blood metabolomics platform as the predictor. Our model considered
296 173 metabolic biomarkers and regularised to retain only the most influential predictors, resulting in a
297 final model that included 37-screen time associated biomarkers (Figure S6). This model, with screen
298 time z-scored for cross-dataset interpretation, trained in COPSAC2010 predicted screen time in both
299 COPSAC2010 (0.80 [0.32-1.28], $p=0.001$), and COPSAC2000 (0.14 [0.03-0.26], $p=0.014$) (adjusted
300 associations). These findings suggest that metabolic disturbances associated with screen time are a
301 robust predictor of screen time across independent cohorts.

302 Additionally, we assessed the associations between screen time and cardiovascular risk in both
303 COPSAC cohorts using an NMR Cardiovascular Risk Score, based on sex-stratified Cox proportional
304 hazards models for 10-year CVD risk trained in the UK Biobank. Screen time showed a positive trend
305 with the NMR CVD-score in COPSAC2010 at 10 years (0.06 [-0.02 - 0.13], $p=0.15$) and was
306 significantly associated in COPSAC2000 at 18 years (0.07 [0.01 - 0.13], $p=0.017$) in adjusted models
307 (*Table 2*).

308 **Sleep is a Modifying Factor in the Association between Screen Time and Cardiometabolic Risk**

309 We explored how different lifestyle factors may influence the relationship between screen time and
310 total CMR, focusing on lifestyle behaviours such as sedentary and light activity time, sleep duration
311 and onset, and dietary patterns. Figure S7 visually represents the associations of these lifestyle
312 factors across quartiles with screen time for COPSAC2010 and COPSAC2000, respectively. In
313 interaction analysis, sedentary time, light activity time and a Western dietary pattern showed no
314 significant contextual associations with screen time; however, sleep duration and onset emerged as
315 modifiers in the screen time-CMR relationship.

316 In COPSAC2010, there was significant effect moderation between screen time and sleep duration
317 ($p=0.029$), indicating that the positive association of screen time on CMR increased, as the amount of
318 sleep decreased (*Figure 2A*). Similarly, there was significant effect moderation between screen time
319 and sleep onset ($p=0.009$), suggesting that later sleep onset may exacerbate the detrimental effects
320 of screen time on CMR (*Figure 2B*).

321 In COPSAC2000, there was a replication of this finding, with a significant moderation between screen
322 time and sleep duration on total CMR ($p=0.012$) (*Figure 2C*). This suggests a similar trend as in
323 COPSAC2010, whereby decreased sleep duration may exacerbate the negative impact of screen
324 time on cardiometabolic health. There was a directional, but non-significant interaction between
325 screen time and sleep onset time in COPSAC2000 ($p=0.22$) (*Figure 2D*).

326 We also conducted sex-stratified analyses to examine potential sex differences in moderating effects.
327 In COPSAC2010 males, the interaction between screen time and sleep duration was more
328 pronounced ($p=0.031$) (*Figure S8A*). In contrast, among COPSAC2000 females, the interaction
329 between screen time and sleep onset was significant ($p=0.005$), suggesting that the detrimental
330 moderation on CMR of increased screen time is magnified when the sleep onset time is later in
331 female adolescents (*Figure S8B*).

332 **DISCUSSION**

333 Our study establishes a clear association in two independent mother-child cohorts between screen
334 time and elevated CMR in both childhood and adolescence, a relationship that persists even when
335 accounting for objective measures of sleep, diet quality, physical activity and pubertal development. In
336 childhood, lifestyle factors such as sleep duration and onset were found to significantly moderate the
337 relationship between screen time and CMR, with sleep duration also partially mediating the
338 association. In adolescence time of sleep onset had independent significant associations with CMR,
339 and sleep duration significantly moderated the relationship. We employed a machine learning model
340 trained in one cohort to uncover a unique metabolic signature associated with screen time, which
341 despite significant cohort characteristic differences, was validated in the other cohort thus opening an
342 avenue for identifying individuals at particular risk of high screen time use. Finally, we used blood
343 metabolome profiles to assess cardiovascular risk using adult data trained on actual CVD outcomes,
344 finding positive directional associations with screen time in childhood and significant associations in
345 adolescence.

346 Previous studies have reported no association between self-reported screen time and CMR in
347 children aged 7-12 (18). However, our study indicates that such an association becomes more
348 pronounced in adolescence, suggesting that the impact of screen time on cardiometabolic health may
349 evolve throughout childhood and adolescence. This is supported by a further study which found that
350 higher screen time in adolescence was associated with higher odds of select indicators of
351 cardiometabolic disease in adulthood, including obesity, hypertension, hyperlipidemia, and diabetes
352 (6). Our study further enriches the literature by identifying sleep duration and time of onset as key
353 modulating factors in the screen time-CMR association in childhood. We validated the moderating
354 effect of sleep duration on CMR in COPSAC2000 and found that time of sleep onset was a significant
355 independent risk factor in adolescence. However, a recent study of 3000 participants aged 6-17
356 utilising self-reported measures of sleep and screen time, found no moderating role of sleep on
357 screen times associated with cardiometabolic risk (31). Our findings align with existing literature that
358 link shorter sleep duration with higher CMR in adolescents (32).

359 A unique strength of our study is the use of two prospective mother-child cohorts with deep
360 phenotyping and longitudinal follow-up. The COPSAC2010 cohort, in particular, utilised repeated

361 outcome and exposure data, allowing for us to account for inter-individual variation in participants,
362 thus providing more robust inference. Furthermore, our application of a machine learning approach
363 uncovered a robust metabolic signature of screen time, which was a significant predictor of actual
364 screen time, independent of other potential confounding factors. To the best of our knowledge, we are
365 also the first study to implement CVD-risk scores modelled on adult CVD outcomes in independent
366 childhood and implement these for inference. Thus, our comprehensive approach which accounts for
367 objective lifestyle measures, establishes a robust link between screen time and CMR during both
368 childhood and adolescence. However, our study also has limitations. The observational nature of the
369 study design limits our ability to infer causality, and we cannot rule out residual confounding.
370 Furthermore, our reliance on reported measures for screen time could introduce bias (13). However,
371 this methodology is widely accepted in the field (33), and the prevalence of high screen time usage is
372 corroborated by studies using wearable cameras to monitor children's screen activities (34).
373 Furthermore, while many of our lifestyle measures such as sleep and physical activity were objective,
374 our dietary assessments were self-reported and therefore potentially subject to recall or social
375 desirability bias. Finally, the nature of our moderation modelling of lifestyle factors and mediation
376 analysis were exploratory, and constituted subanalysis'. Therefore, while these findings provide
377 valuable context, they should be interpreted with caution and considered as hypothesis-generating,
378 rather than definitive.

379 Moving forward, future studies should focus on using objective measures of screen time and related
380 lifestyle behaviours. Our findings suggest that sleep duration and onset may play a significant role in
381 moderating the impact of screen time on cardiometabolic health in childhood. Associations between
382 sleep duration and cardiometabolic risk in childhood and adolescence are well documented (35), with
383 suggested mechanisms including circadian rhythm misalignment (36), sodium retention secondary to
384 insulin resistance (37) and increased sympathetic nervous system activity (35). Our findings indicate a
385 contextual association between screen time and cardiometabolic risk, which becomes stronger in
386 cases of decreased sleep. This may be explained by the reduction in melatonin levels caused by
387 exposure to screen light in the evening, leading to disturbances in circadian rhythms that exacerbate
388 this relationship (38). Moreover, our study suggests that the associations between screen time and
389 cardiometabolic risk are independent of lifestyle behaviours, including sedentary time, suggesting that

390 independent mechanisms whereby screen time may influence cardiometabolic risk, such as poor
391 stress regulation and high sympathetic arousal (39).

392 Future studies are needed to confirm and further elucidate these relationships. Our results also
393 highlight the potential utility of machine learning approaches in identifying key metabolic signatures of
394 screen time. Despite the parental-/self-reported nature of our screen time data, our model was able to
395 predict screen time across two distinct cohorts with significantly different baseline characteristics,
396 suggesting that the metabolic signature of screen time is robust and consistent across varying
397 populations. These insights could be useful in future research to both identify individuals at risk of
398 high screen time and its associated CMR and inform interventions to reduce screen time and improve
399 cardiometabolic health.

400 In conclusion, our findings from two independent mother-child cohorts emphasise the significant
401 detrimental impact of screen time on cardiometabolic risk, with sleep duration and time of onset acting
402 as key contextual factors. Distinct patterns of associations when juxtaposing these cohorts suggests
403 that interventions aimed at reducing CMR may need to be tailored distinctly for children and
404 adolescents, considering the varying influences of lifestyle factors at these stages. These insights
405 underline the importance of comprehensive, multifaceted strategies to mitigate CMR in childhood and
406 adolescence, with a particular focus on reducing screen time, and promoting healthier sleeping habits.

407 References

- 408 1. Milei J, Ottaviani G, Lavezzi AM, Grana DR, Stella I, Matturri L. Perinatal and infant early
409 atherosclerotic coronary lesions. *Can J Cardiol*. 2008 Feb;24(2):137–41.
- 410 2. Canas JA, Sweeten S, Balagopal P (babu). Biomarkers for cardiovascular risk in children. *Curr*
411 *Opin Cardiol*. 2013 Mar;28(2):103.
- 412 3. Eckel RH. Mechanisms of the components of the metabolic syndrome that predispose to
413 diabetes and atherosclerotic CVD. *Proc Nutr Soc*. 2007 Feb;66(1):82–95.
- 414 4. Liyo B, Webb RJ, Amirabdollahian F. The Association between the Atherogenic Index of Plasma
415 and Cardiometabolic Risk Factors: A Review. *Healthc Pap*. 2023 Mar 28;11(7):966.
- 416 5. Sivanesan H, Vanderloo LM, Keown-Stoneman CDG, Parkin PC, Maguire JL, Birken CS. The
417 association between screen time and cardiometabolic risk in young children. *Int J Behav Nutr*
418 *Phys Act*. 2020 Apr 29;17(1):1–10.
- 419 6. Nagata JM, Lee CM, Lin F, Ganson KT, Pettee Gabriel K, Testa A, et al. Screen Time from
420 Adolescence to Adulthood and Cardiometabolic Disease: a Prospective Cohort Study. *J Gen*
421 *Intern Med*. 2023 Jun;38(8):1821–7.
- 422 7. Jahangiry L, Aune D, Farhangi MA. Screen time and the risk of metabolic syndrome among
423 children and adolescents: A systematic review and dose-response meta-analysis. *Nutr Metab*
424 *Cardiovasc Dis*. 2022 Nov;32(11):2483–92.
- 425 8. Hale L, Guan S. Screen time and sleep among school-aged children and adolescents: a
426 systematic literature review. *Sleep Med Rev*. 2015 Jun;21:50–8.
- 427 9. Cabanas-Sánchez V, Martínez-Gómez D, Esteban-Cornejo I, Pérez-Bey A, Castro Piñero J,
428 Veiga OL. Associations of total sedentary time, screen time and non-screen sedentary time with
429 adiposity and physical fitness in youth: the mediating effect of physical activity. *J Sports Sci*. 2019
430 Apr;37(8):839–49.
- 431 10. Carlson SA, Fulton JE, Lee SM, Foley JT, Heitzler C, Huhman M. Influence of limit-setting and
432 participation in physical activity on youth screen time. *Pediatrics*. 2010 Jul;126(1):e89–96.
- 433 11. LeBlanc AG, Katzmarzyk PT, Barreira TV, Broyles ST, Chaput JP, Church TS, et al. Correlates of
434 Total Sedentary Time and Screen Time in 9-11 Year-Old Children around the World: The
435 International Study of Childhood Obesity, Lifestyle and the Environment. *PLoS One*. 2015 Jun
436 11;10(6):e0129622.
- 437 12. Wilhite K, Booker B, Huang BH, Antczak D, Corbett L, Parker P, et al. Combinations of Physical
438 Activity, Sedentary Behavior, and Sleep Duration and Their Associations With Physical,
439 Psychological, and Educational Outcomes in Children and Adolescents: A Systematic Review.
440 *Am J Epidemiol*. 2023 Apr 6;192(4):665–79.
- 441 13. Gauci J, Olds T, Maher C, Watson A, Fraysse F, Munzberg M, et al. Characteristics associated
442 with differences in 24-hour device-measured and self-reported sleep, sedentary behaviour and
443 physical activity in a sample of Australian primary school children. *Journal of Activity, Sedentary*
444 *and Sleep Behaviors*. 2023 Jul 3;2(1):1–13.
- 445 14. Bisgaard H, Vissing NH, Carson CG, Bischoff AL, Følsgaard NV, Kreiner- Møller E, et al. Deep
446 phenotyping of the unselected COPSAC₂₀₁₀ birth cohort study [Internet]. Vol. 43, *Clinical &*
447 *Experimental Allergy*. 2013. p. 1384–94. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/cea.12213>
- 448 15. Bisgaard H. The Copenhagen Prospective Study on Asthma in Childhood (COPSAC): design,
449 rationale, and baseline data from a longitudinal birth cohort study. *Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol*.
450 2004 Oct;93(4):381–9.
- 451 16. Braffett BH, Dagogo-Jack S, Bebu I, Sivitz WI, Larkin M, Kolterman O, et al. Response to

- 452 Comment on Braffett et al. Association of Insulin Dose, Cardiometabolic Risk Factors, and
453 Cardiovascular Disease in Type 1 Diabetes During 30 Years of Follow-up in the DCCT/EDIC
454 Study. *Diabetes Care* 2019;42:657-664. *Diabetes Care*. 2019 Aug;42(8):e137.
- 455 17. Eisenmann JC. On the use of a continuous metabolic syndrome score in pediatric research.
456 *Cardiovasc Diabetol*. 2008 Jun 5;7:17.
- 457 18. Vanderloo LM, Keown-Stoneman CDG, Sivanesan H, Parkin PC, Maguire JL, Anderson LN, et
458 al. Association of screen time and cardiometabolic risk in school-aged children. *Prev Med Rep*.
459 2020 Dec;20:101183.
- 460 19. Barba G, Casullo C, Dello Russo M, Russo P, Nappo A, Lauria F, et al. Gender-related
461 differences in the relationships between blood pressure, age, and body size in prepubertal
462 children. *Am J Hypertens*. 2008 Sep;21(9):1007–10.
- 463 20. Ritchie SC, Jiang X, Pennells L, Xu Y, Coffey C, Liu Y, et al. Cardiovascular risk prediction using
464 metabolomic biomarkers and polygenic risk scores: A cohort study and modelling analyses
465 [Internet]. medRxiv. 2023 [cited 2024 Jul 11]. p. 2023.10.31.23297859. Available from:
466 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2023.10.31.23297859v1.abstract>
- 467 21. Migueles JH, Rowlands AV, Huber F, Sabia S, van Hees VT. GGIR: A research community–
468 driven open source R package for generating physical activity and sleep outcomes from multi-day
469 raw accelerometer data. *J Meas Phys Behav*. 2019 Sep 1;2(3):188–96.
- 470 22. van Hees VT, Sabia S, Anderson KN, Denton SJ, Oliver J, Catt M, et al. A Novel, Open Access
471 Method to Assess Sleep Duration Using a Wrist-Worn Accelerometer. *PLoS One*. 2015 Nov
472 16;10(11):e0142533.
- 473 23. van Hees VT, Gorzelnik L, León ECD, Eder M, Pias M, Taherian S, et al. Separating Movement
474 and Gravity Components in an Acceleration Signal and Implications for the Assessment of
475 Human Daily Physical Activity. *PLoS One*. 2013 Apr 23;8(4):e61691.
- 476 24. van Hees VT, Sabia S, Jones SE, Wood AR, Anderson KN, Kivimäki M, et al. Estimating sleep
477 parameters using an accelerometer without sleep diary. *Sci Rep*. 2018 Aug 28;8(1):12975.
- 478 25. Friedman LA, Morrison JA, Daniels SR, McCarthy WF, Sprecher DL. Sensitivity and specificity of
479 pediatric lipid determinations for adult lipid status: findings from the Princeton Lipid Research
480 Clinics Prevalence Program Follow-up Study. *Pediatrics*. 2006 Jul;118(1):165–72.
- 481 26. Kobylińska M, Antosik K, Decyk A, Kurowska K, Skiba D. Body Composition and Anthropometric
482 Indicators in Children and Adolescents 6-15 Years Old. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* [Internet].
483 2022 Sep 14;19(18). Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/ijerph191811591>
- 484 27. Oerter KE, Uriarte MM, Rose SR, Barnes KM, Cutler GB Jr. Gonadotropin secretory dynamics
485 during puberty in normal girls and boys. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab*. 1990 Nov;71(5):1251–8.
- 486 28. Bates D, Mächler M, Bolker B, Walker S. Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using **lme4**
487 [Internet]. Vol. 67, *Journal of Statistical Software*. 2015. Available from:
488 <http://dx.doi.org/10.18637/jss.v067.i01>
- 489 29. Tingley D, Yamamoto T, Hirose K, Keele L, Imai K. mediation: R Package for Causal Mediation
490 Analysis. *J Stat Softw*. 2014 Sep 2;59:1–38.
- 491 30. Large-scale metabolic biomarker profiling for researchers [Internet]. [cited 2024 Jul 11]. Available
492 from: <https://research.nightingalehealth.com/>
- 493 31. Sehn AP, Brand C, Tornquist L, Tornquist D, de Castro Silveira JF, Gaya AR, et al. Sleep
494 duration and screen time in children and adolescents: Simultaneous moderation role in the
495 relationship between waist circumference and cardiometabolic risk according to physical activity.
496 *EJSS* . 2024 Feb 1;24(2):239–48.
- 497 32. Cespedes Feliciano EM, Quante M, Rifas-Shiman SL, Redline S, Oken E, Taveras EM. Objective

- 498 Sleep Characteristics and Cardiometabolic Health in Young Adolescents. *Pediatrics* [Internet].
499 2018 Jul;142(1). Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1542/peds.2017-4085>
- 500 33. Qi J, Yan Y, Yin H. Screen time among school-aged children of aged 6-14: a systematic review.
501 *Glob Health Res Policy*. 2023 Apr 19;8(1):12.
- 502 34. Lowe BM, Smith M, Jaine R, Stanley J, Gage R, Signal L. Watching the watchers: assessing the
503 nature and extent of children's screen time using wearable cameras. *N Z Med J*. 2023 Jul
504 7;136(1578):12–31.
- 505 35. Quist JS, Sjödin A, Chaput JP, Hjorth MF. Sleep and cardiometabolic risk in children and
506 adolescents. *Sleep Med Rev*. 2016 Oct;29:76–100.
- 507 36. Makarem N, Zuraikat FM, Aggarwal B, Jelic S, St-Onge MP. Variability in Sleep Patterns: an
508 Emerging Risk Factor for Hypertension. *Curr Hypertens Rep*. 2020 Feb 21;22(2):19.
- 509 37. De Bernardi Rodrigues AM, da Silva C de C, Vasques ACJ, Camilo DF, Barreiro F, Cassani RSL,
510 et al. Association of Sleep Deprivation With Reduction in Insulin Sensitivity as Assessed by the
511 Hyperglycemic Clamp Technique in Adolescents. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2016 May 1;170(5):487–94.
- 512 38. Hartley S, Royant-Parola S, Zayoud A, Gremy I, Matulonga B. Do both timing and duration of
513 screen use affect sleep patterns in adolescents? *PLoS One*. 2022 Oct 20;17(10):e0276226.
- 514 39. Lissak G. Adverse physiological and psychological effects of screen time on children and
515 adolescents: Literature review and case study. *Environ Res*. 2018 Jul;164:149–57.

Figures




Figure 1. Gaussian Graphical Models Depicting the Integrated Relationships between Cardiometabolic Risk, Screen Time, and Other Covariates in COPSAC2010 and COPSAC2000. Graphical models illustrate relationships (95% CI) between screen time, cardiometabolic risk and model covariates. **Panel A** represents the COPSAC2010 cohort, showing that screen time and a Western dietary pattern at 6 years are independently associated with cardiometabolic risk, when accounting for model covariates. **Panel B** represents the COPSAC2000 cohort, indicating that both screen time and sleep onset have independent associations with cardiometabolic risk.







Figure 2. Modulating Effects of Sleep Duration and Onset on the Relationship between Screen Time and Cardiometabolic Risk in COPSAC2010 and COPSAC2000. Potential modulating effects of sleep duration and onset on the relationship between screen time and total cardiometabolic risk. **Panels A and B** depict these relationships for the COPSAC2010 cohort, while **Panels C and D** represent the COPSAC2000 cohort

Tables

COPSAC2010 and COPSAC2000 Comparison	COPSAC2010	COPSAC2000	p	C2010/C2000 % Missing
n =	630	364	-	-
Screen Time and Cardiometabolic Outcomes	-	-	-	-
Average Screen Time (hours) (mean (SD))	3.20 (1.21)	6.11 (2.11)	<0.001	0 / 0
Waist Size (cm) (mean (SD))	64.75 (7.42)	80.50 (11.34)	<0.001	4.8 / 1.1
Systolic Blood Pressure (mean (SD))	103.94 (6.93)	115.78 (9.99)	<0.001	5.6 / 1.4
HDL mmol/l (mean (SD))	1.56 (0.32)	1.22 (0.26)	<0.001	20.0 / 8.0
Triglyceride mmol/l (mean (SD))	0.74 (0.32)	0.97 (0.44)	<0.001	19.8 / 8.0
Glucose (mmol/l) (mean (SD))	4.18 (0.36)	5.10 (0.40)	<0.001	16.8 / 8.0
HB1AC (mmol/mol) (mean (SD))	32.10 (2.68)	31.36 (2.80)	<0.001	19.2 / 8.8
HOMA-IR (mean (SD))	1.96 (0.25)	2.78 (1.92)	<0.001	20.8 / 9.3
High sensitivity CRP (mg/L) (mean (SD))	0.57 (1.54)	1.71 (2.55)	<0.001	46.3 / 10.2
GlycA (mmol/l) (mean (SD))	0.68 (0.07)	0.76 (0.11)	<0.001	16.8 / 17.9
ApoB (g/l) (mean (SD))	0.69 (0.12)	0.68 (0.15)	0.207	16.8 / 17.9
Cohorts Characteristics and Covariates	-	-	-	-
Male Sex (%)	324 (51.4)	179 (49.2)	0.536	0
Age (mean (SD))	10.30 (0.39)	17.73 (0.57)	<0.001	0
Siblings (mean (SD))	1.47 (0.94)	1.24 (0.87)	<0.001	0
Maternal Pregnancy Smoking (%)	45 (7.1)	83 (22.8)	<0.001	0
Sedentary time (hours) (mean (SD))	8.47 (1.20)	10.91 (1.31)	<0.001	23.8 / 22.8
Light activity time (hours) (mean (SD))	3.84 (0.66)	3.52 (0.75)	<0.001	23.8 / 22.8
Moderate Activity time (hours) (mean (SD))	2.15 (0.53)	1.59 (0.55)	<0.001	23.8 / 22.8
Vigorous activity time (hours) (mean(SD))	0.42 (0.21)	0.09 (0.10)	<0.001	23.8 / 22.8
Sleep (mean (SD))	9.04 (0.76)	7.73 (0.86)	<0.001	23.8 / 22.8
Sleep Onset Time (hours) (mean (SD))	21.84 (0.82)	24.46 (1.19)	<0.001	23.8 / 22.8
N of valid days (Accelerometer) (mean (SD))	12.32 (1.66)	11.70 (2.13)	<0.001	23.8 / 22.8
Body Anthropometric	-	-	-	-
BMI (mean (SD))	17.08 (2.38)	22.91 (4.10)	<0.001	11.1 / 2.7
Body Weight (kilograms) (mean (SD))	35.77 (6.98)	70.14 (14.06)	<0.001	10.8 / 2.2
Fat Mass (kilograms) (mean (SD))	7.99 (3.24)	16.97 (8.28)	<0.001	11.1 / 2.7
Fat percent (%) (mean (SD))	21.71 (4.78)	23.70 (8.22)	<0.001	11.1 / 2.7

Muscle Mass (kilograms) (mean (SD))	26.31 (4.10)	50.46 (9.71)	<0.001	11.1 / 2.7
Skeletal Mass (kilograms) (mean (SD))	15.73 (2.44)	30.26 (5.93)	<0.001	11.1 / 2.7
Bone Mass (kilograms) (mean (SD))	1.48 (0.22)	2.68 (0.48)	<0.001	11.1 / 2.7
Fat Free Mass (kilograms) (mean (SD))	27.79 (4.31)	53.14 (10.19)	<0.001	11.1 / 2.7
Fat Mass Index (FMI) (mean (SD))	3.80 (1.38)	5.66 (2.92)	<0.001	11.3 / 2.7
Fat-free Mass Index (FFMI) (mean (SD))	13.28 (1.22)	17.28 (2.14)	<0.001	11.3 / 2.7

Table 1. **Exposure,**

Outcome and Covariate Data for COPSAC2010 and COPSAC2000. This table presents the baseline characteristics, outcomes, and covariates for the COPSAC2010 (n=630) and COPSAC2000 (n=364) cohorts. It includes data on screen time, cardiometabolic risk factors, anthropometrics, and lifestyle behaviours such as physical activity and sleep patterns. Significant differences between the cohorts are indicated, including differences in screen time, CMR factors, and anthropometrics. The data presented in this table provide a comprehensive overview of the cohorts' characteristics. * Glucose is estimated from HBA1C in COPSAC2010.

COPSAC2010 6 & 10 year Mixed Model	n =	Unadjusted [95% CI] p-value	Adjusted [95% CI] p-value
Cardiometabolic Risk (Z-score)	513/525	0.08 [0.02 - 0.15] (p = 0.009)	0.08 [0.01 - 0.14] (p = 0.021)
Waist size (cm)	621/600	0.22 [-0.08 - 0.52] (p = 0.157)	0.2 [-0.11 - 0.5] (p = 0.21)
Systolic Blood Pressure (mmHg)	605/595	0.09 [-0.27 - 0.45] (p = 0.621)	0.06 [-0.31 - 0.42] (p = 0.758)
HDL Cholesterol (mmol/l)	491/504	-0.02 [-0.04 - 0] (p = 0.027)	-0.02 [-0.03 - 0] (p = 0.052)
Triglycerides (mmol/l)** Logged	465/505	0.03 [0.01 - 0.06] (p = 0.006)	0.03 [0.01 - 0.06] (p = 0.013)
Glucose (mmol/l) †	507/509	0 [-0.03 - 0.03] (p = 0.998)	0 [-0.03 - 0.03] (p = 0.908)
COPSAC2010 10 year Linear Model	n=	Unadjusted [95% CI] p-value	Adjusted [95% CI] p-value
Cardiometabolic Risk (Z-score)	525	0.14 [0.06 - 0.22] (p = 0.001)	0.12 [0.03 - 0.2] (p = 0.011)
Waist size (cm)	600	0.47 [-0.03 - 0.98] (p = 0.068)	0.34 [-0.19 - 0.88] (p = 0.211)
Systolic Blood Pressure (mmHg)	595	0.19 [-0.29 - 0.66] (p = 0.446)	0.19 [-0.32 - 0.7] (p = 0.458)
HDL Cholesterol (mmol/l)	504	-0.03 [-0.05 - 0] (p = 0.037)	-0.02 [-0.05 - 0] (p = 0.091)
Triglycerides (mmol/l)** Logged	505	0.06 [0.03 - 0.08] (p <0.001)	0.05 [0.02 - 0.07] (p = 0.003)
Glucose (mmol/l)	524	0.01 [-0.02 - 0.04] (p = 0.494)	0.01 [-0.02 - 0.04] (p = 0.467)
HB1AC (mmol/mol)	509	0.01 [-0.19 - 0.21] (p = 0.928)	0 [-0.21 - 0.21] (p = 0.987)
HOMA-IR	499	0.02 [0 - 0.04] (p = 0.013)	0.02 [0 - 0.04] (p = 0.024)
High sensitivity CRP (mg/L)	338	0.03 [-0.12 - 0.17] (p = 0.724)	-0.02 [-0.17 - 0.13] (p = 0.827)
GlycA (mmol/l)	524	0.01 [0 - 0.01] (p = 0.01)	0.01 [0 - 0.01] (p = 0.053)
ApoB (g/l)	524	0 [-0.01 - 0.01] (p = 0.927)	0 [-0.01 - 0.01] (p = 0.961)
NMR Cardiovascular Risk Score (Z-score)	520	0.07 [0 - 0.14] (p = 0.054)	0.06 [-0.02 - 0.13] (p = 0.15)
COPSAC2000 18 year Linear Model	n=	Unadjusted [95% CI] p-value	Adjusted [95% CI] p-value
Cardiometabolic Risk (Z-score)	335	0.14 [0.08 - 0.2] (p <0.001)	0.13 [0.07 - 0.2] (p <0.001)
Waist size (cm)	360	1.47 [0.93 - 2.01] (p <0.001)	1.3 [0.76 - 1.84] (p <0.001)
Systolic Blood Pressure (mmHg)	359	0.7 [0.23 - 1.16] (p = 0.004)	0.63 [0.15 - 1.11] (p = 0.011)
HDL Cholesterol (mmol/l)	335	-0.01 [-0.03 - 0] (p = 0.06)	-0.01 [-0.03 - 0] (p = 0.032)
Triglycerides (mmol/l)** Logged	335	0.02 [0 - 0.04] (p = 0.042)	0.02 [0 - 0.04] (p = 0.103)
Glucose (mmol/l)	335	0 [-0.02 - 0.02] (p = 0.675)	0.01 [-0.02 - 0.03] (p = 0.611)
HB1AC (mmol/mol)	333	-0.08 [-0.23 - 0.07] (p = 0.282)	-0.09 [-0.24 - 0.06] (p = 0.24)
HOMA-IR	330	0.09 [-0.01 - 0.19] (p = 0.064)	0.08 [-0.02 - 0.18] (p = 0.13)
High sensitivity CRP (mg/L)	327	0.04 [-0.09 - 0.17] (p = 0.541)	0.01 [-0.13 - 0.15] (p = 0.863)
GlycA (mmol/l)	299	0.01 [0.01 - 0.02] (p <0.001)	0.01 [0.01 - 0.02] (p <0.001)
ApoB (g/l)	299	0.01 [0.01 - 0.02] (p = 0.001)	0.01 [0.01 - 0.02] (p = 0.001)
NMR Cardiovascular Risk Score (Z-score)	299	0.08 [0.02 - 0.13] (p = 0.007)	0.07 [0.01 - 0.13] (p = 0.017)

Table 2. Associations between Screen Time and Cardiometabolic Risk Factors in COPSAC2010 and COPSAC2000. Results of mixed models and linear regression analyses assessing the associations between screen time and total CMR, as well as its individual components, markers of insulin resistance, inflammation and atherogenic lipoproteins in the COPSAC2010 and COPSAC2000 cohorts. The table provides both unadjusted and adjusted associations, with the latter controlling for potential confounders (social circumstances, maternal smoking during pregnancy, number of siblings, sedentary time, light activity time, moderate to vigorous activity time, sleep duration and time of sleep onset. In COPSAC2010, we included further adjustment for luteinizing hormone (LH) and follicle-stimulating hormone (FSH). The associations are presented as estimates with 95% confidence intervals and corresponding p-value.

† Glucose was not available at 6 years in COPSAC2010, and thus substituted with HBA1C for the purposes of mixed modelling.

Body Anthropometrics COPSAC2010	n=	Female Adjusted [95% CI] p-value	n=	Male Adjusted [95% CI] p-value	P-Interaction
BMI (actual)	269	0.11 [-0.19 - 0.4] (p = 0.473)	291	0.11 [-0.11 - 0.33] (p = 0.339)	p = 0.774
Body Weight (kilograms)	270	0.18 [-0.64 - 1.01] (p = 0.669)	292	0.35 [-0.3 - 1.01] (p = 0.292)	p = 0.788
Fat Mass (kilograms)	269	0.14 [-0.24 - 0.52] (p = 0.473)	291	0.22 [-0.09 - 0.52] (p = 0.164)	p = 0.537)
Fat percent (%)	269	0.28 [-0.23 - 0.8] (p = 0.284)	291	0.3 [-0.14 - 0.75] (p = 0.182)	p = 0.517
Muscle Mass (kilograms)	269	0.07 [-0.41 - 0.55] (p = 0.778)	291	0.1 [-0.27 - 0.48] (p = 0.594)	p = 0.846
Skeletal Mass (kilograms)	269	0.04 [-0.25 - 0.33] (p = 0.776)	291	0.06 [-0.16 - 0.28] (p = 0.59)	p = 0.844
Bone Mass (kilograms)	269	0 [-0.02 - 0.03] (p = 0.741)	291	0 [-0.01 - 0.02] (p = 0.606)	p = 0.77
Fat Free Mass (kilograms)	269	0.07 [-0.44 - 0.58] (p = 0.776)	291	0.11 [-0.29 - 0.5] (p = 0.594)	p = 0.843
Fat Mass Index (FMI)	269	0.08 [-0.09 - 0.24] (p = 0.362)	291	0.09 [-0.04 - 0.22] (p = 0.168)	p = 0.551
Fat-free Mass Index (FFMI)	269	0.03 [-0.12 - 0.19] (p = 0.672)	291	0.02 [-0.09 - 0.13] (p = 0.688)	p = 0.962
Body Anthropometrics COPSAC2000	n=	Female Adjusted [95% CI] p-value	n=	Male Adjusted [95% CI] p-value	P-Interaction
BMI (actual)	181	0.33 [-0.02 - 0.67] (p = 0.065)	173	0.52 [0.28 - 0.76] (p < 0.001)	p = 0.328
Body Weight (kilograms)	181	0.8 [-0.2 - 1.79] (p = 0.12)	175	1.72 [0.83 - 2.61] (p < 0.001)	p = 0.168
Fat Mass (kilograms)	181	0.52 [-0.11 - 1.15] (p = 0.106)	173	1.07 [0.58 - 1.56] (p < 0.001)	p = 0.159
Fat percent (%)	181	0.37 [-0.12 - 0.86] (p = 0.145)	173	0.84 [0.46 - 1.22] (p < 0.001)	p = 0.108
Muscle Mass (kilograms)	181	0.26 [-0.18 - 0.71] (p = 0.251)	173	0.64 [0.15 - 1.12] (p = 0.011)	p = 0.287
Skeletal Mass (kilograms)	181	0.16 [-0.1 - 0.42] (p = 0.228)	173	0.37 [0.07 - 0.67] (p = 0.015)	p = 0.335
Bone Mass (kilograms)	181	0.01 [-0.01 - 0.04] (p = 0.278)	173	0.03 [0.01 - 0.06] (p = 0.007)	p = 0.255)
Fat Free Mass (kilograms)	181	0.27 [-0.19 - 0.74] (p = 0.252)	173	0.67 [0.16 - 1.18] (p = 0.011)	p = 0.285
Fat Mass Index (FMI)	181	0.2 [-0.02 - 0.43] (p = 0.082)	173	0.33 [0.18 - 0.47] (p < 0.001)	p = 0.344
Fat-free Mass Index (FFMI)	181	0.12 [-0.02 - 0.27] (p = 0.091)	173	0.19 [0.07 - 0.31] (p = 0.002)	p = 0.397

Table 3. Sex-Stratified Associations between Screen Time and Body Anthropometrics in COPSAC2010 and COPSAC2000. Results of adjusted sex-stratified analyses assessing the associations between screen time and various body anthropometric measures in the COPSAC2010 and COPSAC2000 cohorts. The measures include BMI, body weight, fat mass, fat percent, muscle mass, skeletal mass, bone mass, fat-free mass, fat mass index, and fat-free mass index. The associations are presented separately for females and males in each cohort. The results highlight the significant associations between increased screen time and various body anthropometric measures, with differences noted between females and males. The associations are presented as estimates with 95% confidence intervals and corresponding p-values.