

1 **Full title:** Relation between motor competence and academic achievement: the
2 mediating role of fitness and cognition in boys and girls

3 **Short title:** Motor competence and academic achievement: the mediating role of fitness
4 and cognition

5 Antonio Fernández-Sánchez^{1,2}, Abel Ruiz-Hermosa^{1,3*}, Andrés Redondo-Tébar^{1,4}, Ana
6 Díez-Fernández^{1,5}, Vicente Martínez-Vizcaíno^{1,6}, María Eugenia Visier-Alfonso^{1,5},
7 Mairena Sánchez-López^{1,2}

8 ¹ *Social and Health Research Center, Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, Cuenca, Spain.*

9 ² *Faculty of Education, Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, Ciudad Real, Spain.*

10 ³ *Faculty of Sport Sciences, ACAFYDE, Universidad de Extremadura, Cáceres, Spain.*

11 ⁴ *Faculty of Nursing, University of Castilla-La Mancha, Ciudad Real, Spain*

12 ⁵ *Faculty of Nursing, University of Castilla-La Mancha, Cuenca, Spain*

13 ⁶ *Faculty of Health Sciences, Autonomous University of Chile, Talca, Chile.*

14

15

16 **E-mail addresses and ORCID:**

17

18 antonioj.fernandez@uclm.es (A. Fernández-Sánchez)

ORCID: 0000-0001-8171-3560

19 mairena.sanchez@uclm.es (M. Sánchez-López)

ORCID: [0000-0002-0217-0623](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0217-0623)

20 abel.ruizhermosa@uclm.es (A. Ruiz-Hermosa)

ORCID: 0000-0002-5127-0591

21 andres.redondo@uclm.es (A. Redondo-Tébar)

ORCID: 0000-0001-5920-6159

22 ana.diez@uclm.es (A. Díez-Fernández)

ORCID: 0000-0002-7673-986X

23 mariaeugenia.visier@uclm.es (M.E. Visier-Alfonso)

ORCID: 0000-0003-0364-8032

24 vicente.martinez@uclm.es (V. Martínez-Vizcaíno)

ORCID: 0000-0001-6121-7893

25

26

27 **Corresponding author: Abel Ruiz-Hermosa PhD.*

28 E-mail: abel.ruizhermosa@uclm.es

29

30 **Authors' contributions.** Vicente Martínez-Vizcaíno was the principal investigator and
31 obtained the funding. Antonio Fernández-Sánchez was the person who wrote the first
32 draft of the manuscript with the support of Mairena Sánchez-López and Abel Ruiz-
33 Hermosa. Andrés Redondo-Tébar, Ana Díez-Fernández, Vicente Martínez-Vizcaíno and
34 María Eugenia Visier-Alfonso gave statistical and epidemiological support. All authors
35 listed on the manuscript have revised and approved the submission of this version of the
36 manuscript and take full responsibility for the manuscript.

37 **Word count for manuscript:** 4672 words.

38 **Word count for abstract:** 300 words.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

39 **ABSTRACT**

40 **Introduction.** Good motor competence is linked to better academic achievement in
41 schoolchildren, potentially mediated by fitness and cognition. However, the relative
42 impact of these factors and whether they differ by sex remains unclear. The aim of the
43 present study was to assess the mediating role of fitness components and executive
44 function on this relationship, with a particular focus on sex differences.

45 **Methods.** This cross-sectional study included 562 schoolchildren (9-11 years, 293 girls)
46 from Cuenca, Spain. We assessed gross motor competence (MABC-2 battery), fitness
47 components (ALPHA battery), executive function (Toolbox battery), academic
48 achievement (mean of language and mathematics grades), weight, height, and
49 sociodemographic variables. Serial multiple mediation models between gross motor
50 competence to AA through fitness and cognition were conducted using the Hayes'
51 PROCESS SPSS macro, both for the total sample and by sex.

52 **Results.** Both fitness and executive function partially mediated the relationship between
53 gross motor competence and AA. In the total sample, the direct effect explained most of
54 the total effect (51.22% to 72.68%), followed by the cognitive path (19.51% to 30.73%),
55 fitness path (10.84% to 19.02%), and multiple path (4.43% to 9.27%). In boys, only the
56 cognitive path mediated the relationship (56.35% to 68.91%), while in girls, the fitness
57 path (for cardiorespiratory fitness and speed/agility, 19.08% and 20.27%), the cognitive
58 path (limited to upper body strength, 14.92%), and the multiple path (for cardiorespiratory
59 fitness, speed/agility, and lower body strength, 4.93%, 8.31% and 9.43%) were partial
60 mediators.

61 **Conclusions.** Our results suggest that part of the effect found between gross motor
62 competence and academic achievement in children occurs from improvements in fitness

63 and executive function. These findings emphasize the need for motor competence
64 programs that target both fitness (especially cardiorespiratory fitness and speed/agility)
65 and executive function to boost academic achievement in children aged 9-11.
66 Additionally, interventions should consider sex-specific differences.

67

68 *Keywords:* motor competence, academic achievement, executive function, physical
69 fitness, serial mediation model, schoolchildren.

70

71 *Abbreviations:* MC motor competence; GMC, gross motor competence; EF, executive
72 function; CRF, cardiorespiratory fitness; S/A, speed/agility; UBS, upper body strength;
73 LBS, lower body strength; AA, academic achievement; IE, indirect effect.

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84 INTRODUCTION

85 Motor competence (MC) can be defined as a person's ability to execute different
86 motor acts, including coordination of fine and gross motor skills that are necessary to
87 manage everyday tasks [1]. There is a growing body of evidence suggesting a positive
88 association between MC and physical health outcomes, including physical fitness and
89 weight status [2]. In addition, MC has been widely recognized as a potential predictor of
90 academic achievement (AA) [3,4]. However, the underlying mechanisms that drive this
91 relationship have not been sufficiently elucidated.

92 Cognitive processes have been suggested as potential mediators between MC and
93 AA [5]. This association may be attributed to be shared neural pathways and cognitive
94 demands between motor skills and executive function (EF) [6,7]. This is because the same
95 brain regions are partially responsible for the development of MC and EF in childhood
96 [8]. Despite this, few studies have examined the mediating role of EF in this relationship,
97 suggesting that MC exerts a positive influence on AA indirectly through EF [5,9].
98 However, the evidence on sex differences remains inconclusive. Since one study reported
99 no significant sex differences [10], another found that EF mediated the relationship
100 exclusively in boys [11].

101 Given the well-established relationship between MC and physical fitness [12], as
102 well as the documented positive association between fitness, cognitive function, and AA
103 [3], it is reasonable to hypothesize that physical fitness could serve as a mediating variable
104 in the relationship between MC and AA. However, to the best of our knowledge, only
105 one study has directly examined this hypothesis, reporting no significant effect [13].
106 Moreover, while physical fitness is generally positively associated with AA [14], this
107 relationship varies depending on the specific fitness component. Cardiorespiratory fitness
108 (CRF) and speed/agility (S/A) have consistently proven to have a positive effect on AA

109 [15–17], but the role of muscular strength remains unclear [14,15]. Thus, it is reasonable
110 to posit that the mediating effect of fitness on the MC-AA relationship may differ across
111 fitness components.

112 It thus appears possible to elucidate the association between MC and AA through
113 two principal paths: the cognitive and the fitness path. Furthermore, a third path may be
114 proposed, termed the ‘multiple path’, which suggests that improvements in MC may
115 result in enhancements in physical fitness, which could, in turn, enhance cognitive
116 function and AA. This multiple path will be analyzed for the first time in this study,
117 thereby providing a new and original viewpoint on the relationship between MC and AA.

118 Finally, research indicates that boys and girls exhibit distinct trajectories in
119 physical and cognitive development [18], as well as in brain activation during cognitive
120 tasks [19]. Such differences could affect the relationship between MC and its connection
121 to fitness, cognitive functions, and AA [20]. Despite these distinctions, there are no
122 studies specifically analyzing the mediating role of fitness and EF by sex.

123 It is therefore necessary to conduct further in-depth research into the relationships
124 between MC, fitness components, cognitive abilities, and AA, with a particular focus on
125 potential sex differences. The objective of this study was to examine whether fitness and
126 EF act as mediators in the relationship between gross motor competence (GMC) and AA,
127 and to identify potential differences between boys and girls.

128 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

129 **Study design and participants**

130 The present study is a cross-sectional analysis of the baseline data from a cluster-
131 randomized controlled trial (NCT03236337) to assess the effectiveness of a physical
132 activity intervention program (MOVI-daFit!) on reducing fat mass and cardiovascular

133 risk and improving physical fitness, EF, and AA among schoolchildren. Ten schools from
134 ten towns in the province of Cuenca, Spain, participated in the study. In all schools, all
135 children belonging to the fourth and fifth grades of primary school (9–11 years old) were
136 invited to participate. The study design, sampling procedures and methods have been fully
137 described elsewhere [21].

138 The study protocol was approved by The Clinical Research Ethics Committee of
139 the ‘Virgen de la Luz’ Hospital in Cuenca (REG: 2016/PI021). The approval of the
140 principal and the board of governors was sought from each school. The children were
141 informed about the study's objectives and gave their verbal consent to participate, with
142 the principal, researchers, and their peers as witnesses. Additionally, the parents or legal
143 guardians of all participants provided written informed consent.

144 **Instruments and study variables**

145 The recruitment period for this study began on September 11, 2017, and ended on
146 October 26, 2017. The measurements were conducted by researchers who were trained in
147 advance to standardize the procedures and were blinded to the participants' group
148 assignments.

149 ***Gross motor competence***

150 Gross motor competence refers to the degree of skilled performance in a wide range
151 of motor tasks as well as the movement coordination and control underlying a particular
152 motor outcome which involves the larger muscle groups [22] and is a prerequisite for
153 child physical activity participation and also for engagement in learning and social
154 activities, including sports and games [23]. To assess GMC, two dimensions (aiming-
155 catching and balance skills) of the validated Spanish version of the Movement
156 Assessment Battery for Children-Second Edition (MABC-2) were used [1] for the age
157 ranges 2 (7-10 years) and 3 (11-16 years). The tasks performed were: 1) Aiming-catching

158 1 (*catching*): The child had to throw a tennis ball against the wall and catch it with both
159 hands (9-10 years); The child had to throw a tennis ball against the wall and then catch it
160 using only one hand (11 years). 2) Aiming-catching 2 (*throwing*): The child had to aim a
161 beanbag into a red circle on a mat (9-10 years); The child had to throw a tennis ball into
162 a red circle on the wall (11 years). 3) Balance 1 (*static*): Single-board balance - The child
163 had to balance on one foot on the balance board (9-10 years); Two-board balance - The
164 child had to balance on the balance board, ensuring that the heel of one foot and the toes
165 of the other foot touch (11 years). 4) Balance 2 (*dynamic*): Heel to toe - The child had to
166 walk along a line while the heel of one foot touches the toes of the other foot. (9-10 years);
167 Walking backwards heel to toe - The child had to walk backwards along a line, making
168 sure that the toes of one foot touch the heel of the other (11 years). 5) Balance 3 (*dynamic*):
169 Hopscotch - The child had to jump forward on one leg from mat to mat starting from a
170 standing position (9-10 years); Zigzag hopping - The child had to jump diagonally from
171 one mat to another on one leg (11 years) [24]. Each test received a raw score (number of
172 catches, number of hits on target, seconds on one leg, number of steps on the line and
173 number of right jumps, respectively) where a higher score indicated a better GMC. The
174 resulting variable, *GMC Total Score*, was calculated as the sum of the z-scores for aiming-
175 catching, static balance, and dynamic balance.

176 ***Fitness variables***

177 Fitness is defined as a set of attributes related to a person's ability to perform
178 physical activities that require aerobic capacity, endurance, strength, or flexibility and is
179 determined mostly by a combination of regular activity and genetically inherited ability
180 [25]. The evidence-based ALPHA-Fitness test battery [26] was used, including the
181 following tests:

182 *Cardiorespiratory fitness*, using the 20-metre shuttle run test, a valid test to estimate
183 aerobic capacity in children. The children were required to run 20 meters between two
184 lines while keeping pace with the rhythm marked by acoustic signals. The initial speed of
185 8.5 km/h was increased by 0.5 km/h for each stage (one stage equals one minute). The
186 last half stage completed by the child was considered an indicator of CRF. Maximal
187 oxygen intake ($VO_2\text{max}$) was estimated by applying the Léger formula [27].

188 *Speed-agility*, using the 4×10 meter shuttle run test. Children were required to run
189 and turn (shuttle) 10 meters twice at maximum speed (4x10m). Two parallel lines were
190 drawn on the floor. When the start was given, the children ran as fast as possible to the
191 other line and returned to the starting line twice, crossing both lines with both feet. Two
192 attempts were made, with an interval of five minutes between attempts, and the best score
193 was recorded in seconds. A lower score indicated a better S/A.

194 *Upper Body strength* (UBS), through the handgrip strength test, determined in
195 kilograms using a digital dynamometer with adjustable grip TKK 5401 Grip-DW
196 (Takeya, Tokyo, Japan). The handgrip strength test has high-to-very high construct
197 validity with total muscle strength in healthy children, among other parameters [28]. The
198 test was performed twice with each hand and the arithmetic mean of the four
199 measurements was computed. Handgrip data was normalized by dividing absolute
200 handgrip strength (kg) by body weight (kg).

201 *Lower Body strength* (LBS), using the standing broad jump test, which measures
202 explosive LBS. The children jumped horizontally to achieve the maximum distance and
203 the best of three attempts was recorded in centimeters.

204 ***Executive functions***

205 Executive functions refer to a family of mental processes that have been categorized
206 in three core functions: inhibitory control (the ability to selectively attend, focusing on

207 what we choose and suppressing attention to other stimuli), cognitive flexibility (the
208 ability to change perspectives) and working memory (the ability to hold information in
209 mind and mentally working with it) [29]. Three EFs, using the NIH Toolbox software
210 (NIH Toolbox in Spanish, v. 1.8) [30] were assessed. All tests were performed
211 individually in a quiet classroom using a tablet (iPad Pro, Apple, Inc., California, USA).
212 The evaluation tests included in the NIH Toolbox for each cognitive domain are listed as
213 follows:

214 *Inhibitory control*, using an adaptation of the Flanker test [31]. Participants had to
215 indicate the left-right direction of a centrally shown stimulus while inhibiting their
216 attention to the potentially incongruent stimuli around it. In some trials, the orientation of
217 the flanking stimuli was congruent with the orientation of the central stimulus (>>>>
218 or <<<<,) while in other trials, this orientation was incongruent (>><>> or <<><
219 <). The NIH Toolbox contained a practice block of trials. If participants passed it, a 20-
220 trial block was presented. These trials consisted of a succession of congruent and
221 incongruent combination of arrows. Using a two-vector method that included both
222 reaction time and accuracy, a final score was calculated for school children who reached
223 a high level of accuracy (>80%), which was as follows: $(0.25 \times \text{number of correct}$
224 $\text{responses}) + 5 - \log_{10} [(\text{congruent reaction time} + \text{incongruent reaction time}) / 2]$. A total
225 score considering accuracy was determined for children who scored less than 80%.

226 *Cognitive flexibility*, using the Dimension Change Card Sort (DCCS) [31].
227 Participants were shown two target cards and asked to order a group of bivalent test cards,
228 first according to one dimension and then according to the other dimension. After a four-
229 trial practice, children were given a 30-trial block with both ‘shape’ and ‘color’
230 requirements. Using reaction time and accuracy percentage on preswitch and postswitch,
231 a raw score was determined. Using a two-vector method that integrated both accuracy

232 and reaction time, a final score was calculated for children who reached a high level of
233 accuracy (>80%) as follows: $(0.167 \times \text{number of correct responses}) + 5 - \log_{10}$
234 $[(\text{congruent reaction time} + \text{incongruent reaction time}) / 2]$. For participants scoring
235 <80%, a total outcome considering accuracy was determined.

236 *Working memory*, using the List Sorting Working Memory Test [32]. Children were
237 given a group of pictures, and items were presented both auditorily and visually. Then,
238 they were required to repeat the names of the items observed in order of size, from
239 smallest to biggest. The number of items shown in each trial increased by one for each
240 series. This test was made up of two parts. In the first one, all the items belonged to the
241 same category (animals or food items). In the second one, the items from both categories
242 (food items and animals) were presented together, and children had to repeat the items by
243 category and size. The List Sorting “Total Score” was composed of final scores based
244 upon a sum of the total correct trials across the two lists.

245 The resulting variable, *EF Total Score*, was calculated as the sum of the z-scores
246 for inhibitory control, cognitive flexibility, and working memory.

247 *Academic achievement*

248 The final grades in language and mathematics, provided by the school
249 administration, were used to determine AA. These subjects were selected because, in
250 Spain, they are considered instrumental subjects, as they serve as a foundation for learning
251 other subjects and help in everyday life and activities. The children’s final grades from
252 the previous academic year were used (range from 1 to 10 score, with 10 being the best
253 grade). The arithmetic mean of the grades in language and mathematics was used in the
254 analysis. In Spain, final grades represent the student’s work across a complete academic
255 year.

256 *Anthropometry*

257 Weight was measured using a scale (Seca 861, Vogel and Halke, Hamburg,
258 Germany) with the child in light clothing and barefoot. For height, a wall stadiometer
259 (Seca 222, Vogel and Halke) was used with children barefoot and standing upright with
260 their sagittal midline in contact with the backboard. Both weight and height were
261 measured twice, and their arithmetic mean was considered for the analysis. Body mass
262 index (BMI) was calculated as weight (kg) / height (m²).

263 ***Sociodemographic data***

264 The age, sex and mother's education level were gathered using a questionnaire
265 administered to the parents. Data on mother's education level as the maximum level of
266 education attained by the children's mothers gathered the validated scale proposed by the
267 Spanish Society of Epidemiology [33] to measure socioeconomic status. This
268 questionnaire includes an item referred to mother's education with six response options:
269 i) no literacy skills; ii) no studies; iii) elementary studies; iv) secondary studies; v) high
270 school; and vi) university studies. In our study, these six categories were collapsed into
271 three, due to the small number of individuals in the lower and upper categories:
272 lower/lower middle (no literacy skills, no studies, and elementary studies), middle
273 (secondary studies) and upper middle/upper (high school and university studies). The
274 mother's education level was used as covariate in the mediation models (as an interval
275 variable), because it has been shown to be a strong predictor of children's AA [34].

276 **Statistical analysis**

277 Interval variables were summarized as means and standard deviations. The
278 mother's education level was expressed as counts and frequencies. Both statistical
279 (Kolmogorov-Smirnov test) and graphical procedures (normal probability plots) were
280 used to evaluate the goodness of fit of variables to a normal distribution and all variables

281 fitted to a normal distribution. Differences in all variables between boys and girls were
282 tested using Student's t-tests.

283 Pearson correlation coefficients were estimated to examine the relationship between
284 GMC, CRF, S/A, UBS, LBS, EF Total Score, and AA for the total sample and by sex.
285 Values below 0.1 were defined as trivial, weak in the range 0.1–0.29, moderate in the
286 interval 0.3–0.49, and large when greater than 0.5 [35].

287 The mediation effect of different fitness components (CRF, S/A, UBS, and LBS)
288 and EF on the relationship between GMC and AA for the total sample and by sex was
289 tested using the PROCESS SPSS Macro, version 4.2, selecting model 6 (serial multiple
290 mediation analysis) and 10,000 bias-corrected bootstrap samples [36]. For this analysis,
291 GMC was entered in the model as the independent variable, the proposed mediators were,
292 consecutively, fitness variables and EF, and AA was included as the dependent variable.
293 Each fitness component was individually entered in a different model: model a, CRF;
294 model b, S/A; model c, UBS; and model d, LBS. In the mediation model, the total (c),
295 and direct effects (a_1 , a_2 , b_1 , b_2 , d_{12} and c') were estimated. Additionally, this model
296 examines three indirect effects (IEs) (fitness path, cognitive path, and multiple path) that
297 indicate the change in AA for each unit change in GMC that is mediated by each fitness
298 variable and EF. The IEs were considered significant when the 95% confidence interval
299 did not include zero.

300 The IE is represented by the path from GMC to AA via mediators (paths a, b, and
301 d). The fitness path (a_1 - b_1), from GMC to AA via fitness variables (a, CRF; b, S/A; c,
302 UBS; and d, LBS). The cognitive path (a_2 - b_2), from GMC to AA via EF. Finally, the
303 multiple path (d_{12}), from GMC to AA via fitness variables (a, CRF; b: S/A; c, UBS; and
304 d, LBS) and EF. Proposed cut points to quantify effect size were 0.14, 0.36, and 0.51 for
305 small, medium and large effect sizes, respectively [37]. The percentages of mediation

306 (P_M) were calculated as (IE/total effect) x 100 to estimate the percentage of the total effect
 307 explained by the mediation paths. All analyses were adjusted by age, BMI, and mother's
 308 education level.

309 Data analyses were conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics version 28.0 (IBM®
 310 SPSS®, Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.), and the level of significance was set at $p < 0.05$.

311 RESULTS

312 The characteristics of the total sample, as well as by sex, are presented in **Table**
 313 **1**. Of the 562 schoolchildren involved in the study, 293 were girls (52.14%), with a mean
 314 age of 10.02 years ($SD = \pm 0.71$). Boys scored significantly higher on aiming-catching (p
 315 < 0.001), CRF ($p < 0.001$), S/A ($p = 0.006$), UBS ($p = 0.004$), and LBS ($p < 0.001$) while
 316 girls scored significantly higher on static and dynamic balance ($p < 0.001$), and cognitive
 317 flexibility ($p = 0.014$).

318 Table 1. Characteristics of the study sample by sex.

	Total Sample (n=562)	Boys (n=269)	Girls (n=293)	p-value
Sample Characteristics				
Age (years)	10.02 (0.71)	10.01 (0.71)	10.04 (0.71)	0.291
Weight (kg)	36.55 (9.77)	36.62 (9.72)	36.48 (9.84)	0.433
Height (cm)	140.91 (7.33)	140.99 (7.07)	140.84 (7.56)	0.407
Body Mass Index (kg/m ²)	18.22 (3.78)	18.25 (3.86)	18.19 (3.72)	0.423
Mother's Education Level [n (%)]				
Lower/lower middle	62 (12.38)	28 (11.76)	34 (12.93)	0.641
Middle	221 (44.11)	102 (42.86)	119 (45.25)	0.492
Upper middle/upper	218 (43.51)	108 (45.38)	110 (41.82)	0.548
Gross Motor Competence (GMC)				
Aiming-Catching (n)	7.13 (1.78)	7.76 (1.67)	6.55 (1.68)	< 0.001
Static Balance (s)*	18.47 (8.97)	16.80 (8.87)	20.02 (8.80)	< 0.001
Dynamic Balance (p)	9.30 (1.68)	8.99 (1.99)	9.58 (1.27)	< 0.001
GMC Total Score ^Z	0.3880 (1.89)	0.4123 (2.00)	0.3656 (1.79)	0.385
Fitness				
Cardiorespiratory Fitness (VO ₂ max)	45.97 (4.61)	47.41 (4.98)	44.66 (3.81)	< 0.001
Speed/Agility (s)**	13.71 (1.36)	13.56 (1.40)	13.85 (1.32)	0.006
Upper Body Strength (kg)	12.39 (3.49)	12.80 (3.77)	12.01 (3.17)	0.004
Lower Body Strength (cm)	116.66 (20.71)	121.55 (21.41)	112.23 (19.04)	< 0.001
Executive Function (EF)				
Inhibitory Control (FT) [¥]	19.66 (1.35)	19.61 (1.36)	19.70 (1.33)	0.172
Cognitive Flexibility (DCCS) [§]	28.17(3.10)	27.87 (3.10)	28.44 (3.08)	0.014
Working Memory (LSWM)	14.25 (3.18)	14.45 (3.31)	14.06 (3.04)	0.077
EF Total Score ^Z	0.0037 (1.91)	-0.0030 (1.96)	0.0099 (1.88)	0.469
Academic Achievement (AA)				

Language-Mathematics ^Δ	7.04 (1.73)	7.01 (1.74)	7.07 (1.73)	0.336
-----------------------------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------

319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332

Values are mean ± standard deviation, except for mother's education level, which are shown as number and percentages [n (%)]. Abbreviations. GMC = gross motor competence; Test scores: n = number of right attempts; s = seconds; p = punctuation. EF = executive function; FT = flanker task; DCCS = dimensional change card sort test; LSWM = list shorting working memory test. In bold (p-values), statistical signification (p < 0.05).
^ZGMC Total score was calculated from z scores of aiming-catching, static balance and dynamic balance.
^ZEF Total score was calculated from z total scores of inhibitory control, cognitive flexibility and working memory.
^{*}In Static Balance (seconds), more time indicates better score. ^{**}In Speed/Agility (seconds), more time indicates worse score.
[‡]Total score was calculated using a two-vector method that incorporates both accuracy and reaction time. Total score = (0.25 x number correct responses) + 5 - log₁₀ [(congruent reaction time + incongruent reaction time)/2].
[§]Total score was calculated using a two-vector method that incorporates both accuracy and reaction time. Total score = (0.167 x number correct responses) + 5 - log₁₀ [(congruent reaction time + incongruent reaction time)/2].
^ΔMean of the grades in language and mathematics.

333 The Pearson's correlation coefficients for the total sample, as well as by sex, are
 334 shown in **Table 2**. For the total sample, all the fitness variables showed a significant
 335 correlation with AA and EF (r values between 0.131 and 0.249, p < 0.01), except between
 336 UBS and EF. By sex, all the fitness variables show a significant correlation with AA and
 337 EF except between UBS and EF for both sexes, between UBS and AA for girls, and
 338 between LBS and AA for boys. In all the fitness variables, the correlation coefficient with
 339 both EF and AA was consistently higher in girls compared to boys. Specifically, S/A
 340 stands out as the fitness variable with the strongest correlation with EF (r = -0.217 in boys
 341 and r = -0.269 in girls; p < 0.01), while CRF exhibits the highest correlation with AA (r
 342 = 0.219 in boys and r = 0.317 in girls; p < 0.01). Most of the mentioned associations show
 343 weak correlation strength. However, notable moderate strength correlations are observed
 344 between CRF and AA (r = 0.317; p < 0.01), as well as between LBS and EF (r = 0.312; p
 345 < 0.01), both exclusively in girls.

346 Table 2. Bivariate correlation coefficients among the study variables for the total sample and by sex.

		GMC	CRF	Speed/ Agility	Upper Body Strength	Lower Body Strength	Executive Function Total Score
CRF	Total	0.278**					
	Boys	0.270**					
	Girls	0.313**					
Speed/Agility ^T	Total	-0.410**	-0.490**				
	Boys	-0.441**	-0.487**				
	Girls	-0.380**	-0.483**				

Upper Body Strength	Total	0.127**	0.003	-0.138**			
	Boys	0.185**	0.013	-0.204**			
	Girls	0.055	-0.095	-0.042			
Lower Body Strength	Total	0.333**	0.469**	-0.544**	0.214**		
	Boys	0.354**	0.497**	-0.620**	0.311**		
	Girls	0.367**	0.473**	-0.556**	0.144*		
Executive Function Total Score	Total	0.229**	0.181**	-0.241**	0.064	0.249**	
	Boys	0.262**	0.161*	-0.217**	0.049	0.177**	
	Girls	0.194**	0.233**	-0.269**	0.083	0.312**	
Academic Achievement ^Δ	Total	0.225**	0.246**	-0.237**	-0.113**	0.131**	0.417**
	Boys	0.171**	0.219**	-0.201**	-0.142*	0.061	0.506**
	Girls	0.282**	0.317**	-0.278**	-0.079	0.209**	0.331**

347 Abbreviations: GMC = Gross motor competence; CRF = Cardiorespiratory fitness.

348 [†]In Speed/Agility, lower scores indicate better results (time variable).

349 ^ΔMean of the grades in language and mathematics.

350 *p < 0.05; **p < 0.01

351

352 Multiple mediation models for the total sample indicated a consistent association
 353 between GMC and AA across all models, with unstandardized coefficients ranging from
 354 0.203 to 0.205 (p<0.001). Most of this effect was explained by the direct association, with
 355 coefficients between 0.105 and 0.149 (p<0.05). Additionally, all three indirect paths
 356 (fitness, cognitive, and multiple) were significant for all fitness variables, except for the
 357 fitness path in UBS and LBS, and the multiple path in S/A and UBS (**Fig 1**).

358
 359 — Significant effect
 360 - - - Non-significant effect
 361 *p < 0.05; **p < 0.001
 362 Fitness path
 363 Cognitive path
 364 Multiple path
 365
 366
 367

Fig 1. Serial multiple mediation model (total sample). Association between gross motor competence (independent variable) and academic achievement (dependent variable), with different fitness components (CRF, S/A, UBS and LBS) and executive functions as mediators, controlling for age, body mass index and mother's education level. Values for the a₁, a₂, b₁, b₂ and d₁₂ paths are expressed as the unstandardized regression coefficients (standard error). Values c and c' express total and direct effect, respectively. GMC gross motor competence, CRF cardiorespiratory fitness, S/A speed/agility, UBS upper body strength, LBS lower body strength, EF executive function, AA academic achievement.

368 Among boys (**Fig 2**) the total effect of GMC on AA was significantly lower, with
 369 coefficients ranging from 0.119 to 0.130 (p<0.05) highlighting no direct association
 370 between GMC and AA for any of the variables studied. Instead, improvements in AA
 371 through GMC consistently occurred via EF (cognitive path). In contrast, among girls, the
 372 total effects were significantly higher (0.295 to 0.304, p<0.001), with most of the effect
 373 explained by the direct association between GMC and AA, which was significant across

374 all models, with coefficients ranging from 0.200 to 0.252 ($p < 0.05$). Additionally, for CRF
375 and S/A, both the fitness and multiple paths were significant, while only the cognitive
376 path was significant for UBS, and only the multiple path was significant for LBS.

377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385




Fig 2. Serial multiple mediation model (boys and girls). Association between gross motor competence (independent variable) and academic achievement (dependent variable), with different fitness components (CRF, S/A, UBS and LBS) and executive functions as mediators, controlling for age, body mass index and mother's education level. Values for the a_1 , a_2 , b_1 , b_2 and d_{12} paths are expressed as the unstandardized regression coefficients (standard error). Values c and c' express total and direct effect, respectively. GMC gross motor competence, CRF cardiorespiratory fitness, S/A speed/agility, UBS upper body strength, LBS lower body strength, EF executive function, AA academic achievement.

386
387

The total, direct, and IEs of the different paths from the serial multiple mediation
388 analyses, along with the mediation percentages for direct and IEs, are summarized in
389 **Table 3**. Across all models examined, a positive association between GMC and AA was
390 observed. For the total sample, most of the total effect was accounted for the direct effect
391 (51.22% to 72.68%), followed by the IEs of the cognitive path (19.51% to 30.73%),
392 fitness path (10.84% to 19.02%), and multiple path (4.43% to 9.27%). In boys, more than
393 half of the total effect was explained by the IE of the cognitive path (56.35% to 68.91%).
394 In contrast, in girls, the majority of the total effect was attributed to the direct effect of
395 GMC on AA (66.45% to 85.42%), followed by the IEs of the fitness path (19.08% to
396 20.27%), cognitive path (for UBS only, 14.92%), and multiple path (4.93% to 9.43%).

397

398 **Table 3.** Total, direct, and indirect effects of the different paths from the serial multiple mediation analyses, investigating fitness and executive functions as mediators
 399 between gross motor competence and academic achievement, controlling for age, body mass index, and mother's education level.

Fitness Mediator Variable	Total Effect (c)	Indirect Effects																	
		Direct Effect (c')			FITNESS PATH					COGNITIVE PATH					MULTIPLE PATH				
		Direct Effect (c')	P _M (%)	Indirect Effect	95% CI		P _M (%)	Indirect Effect	95% CI		P _M (%)	Indirect Effect	95% CI		P _M (%)				
					Lower	Upper			Lower	Upper			Lower	Upper					
Total	CRF	0.203 (0.038)**	0.117 (0.038)*	57.64	0.022 (0.012)*	0.001	0.047	10.84	0.055 (0.017)**	0.023	0.088	27.09	0.009 (0.005)*	0.001	0.02	4.43			
	S/A	0.205 (0.038)**	0.105 (0.039)*	51.22	0.039 (0.016)*	0.008	0.072	19.02	0.040 (0.016)*	0.009	0.073	19.51							
	UBS	0.205 (0.038)**	0.149 (0.036)**	72.68					0.063 (0.016)**	0.032	0.097	30.73							
	LBS	0.205 (0.038)**	0.141 (0.038)**	68.78					0.046 (0.016)*	0.016	0.079	22.44	0.019 (0.006)**	0.009	0.033	9.27			
Boys	CRF	0.119 (0.054)*							0.082 (0.027)*	0.029	0.137	68.91							
	S/A	0.126 (0.054)*							0.071 (0.029)*	0.018	0.130	56.35							
	UBS	0.131 (0.053)*							0.085 (0.027)*	0.035	0.141	64.89							
	LBS	0.130 (0.054)*							0.080 (0.027)*	0.030	0.135	61.54							
Girls	CRF	0.304 (0.054)**	0.204 (0.056)**	67.11	0.058 (0.027)*	0.008	0.114	19.08					0.015 (0.008)*	0.003	0.035	4.93			
	S/A	0.301 (0.054)**	0.200 (0.057)*	66.45	0.061 (0.025)*	0.015	0.115	20.27					0.025 (0.010)**	0.008	0.047	8.31			
	UBS	0.295 (0.055)**	0.252 (0.053)**	85.42					0.044 (0.020)*	0.009	0.088	14.92							
	LBS	0.297 (0.054)**	0.237 (0.057)**	79.80									0.028 (0.010)**	0.011	0.05	9.43			

400 Results showed unstandardized coefficients (standard error) and bootstraps confidence 95% confidence interval (CI) on 10000 bootstraps.
 401 CRF, cardiorespiratory fitness; S/A, speed/agility; UBS, upper body strength; LBS, lower body strength; P_M, percentage of mediation. *p<0.05; **p<0.001.

402 **DISCUSSION**

403 To our knowledge, this is the first study to use multiple mediation models to
404 examine the influence of physical fitness components and EF on the relationship between
405 GMC and AA. Our analyses indicate that the fitness path (for CRF and S/A), the cognitive
406 path (across all fitness components), and the multiple path (for CRF and LBS) partially
407 mediated the relationship between GMC and AA in primary schoolchildren even after
408 controlling for age, BMI and mother's education level. Moreover, significant sex
409 differences were also found, with EF being the only mediator of this relationship in boys,
410 whereas fitness variables, particularly CRF and S/A, were found to be the main mediators
411 in girls.

412 Compared to previous studies, our findings agree with those obtained by Schmidt
413 et al. [9], who reported that motor ability predicted AA fully mediated through EF
414 performance in a longitudinal study with children aged 10 to 12 years using structural
415 equation models, and with a previous study by our group that found that different domains
416 of EF acted as a partial mediator in this relationship [11]. Similarly, findings by Cadoret
417 et al. [5], support a mediation model in which the relationship between motor proficiency
418 and AA is mediated by cognitive ability in 7-year-old children.

419 To our knowledge, only one study [13] has investigated the mediating role of CRF
420 between MC and AA in Finnish schoolchildren, which limits the comparability of our
421 results. This study examined whether parent-reported MC at 8 years, predicts AA (grades)
422 via CRF (cycle ergometer test) at 16 years. In contrast to our data, this study found that
423 CRF did not mediate this relationship. These differences could be explained by the
424 different instruments and predictive methodologies used to evaluate CRF, MC, and AA,
425 as well as changes in educational level and the transformations that occur during puberty.

426 However, further studies are needed to gain a deeper understanding of the mediating role
427 of fitness in the MC-AA relationship.

428 Our findings also suggest that improvements in GMC lead to increased physical
429 fitness, which, in turn, enhances EF, ultimately improving AA in schoolchildren. This
430 multiple mediation path showed that improving AA through fitness and EF was effective
431 for CRF and LBS in the total sample, and for CRF, S/A, and LBS in girls. These findings
432 highlight the importance of designing motor activities/games that improve both the
433 components of physical fitness (especially CRF and S/A) and the mental skills of EF in
434 programs focused on GMC to improve AA in children aged 9-11 years.

435 Our study found distinct sex differences in the relationship between GMC and
436 AA. For girls, this relationship is complex, with direct links and several mediating paths
437 through fitness (CRF and S/A), cognition (UBS), and multiple path (CRF, S/A, and LBS).
438 In boys, however, the relationship is solely mediated by the cognitive path, supporting
439 prior research by Fernández-Sánchez et al. [11], but contrasting with findings by Lopes
440 et al. [10], which reported no significant sex differences. The direct association between
441 GMC and AA in girls, along with the mediation via physical fitness, might suggests a
442 more integrated development of physical and cognitive domains in females compared to
443 males. These differences could be based in biological and sociocultural factors that
444 influence the development of motor skills and cognitive functions in boys and girls [38],
445 such as the different rates of biological maturation [39] and brain development [40,41],
446 as well as gender biases in activities performed [42]. Another possible explanation for
447 these sex differences could be due to the fact that boys and girls use different circuits and
448 molecular mechanisms to solve the same cognitive problems. Consequently, although
449 general ability may be the same, it is unlikely that the strategies used by boys and girls

450 rely on identical neurobiological mechanisms [43]. Nevertheless, given the scarcity of
451 studies with a particular focus on sex differences, more research is needed.

452 With evidence that the fitness path, cognitive path, and multiple path all act as
453 mediators on the relationship between GMC and AA, the question arises as to which of
454 these three paths is the most influential mediator of this relationship. In the total sample,
455 the cognitive path is the predominant mediator, followed by the fitness path and the
456 multiple path. When analyzed by sex, for boys, only the cognitive path mediates this
457 relationship, whereas for girls, the fitness path is the most predominant mediator,
458 followed by the cognitive path and the multiple path. Our findings suggest the existence
459 of a greater preponderance of the cardiovascular hypothesis [44] in the mediating
460 mechanisms in girls, while the cognitive hypothesis [45,46] better explains these
461 mechanisms in boys. This could be due to significant sex differences previously
462 mentioned, especially at 9-10 years, an age at which these differences are more
463 pronounced [47]. These different underlying mechanisms suggest that the impact of GMC
464 on enhancing AA may vary depending on the type of physical activity, specifically
465 whether it is cognitively engaging versus oriented towards fitness.

466 Finally, our results suggest that CRF and S/A act as significant mediators of
467 cognitive benefits, while the role of muscular strength remains unclear. This could be due
468 to different biological and neurological mechanisms described in the literature.
469 Specifically, CRF is associated with angiogenesis in the motor cortex and increased
470 cerebral blood flow, which enhances brain vascularization and could positively impact
471 cognitive performance [48]. Improvements in S/A could enhance attention [49] and speed
472 nerve impulse conduction, influencing brain processing speed [15]. These factors may
473 improve the spinal cord function, causing synaptogenesis, increasing the BDNF and the
474 reorganization of movement representations within the motor cortex [50]. This combined

475 set of neural changes could positively impact on cognition [50] and, subsequently, on AA
476 [15]. However, the relationship between muscle strength and cognition and AA remains
477 equivocal. While some studies report positive correlations [51,52], others find no
478 significant relationship [53,54]. Therefore, further research is needed to clarify the
479 influence of physical fitness components on cognitive and academic outcomes.

480 **Limitations**

481 The present study has some limitations to be described. First, its cross-sectional
482 design limits our ability to infer causality. Longitudinal studies are needed to establish
483 causal relationships and to understand the developmental trajectories of these variables.
484 Nevertheless, the temporality proposed in our models is consistent with the current
485 knowledge about the relationship between GMC, fitness, EF, and AA [5,9,11,55,56].
486 Second, the reliance on school-based assessments of AA may not capture the full
487 spectrum of academic skills. Although mathematics and language in primary education
488 are key cross-curricular areas for the remaining subjects and other academic competences.
489 Third, the study does not consider potential behavior-related confounders, moderators, or
490 mediators such as physical activity or sleep. Finally, even though the analysis in this study
491 was controlled for some potential confounders, neither visual acuity nor adiposity was
492 controlled for, and both are known to be health conditions affecting the performance in
493 motor skills tests [57–59].

494 **Conclusions**

495 Our results suggest that a significant proportion of the effect found between GMC
496 and AA in children is due to improvements in fitness (CRF and S/A) and EF. These
497 findings highlight the need for motor skills programs that target both fitness (particularly
498 CRF and S/A) and EF to improve AA. Furthermore, the sex differences observed in the

499 mediation pathways highlight the need for sex-sensitive approaches in interventions.
500 Boys may benefit from engaging in activities that combine physical activity with high
501 cognitive demands, such as perceptual-motor tasks. Conversely, girls may benefit from
502 prioritizing activities that focus on improving physical fitness.

503 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

504 The authors thank the schools, families, and children for their enthusiastic
505 participation in the study. We thank all membership of the Cuenca Study Group, who
506 helped to make this study possible: Carlos Berlanga-Macías, Blanca Notario-Pacheco,
507 María Jesús Pardo-Guijarro, Celia Álvarez-Bueno, Marta Nieto-López, Alberto
508 González-García, Jorge Cañete García-Prieto, Ana Torres-Costoso, Antonio García-
509 Hermoso, Caterina Pesce, and Ricardo Cuevas-Campos.

510 **REFERENCES**

- 511 1. Henderson SE, Sugden D, Barnett AL. Movement Assessment Battery for Children-2.
512 London, Uk: The Psychological corporation; 2007 [cited 2023 Jan 23]. Available from:
513 <http://doi.apa.org/getdoi.cfm?doi=10.1037/t55281-000>
- 514 2. Barnett LM, Webster EK, Hulteen RM, De Meester A, Valentini NC, Lenoir M, et al.
515 Through the Looking Glass: A Systematic Review of Longitudinal Evidence, Providing
516 New Insight for Motor Competence and Health. *Sports Med.* 2022 Apr 1;52(4):875–920.
- 517 3. Haapala EA. Cardiorespiratory Fitness and Motor Skills in Relation to Cognition and
518 Academic Performance in Children – A Review. *J Hum Kinet.* 2013 Mar 28;36:55–68.
- 519 4. Syväoja HJ, Joensuu L, Kallio J, Hakonen H, Hillman CH, Tammelin TH. The
520 Longitudinal Associations of Fitness and Motor Skills with Academic Achievement.
521 Kankaanpää A, editor. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2019 Oct;51(10):2050–7.
- 522 5. Cadoret G, Bigras N, Duval S, Lemay L, Tremblay T, Lemire J. The mediating role of
523 cognitive ability on the relationship between motor proficiency and early academic
524 achievement in children. *Hum Mov Sci.* 2018 Feb;57:149–57.
- 525 6. Best JR. Effects of Physical Activity on Children’s Executive Function: Contributions of
526 Experimental Research on Aerobic Exercise. *Dev Rev DR.* 2010 Dec;30(4):331–551.
- 527 7. Ridler K, Veijola JM, Tanskanen P, Miettunen J, Chitnis X, Suckling J, et al. Fronto-
528 cerebellar systems are associated with infant motor and adult executive functions in healthy
529 adults but not in schizophrenia. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2006 Oct 17;103(42):15651–6.


- 530 8. Diamond A. Close Interrelation of Motor Development and Cognitive Development and of
531 the Cerebellum and Prefrontal Cortex. *Child Dev.* 2000;71(1):44–56.
- 532 9. Schmidt M, Egger F, Benzing V, Jäger K, Conzelmann A, Roebers CM, et al.
533 Disentangling the relationship between children’s motor ability, executive function and
534 academic achievement. *PloS One.* 2017;12(8):e0182845.
- 535 10. Lopes L, Santos R, Pereira B, Lopes VP. Associations between gross motor coordination
536 and academic achievement in elementary school children. *Hum Mov Sci.* 2013
537 Feb;32(1):9–20.
- 538 11. Fernández-Sánchez A, Redondo-Tébar A, Sánchez-López M, Visier-Alfonso ME, Muñoz-
539 Rodríguez JR, Martínez-Vizcaíno V. Sex differences on the relation among gross motor
540 competence, cognition, and academic achievement in children. *Scand J Psychol.*
541 2022;63(5):504–12.
- 542 12. Haga M. The relationship between physical fitness and motor competence in children.
543 *Child Care Health Dev.* 2008;34(3):329–34.
- 544 13. Kantomaa MT, Stamatakis E, Kankaanpää A, Kaakinen M, Rodriguez A, Taanila A, et al.
545 Physical activity and obesity mediate the association between childhood motor function and
546 adolescents’ academic achievement. *Proc Natl Acad Sci.* 2013 Jan 29;110(5):1917–22.
- 547 14. Santana CCA, Azevedo LB, Cattuzzo MT, Hill JO, Andrade LP, Prado WL. Physical
548 fitness and academic performance in youth: A systematic review. *Scand J Med Sci Sports.*
549 2017;27(6):579–603.
- 550 15. Esteban-Cornejo I, Tejero-González CM, Martínez-Gómez D, del-Campo J, González-Galo
551 A, Padilla-Moledo C, et al. Independent and Combined Influence of the Components of
552 Physical Fitness on Academic Performance in Youth. *J Pediatr.* 2014 Aug 1;165(2):306-
553 312.e2.
- 554 16. Ruiz-Ariza A, Grao-Cruces A, de Loureiro NEM, Martínez-López EJ. Influence of physical
555 fitness on cognitive and academic performance in adolescents: A systematic review from
556 2005–2015. *Int Rev Sport Exerc Psychol.* 2017 Jan 1;10(1):108–33.
- 557 17. Sardinha LB, Marques A, Minderico C, Palmeira A, Martins S, Santos D, et al.
558 Longitudinal relationship between cardiorespiratory fitness and academic achievement.
559 *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2016 May;48(5):839–44.
- 560 18. Miller DI, Halpern DF. The new science of cognitive sex differences. *Trends Cogn Sci.*
561 2014 Jan;18(1):37–45.
- 562 19. Bell EC, Willson MC, Wilman AH, Dave S, Silverstone PH. Males and females differ in
563 brain activation during cognitive tasks. *NeuroImage.* 2006 Apr 1;30(2):529–38.
- 564 20. Zayed K, Jansen P. Gender Differences and the Relationship of Motor, Cognitive and
565 Academic Achievement in Omani Primary School-Aged Children. *Front Psychol [Internet].*
566 2018 [cited 2024 Jan 8];9. Available from:
567 <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02477>
- 568 21. Martínez-Vizcaíno V, Álvarez-Bueno C, Cavero-Redondo I, Pozuelo-Carrascosa DP,
569 Garrido-Miguel M, Martínez-Hortelano JA, et al. MOVI-daFIT! Intervention: Rationale
570 and design of a cluster randomized controlled trial testing the effects on improving
571 adiposity, cognition, and subclinical atherosclerosis by increasing cardiorespiratory fitness
572 in children. *Medicine (Baltimore).* 2019 Mar;98(9):e14737.

- 573 22. D'Hondt E, Deforche B, Gentier I, De Bourdeaudhuij I, Vaeyens R, Philippaerts R, et al. A
574 longitudinal analysis of gross motor coordination in overweight and obese children versus
575 normal-weight peers. *Int J Obes* 2005. 2013 Jan;37(1):61–7.
- 576 23. Cameron CE, Cottone EA, Murrah WM, Grissmer DW. How Are Motor Skills Linked to
577 Children's School Performance and Academic Achievement? *Child Dev Perspect*.
578 2016;10(2):93–8.
- 579 24. Movement Assessment Battery for Children 2nd Edition. [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2021 Jan
580 24]. Available from: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_FucZyMY_ug
- 581 25. Ortega FB, Cadenas-Sanchez C, Lee D chul, Ruiz JR, Blair SN, Sui X. Fitness and Fatness
582 as Health Markers through the Lifespan: An Overview of Current Knowledge. *Prog Prev*
583 *Med*. 2018 Apr;3(2):e0013.
- 584 26. Ruiz JR, Castro-Piñero J, España-Romero V, Artero EG, Ortega FB, Cuenca MM, et al.
585 Field-based fitness assessment in young people: the ALPHA health-related fitness test
586 battery for children and adolescents. *Br J Sports Med*. 2011 May 1;45(6):518–24.
- 587 27. Léger LA, Mercier D, Gadoury C, Lambert J. The multistage 20 metre shuttle run test for
588 aerobic fitness. *J Sports Sci*. 1988 Jun 1;6(2):93–101.
- 589 28. Wind AE, Takken T, Helders PJM, Engelbert RHH. Is grip strength a predictor for total
590 muscle strength in healthy children, adolescents, and young adults? *Eur J Pediatr*. 2010
591 Mar;169(3):281–7.
- 592 29. Diamond A. Executive functions. *Annu Rev Psychol*. 2013;64:135–68.
- 593 30. Weintraub S, Bauer PJ, Zelazo PD, Wallner-Allen K, Dikmen SS, Heaton RK, et al. I. NIH
594 Toolbox Cognition Battery (CB): introduction and pediatric data. *Monogr Soc Res Child*
595 *Dev*. 2013 Aug;78(4):1–15.
- 596 31. Zelazo PD, Anderson JE, Richler J, Wallner-Allen K, Beaumont JL, Weintraub S. II. NIH
597 Toolbox Cognition Battery (CB): measuring executive function and attention. *Monogr Soc*
598 *Res Child Dev*. 2013 Aug;78(4):16–33.
- 599 32. Tulskey DS, Carlozzi NE, Chevalier N, Espy KA, Beaumont JL, Mungas D. V. NIH
600 Toolbox Cognition Battery (CB): measuring working memory. *Monogr Soc Res Child Dev*.
601 2013 Aug;78(4):70–87.
- 602 33. Domingo-Salvany A, Regidor E, Alonso J, Alvarez-Dardet C. [Proposal for a social class
603 measure. Working Group of the Spanish Society of Epidemiology and the Spanish Society
604 of Family and Community Medicine]. *Aten Primaria*. 2000 Mar 31;25(5):350–63.
- 605 34. Crede J, Wirthwein L, McElvany N, Steinmayr R. Adolescents' academic achievement and
606 life satisfaction: the role of parents' education. *Front Psychol*. 2015;6:52.
- 607 35. Cohen J. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. 2nd ed. Lawrence Erlbaum
608 Associates Publishers; 1988.
- 609 36. Hayes AF. *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: a*
610 *regression-based approach*. Second edition. New York: Guilford Press; 2018. 692 p.
611 (Methodology in the social sciences).
- 612 37. Cheung MWL. Comparison of methods for constructing confidence intervals of
613 standardized indirect effects. *Behav Res Methods*. 2009 May 1;41(2):425–38.


- 614 38. Riva D. Sex and gender difference in cognitive and behavioral studies in developmental
615 age: An introduction. *J Neurosci Res*. 2023;101(5):543–52.
- 616 39. Machado-Rodrigues AMM, Silva MJC e, Mota J, Cumming SP, Sherar LB, Neville H, et
617 al. Confounding Effect of Biologic Maturation on Sex Differences in Physical Activity and
618 Sedentary Behavior in Adolescents. 2010 Aug 1 [cited 2024 Nov 1]; Available from:
619 <https://journals.humankinetics.com/view/journals/pes/22/3/article-p442.xml>
- 620 40. De Bellis MD, Keshavan MS, Beers SR, Hall J, Frustaci K, Masalehdan A, et al. Sex
621 Differences in Brain Maturation during Childhood and Adolescence. *Cereb Cortex*. 2001
622 Jun 1;11(6):552–7.
- 623 41. Lenroot RK, Giedd JN. Sex differences in the adolescent brain. *Brain Cogn*. 2010 Feb
624 1;72(1):46–55.
- 625 42. Abel T, Graf N, Niemann S. Gender bias in the assessment of physical activity in
626 population studies. *Soz- Präventivmedizin*. 2001 Jul 1;46(4):268–72.
- 627 43. Grissom, Reyes. Let’s call the whole thing off: evaluating gender and sex differences in
628 executive function. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2019 Jan;44(1):86–96.
- 629 44. de Greeff JW, Bosker RJ, Oosterlaan J, Visscher C, Hartman E. Effects of physical activity
630 on executive functions, attention and academic performance in preadolescent children: a
631 meta-analysis. *J Sci Med Sport*. 2018 May 1;21(5):501–7.
- 632 45. Diamond AB. The Cognitive Benefits of Exercise in Youth. *Curr Sports Med Rep*.
633 2015;14(4):320–6.
- 634 46. Howie EK, Pate RR. Physical activity and academic achievement in children: A historical
635 perspective. *J Sport Health Sci*. 2012 Dec 1;1(3):160–9.
- 636 47. Butterfield SA, Angell RM, Mason CA. Age and Sex Differences in Object Control Skills
637 by Children Ages 5 to 14. *Percept Mot Skills* [Internet]. 2012 Feb 1 [cited 2024 Jun 22];
638 Available from: [https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/epdf/10.2466/10.11.25.PMS.114.1.261-](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/epdf/10.2466/10.11.25.PMS.114.1.261-274)
639 [274](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/epdf/10.2466/10.11.25.PMS.114.1.261-274)
- 640 48. Hillman CH, Erickson KI, Kramer AF. Be smart, exercise your heart: exercise effects on
641 brain and cognition. *Nat Rev Neurosci*. 2008 Jan;9(1):58–65.
- 642 49. Budde H, Voelcker-Rehage C, Pietraßyk-Kendziorra S, Ribeiro P, Tidow G. Acute
643 coordinative exercise improves attentional performance in adolescents. *Neurosci Lett*. 2008
644 Aug 22;441(2):219–23.
- 645 50. Adkins DL, Boychuk J, Remple MS, Kleim JA. Motor training induces experience-specific
646 patterns of plasticity across motor cortex and spinal cord. *J Appl Physiol Bethesda Md*
647 *1985*. 2006 Dec;101(6):1776–82.
- 648 51. Coe DP, Peterson T, Blair C, Schutten MC, Peddie H. Physical Fitness, Academic
649 Achievement, and Socioeconomic Status in School-Aged Youth. *J Sch Health*.
650 2013;83(7):500–7.
- 651 52. Van Dusen DP, Kelder SH, Kohl III HW, Ranjit N, Perry CL. Associations of Physical
652 Fitness and Academic Performance Among Schoolchildren*. *J Sch Health*.
653 2011;81(12):733–40.

- 654 53. Castelli DM, Hillman CH, Buck SM, Erwin HE. Physical Fitness and Academic
655 Achievement in Third- and Fifth-Grade Students. *J Sport Exerc Psychol*. 2007 Apr
656 1;29(2):239–52.
- 657 54. Chen LJ, Fox KR, Ku PW, Taun CY. Fitness change and subsequent academic performance
658 in adolescents. *J Sch Health*. 2013 Sep;83(9):631–8.
- 659 55. Aadland KN, Moe VF, Aadland E, Anderssen SA, Resaland GK, Ommundsen Y.
660 Relationships between physical activity, sedentary time, aerobic fitness, motor skills and
661 executive function and academic performance in children. *Ment Health Phys Act*. 2017 Mar
662 1;12:10–8.
- 663 56. Álvarez-Bueno C, Pesce C, Cervero-Redondo I, Sánchez-López M, Martínez-Hortelano JA,
664 Martínez-Vizcaíno V. The Effect of Physical Activity Interventions on Children's
665 Cognition and Metacognition: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *J Am Acad Child
666 Adolesc Psychiatry*. 2017 Sep 1;56(9):729–38.
- 667 57. Bakke HA, Cavalcante WA, Oliveira IS de, Sarinho SW, Cattuzzo MT. Assessment of
668 Motor Skills in Children With Visual Impairment: A Systematic and Integrative Review.
669 *Clin Med Insights Pediatr*. 2019 Jan 1;13:1179556519838287.
- 670 58. Cheng J, East P, Blanco E, Sim EK, Castillo M, Lozoff B, et al. Obesity leads to declines in
671 motor skills across childhood. *Child Care Health Dev*. 2016;42(3):343–50.
- 672 59. Houwen S, Visscher C, Hartman E, Lemmink KAPM. Gross Motor Skills and Sports
673 Participation of Children With Visual Impairments. *Res Q Exerc Sport*. 2007 Mar
674 1;78(2):16–23.
- 675


a) Cardiorespiratory Fitness (CRF)




b) Speed/Agility (S/A)











c) Upper Body Strength (UBS)



d) Lower Body Strength (LBS)



Figure

BOYS**GIRLS****a) Cardiorespiratory Fitness (CRF)****b) Speed/Agility (S/A)****c) Upper Body Strength (UBS)****d) Lower Body Strength (LBS)**

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.21.24317694>; this version posted November 22, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).