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Abstract

Objective: To synthesise reviews investigating physical activity and depression, anxiety, self-esteem and cognitive functioning in children and adolescents. In addition, a brief review was undertaken to assess the association between sedentary behaviour and mental health.

Methods: Searches were performed in 2010. Inclusion criteria specified review papers reporting chronic physical activity and at least one mental health outcome that included depression, anxiety/stress, self-esteem, and cognitive functioning with children or adolescents.

Results: Four review papers reported evidence concerning depression, four for anxiety, three for self-esteem, and seven for cognitive functioning. Nine primary studies assessed associations between sedentary behaviour and mental health. Physical activity has potentially beneficial effects for reduced depression, but the evidence base is weak. Intervention designs are low in quality, and many reviews include cross-sectional studies. Physical activity interventions have been shown to have a small beneficial effect for reduced anxiety but the evidence base is limited. Physical activity can lead to improvements in self-esteem, at least in the short term. However, there is a paucity of good quality research. Reviews on physical activity and cognitive functioning have shown evidence that routine physical activity can be associated with improved cognitive performance and academic achievement, but these associations are usually small and inconsistent. Primary studies showed consistent negative associations between mental health and sedentary behaviour.

Conclusions: Associations between physical activity and mental health in young people is evident, but research designs are often weak and effects are small-to-moderate. Evidence shows small but consistent associations between sedentary screen-time and poorer mental health.
Mental illness is a serious public health issue. It is expected to account for 15% of the global burden of disease by 2020, which would make it the leading disease burden [1]. Suicide, depression, eating disorders, and anxiety are some of the conditions that affect young people in disproportionate rates in comparison to many other population groups [2]. Moreover, there is widespread belief that physical activity is inherently ‘good’ for young people in respect of varied psychosocial outcomes, such as self-esteem and cognitive functioning. The majority of studies in this area, however, are cross-sectional and therefore causality cannot be established because the temporal relationship between exposure (physical activity) and outcome (mental health) has not been tested or shown with any consistency. Thus, although there is evidence that physical activity can enhance psychological well-being, such an outcome may not be inevitable [3] or may be dependent on certain conditions existing.

The effect of physical activity on mental health in children and adolescents has received significantly less attention than in adult populations [4]. Where it has been investigated the work has primarily focused on depression, anxiety and self-esteem. In addition, researchers and education professionals are showing increasing interest in the effects of physical activity on cognitive functioning. For these reasons, as well as restrictions of space, our review is delimited to the outcomes of depression, anxiety, self-esteem, and cognitive functioning.

The purpose of this paper, therefore, is to synthesise evidence on chronic physical activity participation and mental health in children and adolescents mainly through a ‘review of reviews’. Such a method has been adopted to optimise the ability to cover four areas of mental health and to synthesise 18 reviews. It would have been unwieldy to attempt individual systematic reviews of the literature in each of the four mental health domains. Moreover, a ‘review of reviews’ is accepted practice in the medical and health behaviour
In addition, a brief analysis will also be provided on links between sedentary behaviour and mental health from primary research studies.

**METHOD**

To locate reviews of studies on chronic physical activity and mental health in young people, searches of the following electronic databases took place up to October 2010: PubMed, SPORTDiscus, PsychINFO, Web of Science, Medline, Cochrane Library, and ISI Science Citation Index. We searched by terms that reflected exposure variables of interest (e.g., sport, exercise, physical activity), mental health outcome variables (e.g., depression, anxiety, self-esteem, cognitive functioning), as well as methods (only reviews, systematic reviews and meta-analyses). Only review papers were included. Additional searches of personal files supplemented the electronic sources.

Papers were selected for detailed analysis if they met the following inclusion criteria: a). were review papers (narrative, systematic or meta-analytic); b). reported on the relationship between physical activity and at least one mental health outcome that included depression, anxiety/stress, self-esteem or physical self-worth, and cognitive functioning; c). reported chronic physical activity studies, including interventions (reviews of acute studies were excluded); d). were on school-aged children or adolescents up to and including aged 18 years with no known physical health limitations. If a review contained some data on young people, but the primary emphasis was on adults, the data were scrutinised and reported where appropriate.

To balance the work on physical activity, a brief narrative review was conducted on sedentary behaviour and mental health. This is not meant to be a comprehensive systematic review but rather a commentary on recent papers.

**RESULTS**
Five review papers were retrieved that reviewed evidence concerning physical activity and depression, four for anxiety, three for self-esteem, and seven for cognitive functioning. Two papers covered more than one mental health outcome variable, with Larun et al. [6] addressing anxiety and depression, and Calfas and Taylor [7] reviewing depression, anxiety and self-esteem.

**Depression**

Evidence from adult studies demonstrates that physical activity is inversely associated with symptoms of depression [8, 9] and there is some evidence that this relationship is causal [10]. There is, however, much less evidence for this relationship in children and adolescents. We located five reviews that synthesised data for young people [6-9, 11], although the paper by Dunn and Weintraub primarily provides a methodological critique of papers used in the Larun et al. review. Reviews of depression are summarised in Table 1, excluding the critique by Dunn and Weintraub, leaving four reviews.

North et al. [9] was the first meta-analysis investigating associations between physical activity and depression and included all research designs. An overall effect size (ES) of -0.53 was reported with five studies involving only young people reflecting a similar value (ES=-0.49). However, acute and chronic studies were included as well as non-intervention designs.

The first systematic review concerning physical activity and mental health in adolescents was published as part of the American physical activity guidelines process [7], although the authors used a wide age range of 11-21 years. All research designs were eligible for analysis but an effect size was calculated only for experimental designs. From only four intervention studies, ES=-0.38 favouring physical activity over a control group. Using all research designs, Calfas and Taylor reported that 9 of 11 studies showed a negative association between physical activity and depression.
Craft and Landers [8] conducted a meta-analysis on exercise and depression for those with clinical depression. Only three studies provided data for those aged 12-18 years, showing a small non-significant effect size of -0.15, much smaller than for adults and all studies (-0.72).

Larun and colleagues [6] conducted a systematic review of exercise interventions on depression in young people up to the age of 20 years. Five trials were located that investigated whether vigorous exercise (fitness training and weight training) conferred benefits over no intervention. They found a significant moderate effect (ES = -0.66, CI -1.25 to -0.08) but noted that the trials were of low quality and highly varied in respect of methodological characteristics, such as sampling and measurement. When comparing vigorous with low intensity exercise, only two trials were located and these showed no significant effect, a result repeated for two trials investigating children receiving psychological treatment. This might suggest that lower levels of physical activity intensity may also be effective for anxiety reduction.

When comparing exercise with psychosocial interventions, Larun et al. found only two trials, and no significant effect was evident. This was also the case for one trial involving children receiving psychological treatment, suggesting that physical activity may be equally effective as psychosocial interventions. There was no evidence for intervention effectiveness after 8 weeks.

Limitations of findings include the use of broad inclusion criteria that allows participants in some interventions to have rather mild depression over a short time frame (i.e., they may not be particularly depressed at all). Studies also fail to specify the exact nature of the physical activity interventions in respect of frequency, intensity, duration and type of activity. Group-based physical activity interventions often fail to control for the effects of social interaction.
In summary, physical activity over no intervention appears to be potentially beneficial for reduced depression, but the evidence base is weak. Intervention designs are low in quality, and many reviews include cross-sectional studies that may distort associations or fail to rule out ‘reverse causality’.

**Anxiety**

Active adults report fewer symptoms of anxiety than inactive adults [12, 13]. However, the amount of evidence for young people is considerably less. Our search revealed four reviews (see Table 2). The meta-analysis of exercise and anxiety reduction conducted by Petruzzello et al. [14] also reported effect sizes for those under 18 years of age. Results showed a small-to-moderate effect for physical activity programmes when assessing trait anxiety (ES=-0.47), although only three studies were available for review. The review by Calfas and Taylor [7] located only three intervention studies on anxiety and reported ES = -0.15. This review does not completely map onto the studies reviewed by Petruzzello et al. and lacks methodological detail.

Larun et al. [6] conducted a systematic review of exercise interventions on anxiety in young people up to the age of 20 years. Six trials were located that investigated whether vigorous exercise conferred benefits over no intervention. They found a non-significant, though small-to-moderate, trend (ES = -0.48). Studies were of low quality and highly varied in respect of methodological characteristics. When comparing vigorous with low intensity exercise, only three trials were located and these showed no significant effect. When comparing exercise with psychosocial interventions, Larun et al. found only two trials, and no significant difference was evident.

Wipfli et al. [15] claimed to address the methodological weaknesses of previous reviews by conducting a meta-analysis of just randomised controlled trials, although this was also done by Larun et al [6]. Three trials were reviewed for those under 18 years of age,
revealing a non-significant effect (ES = -0.18). It is not clear why Wipfli et al. only located three interventions two years after Larun et al. analysed six.

In summary, physical activity interventions for young people have been shown to have a small beneficial effect for reduced anxiety. However, the evidence base is limited and in need of development.

**Self-esteem**

Self-esteem reflects the degree to which an individual values themselves and is widely viewed as a key indicator of positive mental health and well-being [16]. The belief that physical activity, including sport, is associated with the development of self-esteem in young people is a commonly held view. Typically, global self-esteem is seen as the apex of a hierarchical and multidimensional framework, underpinned by different domains of the self, including the perceptions of physical self-worth [17].

We located three systematic reviews addressing physical activity and self-esteem in young people [7, 18, 19] (see Table 3). One of the first meta-analyses in exercise psychology was that by Gruber (1986). He meta-analysed 27 experimental designs, mainly on children, but gave limited detail on methodology.

Gruber [19] reported an overall effect for physical activity on self-esteem of 0.41, representing a small effect. Larger effects were found for children with perceptual, emotional and learning disabilities (ES = 0.57), for better controlled experiments assessing only one dependent variable (ES = 0.65), and for aerobic fitness activities (ES = 0.89). Three studies analysed by Calfas and Taylor [7] showed a small effect (ES = 0.12).

A recent Cochrane meta-analysis by Ekeland et al. [18] examined whether exercise interventions improved global self-esteem among children and young people aged 3-20 years of age. This was later published as a journal paper [20]. The results showed that in the 8 trials
available for meta-analysis and testing an exercise alone intervention versus a no-intervention control there was a small-to-moderate effect in favour of the intervention group (ES = 0.49).

Most of the trials analysed by Ekeland et al. [18] were small scale and of short duration. No follow-up results were given so the sustainability of changes could not be assessed. Only one of the trials was considered to be of high methodological quality, but it did demonstrate the strongest effects. A further four trials compared the effects of exercise as part of a comprehensive intervention package against no-intervention control groups and showed a moderate positive effect on self esteem in favour of the intervention (ES = 0.51).

In summary, physical activity can lead to improvements in self-esteem, at least in the short term. However, there is a paucity of good quality research. Moreover, global measures of self-esteem can be affected by many factors beyond physical activity. Hence, measures of physical aspects of the self, such as body image or physical self-worth, important indices of psychological health in their own right, might be better targets for intervention.

**Cognitive Functioning**

A link between physical activity and cognitive functioning has been thought to exist for many years. Blakemore [21] reported that the brain is activated during physical activity by increasing blood flow to essential areas that may stimulate learning [22]. Moreover, research has suggested that integrating physical activity in the classroom will enhance student learning [23]. However, further studies are needed to make school authorities confident that encouraging school physical activity will improve learning rather than disrupt ‘academic’ time. Cognitive functioning is best defined as a). intelligence (IQ), which is the ability to reason quickly and abstractly; b). cognitive skills of concentration and attention; c). academic achievement, usually assessed by overall school grades and performance.

Seven review papers were located (see Table 4). More than a decade ago, Shephard [24] reported a systematic review to investigate links between physical activity and cognitive
functioning using cross-sectional and longitudinal studies. It was found that increasing schools’ Physical Education (PE) time by 14-26% did not have a significant negative effect on academic performance. However, only 3 studies on routine physical activity were involved and evidence was not established concerning additional time for physical activity and intellectual enhancement; students who had extra PE time performed equally as well as students who had intact classroom curricular time.

Sibley and Etnier [25] conducted a meta analysis to investigate the effects of different types of physical activity on cognitive functioning across varied age groups of young people. All research designs were included. The findings revealed that physical activity was associated with better cognitive functioning across all age groups. A small effect for chronic studies was found (ES=0.29).

Trudeau and Shephard [26] conducted a systematic review on physical activity, physical fitness and academic performance. Seventeen studies of varied research designs were involved. Findings indicated that allocating up to an additional hour per day of curricular time to physical activity programmes in school do not affect academic performance of primary school students. Furthermore, physical activity improved classroom behaviour, attention and concentration. A positive but weak relationship was established between physical fitness and academic achievement. However, for experimental studies, the authors did not find strong evidence for an effect of school physical activity on academic performance because children in the experimental group, whose academic tuition was reduced, did not perform better than the control group; that is, children exposed to additional school physical activity achieved equally well as those students who had regular academic tuition.

Tomporoski, Davis, Miller and Naglieri [27], in a systematic review of 15 studies, examined the relationship between physical activity and cognitive functioning among 6 to 16
year-olds. For prospective and experimental designs, 2 of 4 studies showed improvements in intelligence, 3 of 6 for cognition, and one of 6 for academic achievement. In contrast, 3 of 4 cross-sectional studies on academic achievement showed positive associations. They concluded that children’s cognitive functioning can be enhanced through physical activity, but this is mainly in respect of executive functioning tasks (i.e., “goal-directed actions in complex stimulus environments, especially novel ones, in which elements are constantly changing”; p. 126).

To update previous reviews, Keeley and Fox [28] conducted a systematic review to investigate the link between physical activity, physical fitness and cognitive functioning among 4 to 18 year old students. Eighteen studies with varied research designs were included. Generally studies involved exposing experimental participants to increased school-based physical activities at the expense of academic work time. A weak positive relationship was found between increased school physical activity and cognitive functioning. Specifically, cross-sectional studies indicated that more physical activity was associated with better performance in some subjects (e.g., mathematics) but not in others (e.g., English). One intervention study reported that increased physical activity significantly improved cognitive functioning; two intervention studies found no association between increased physical activity and academic performance. A weak but positive association was found between physical fitness and cognitive functioning in young people with the strongest correlations being with cardiovascular fitness.

Though a strong association has not been established between increased school physical activity and cognitive functioning, Keeley and Fox (2009) found that the introduction of more physical activity, at the expense of academic subject time, did not have a detrimental effect on children’s academic performance. This reflects conclusions from other reviews.
The Centres for Disease Control and Prevention [29] in the USA have also examined the relationship between routine physical activity on the cognitive functioning of young people. The review involved 50 studies with cross-sectional (K=11) and longitudinal (K=38) research designs, with 32 classified as interventions. It was found that increased time in school PE had a positive but weak relationship with academic achievement in 11 of 14 studies. Time spent in increased break (recess) play had a small positive relationship with classroom behaviour, including children’s attention and concentration (all 8 studies found one or more positive associations between recess and indicators of cognitive skills). In addition, classroom based physical activity (5-20 minutes break during lessons) improved children’s academic behaviour and achievement (8 of the 9 studies found positive associations). Extracurricular physical activities (participation in school sports) also had a positive association with academic performance (all 19 studies examining after-school sport found one or more positive associations with cognitive performance). Finally, the review concluded that school physical activity programmes have a positive impact on academic performance. However, effects are inconsistent and often small.

In a recent systematic review, Best [30] examined the relationship between aerobic physical activity and cognitive functioning in young people. Studies used experimental designs, however only 3 studies assessed the effects of chronic aerobic exercise on cognitive functioning. Aerobic exercise did not influence children’s tasks requiring visual-motor coordination but did improve tasks requiring flexible and divergent thinking.

In summary, systematic reviews on physical activity and cognitive functioning have shown evidence that routine physical activity can be associated with improved cognitive performance, classroom behaviour and academic achievement in young people, but these associations are usually small and not entirely consistent.
The major implication arising from these reviews is that integrating physical activity in the school system may help young people to learn better and reduce the likelihood of negative classroom behaviours. However, strong evidence has not yet been established between chronic physical activity and students’ cognitive functioning, and this could be due to methodological shortcomings of studies. These include expectancy effects and un-blinded intervention designs. Thus, available evidence does not contribute strongly to the proposition that increasing school physical activity time to the detriment of classroom curricular time is beneficial for school children. Studies with more rigorous designs are needed on physical activity, including non-aerobic exercise, and its effect on cognitive functioning.

**Sedentary Behaviour and Mental Health**

Sedentary behaviour in young people and adults is a rapidly developing area of research. Operationally defined as ‘sitting time’, sedentary behaviour can be high in the contexts of leisure time (e.g., screen time), school, and travel (i.e., car use). Most of the evidence with young people has centred on screen time, and TV viewing in particular. Although TV viewing remains the most prevalent sedentary behaviour for youth, it is only one behaviour and may not reflect wider patterns of excessive sitting [31]. However, the development of attractive home-based or even mobile electronic entertainment has led to concerns about excessive sitting time in young people.

Most of the evidence linking sedentary behaviour to health outcomes has focussed on TV viewing and weight status [32], with more recent studies looking at screen time (i.e., TV and computers) as well as aspects of metabolic health more broadly [33, 34]. Less has been written about sedentary behaviour and mental health in young people. For this brief section of the paper, we review recent papers addressing links between sedentary behaviour and mental health, with a summary shown in Table 5.
Results from the nine primary studies show consistent negative mental health associations with sedentary behaviour, primarily screen viewing. This mirrors a growing literature showing adverse physical health outcomes of high sitting time [35]. The one longitudinal study did show that TV viewing, but not computer games, was associated with increased odds of depression after 7y follow-up [36].

The associations across the studies, however, are small and all but one are derived from cross-sectional designs. It is plausible that those with poorer mental health choose to be more sedentary at screens – a reverse causality hypothesis. Only half the cross-sectional studies controlled for physical activity in their analyses. Most of the studies are large, with some being very large, and one assessing across multiple countries. Sedentary behaviour needs to be considered alongside physical activity in the study of mental health.

Overall Conclusions

In summarising physical activity and mental health in young people, physical activity is likely to have positive psychosocial outcomes. The ‘review of reviews’ method adopted allows us to see the wider field of several mental health outcomes associated with physical activity in young people. It also allows a view of the gaps and inconsistencies across different outcomes.

The effects appear strongest for self-esteem (at least in the short term), and those who are physically active appear less likely to suffer from mental health problems and may have enhanced cognitive functioning. Evidence on depression is also promising but remains an underdeveloped area of enquiry. Although all participants are likely to gain significant benefits, such effects are likely to be greater in those who have poorer mental health at baseline, however, the evidence is not extensive. Studies are largely cross-sectional (thus unable to rule out ‘reverse causality’), small-scale, and lack measurement consistency. In addition, while physical activity may enhance psychological well-being, it is possible that the
prevailing psychological climate and social interactions inherent in such settings will also be crucial. Unfortunately, such factors are rarely accounted for. Higher levels of sedentary (sitting) behaviour are associated with worse mental health.
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Table 1. Reviews of physical activity and depression in young people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author, date &amp; years covered</th>
<th>Type of review; number of studies (K)</th>
<th>Sample for current analyses</th>
<th>Exposure variables</th>
<th>Types of research design</th>
<th>Main findings</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Craft &amp; Landers [8] Up to 1996</td>
<td>Meta-analysis and systematic review K=3</td>
<td>12 - 18 yrs</td>
<td>PA: Aerobic and anaerobic</td>
<td>Quasi-experimental</td>
<td>Exercise significantly reduced depression among participants with clinical depression and depression resulting from mental illness (including adults). Effect size for young people was small (ES= -0.15).</td>
<td>The review is one of the few that examined the effects of chronic exercise on clinically diagnosed depression. Review includes varied age groups. Only 3 studies were on young people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calfas &amp; Taylor [7] Up to 1982</td>
<td>Meta-analysis K=11</td>
<td>11-21 yrs</td>
<td>PA: flexibility training; running; vigorous activity</td>
<td>Quasi-experimental &amp; cross-sectional observational</td>
<td>34 trials available for meta-analysis Significant negative relationship between PA and depression (ES= -0.38) 9 of 11 studies showed negative association.</td>
<td>Only 4 effect sizes available for calculation of overall ES.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North, et al. [9]</td>
<td>Meta-analysis</td>
<td>&lt;18 yrs</td>
<td>PA aerobic; and</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Higher levels of exercise significantly associated with lower depression (ES= -0.49) among young people.</td>
<td>Only 5 studies involved young people. It was not possible to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 1989</td>
<td>K=5</td>
<td>muscular strength endurance</td>
<td>identify research designs used, intensity or duration of exercise, or type of depression assessed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author, date &amp; years covered</td>
<td>Type of review; number of studies (K)</td>
<td>Sample for current analyses</td>
<td>Exposure Variables</td>
<td>Types of research design</td>
<td>Main Findings</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larun et al. [6] 1965-2005</td>
<td>Meta-analysis K=6</td>
<td>11-19yrs</td>
<td>Vigorous exercise</td>
<td>RCTs</td>
<td>VIG had a small-to-moderate effect on anxiety (ES=−0.48). There was no statistically significant difference between VIG and low intensity exercise on anxiety. There was no statistically significant difference between exercise and psychosocial interventions on anxiety.</td>
<td>Few studies and many with methodological weaknesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wipfli et al. [15] up to Jan 2006</td>
<td>Meta-analysis K=3</td>
<td>&lt;18yrs</td>
<td>PA aerobic; anaerobic; combined</td>
<td>RCTs</td>
<td>Exercise group showed small reductions in anxiety v. other forms of anxiety treatment (ES = -0.19).</td>
<td>8 studies were included in the full meta-analysis (all ages) that were acute studies. It was not possible to tell if the 3 studies on those &lt;18 yrs included those in acute exercise RCTs. Unclear why only three interventions were located two years after Larun et al. analysed six.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calfas &amp; Taylor [7] up to 1982</td>
<td>Meta-analysis and systematic review K=20</td>
<td>11-21 yrs</td>
<td>PA (Fitness training); flexibility training; running; vigorous activity</td>
<td>Quasi-experimental &amp; cross-sectional observational</td>
<td>3 trials available for meta-analysis Small relationship between PA and anxiety (ES=−0.15).</td>
<td>Duration of PA was not mentioned; moderate PA was not adequately explained.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Reviews of physical activity and self-esteem in young people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author, date &amp; years covered</th>
<th>Type of review; number of studies (K)</th>
<th>Sample for current analyses</th>
<th>Exposure Variables</th>
<th>Types of research design</th>
<th>Main Findings</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ekeblad et al. [18]</td>
<td>Meta-analysis K=25</td>
<td>3-20yrs</td>
<td>PA &gt; 4 weeks</td>
<td>RCTs</td>
<td>8 trials available for meta-analysis</td>
<td>Exercise alone intervention versus a no-intervention control showed small-to-moderate effect in favour of the intervention group (SMD = 0.49).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gruber [19]</td>
<td>Meta-analysis K=27</td>
<td>&lt;18yrs</td>
<td>PA: Aerobic; PE activities; perceptual motor; dance</td>
<td>Experimental &amp; quasi-experimental</td>
<td>Exercise significantly associated with higher self-esteem among children (ES=0.41). Exercise had larger effects for children with a disability (ES=0.57) and for aerobic fitness activities (ES=0.89). Report lacked detail on search strategies and methods.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Reviews of physical activity and cognitive functioning in young people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author, date &amp; years covered</th>
<th>Type of review; number of studies (K)</th>
<th>Sample for current analyses</th>
<th>Exposure Variables</th>
<th>Types of research design</th>
<th>Main Findings</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best [30] Dates covered not stated</td>
<td>Systematic Review K=3</td>
<td>7-11 yrs</td>
<td>PA (Aerobic): Running; walking</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Exercise (specifically aerobic) had significant positive relationship with creativity - specifically flexible and divergent thinking but not with perceptual-motor skills or visual-motor coordination.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centres for Disease Control and Prevention [29] Dates covered not stated</td>
<td>Systematic review K=50</td>
<td>Children; exact ages not stated</td>
<td>School PE; Recess (break); classroom physical activity breaks; extra-curricular physical activity</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>School-based PE (k=14): weak or no association between increased PE time and academic achievement Recess studies (k=8): weak or no association between recess activity and cognitive outcomes Classroom physical activity studies (k=9): Consistent association between classroom activity breaks and cognitive outcomes Extra-curricular physical activity studies (k=19): Consistent association between extra-curricular physical activity and cognitive outcomes</td>
<td>Some studies analysed included ‘attitude’ and ‘mood’ outcomes, not cognitive functioning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeley and Fox [28] Up to Feb 2009</td>
<td>Systematic review N=18</td>
<td>4-18 yrs</td>
<td>PA (break-time play; active travel; sport &amp; physical education; informal play &amp; sports; and dance clubs outside school)</td>
<td>RCTs; quasi experimental; longitudinal; cross sectional</td>
<td>A weak positive relationship was found between increased school physical activity and cognitive functioning. Cross-sectional studies indicated that more physical activity was associated with better performance in some subjects (e.g., mathematics) but not in others (e.g., English). Intervention Studies indicated that introduction of more curricular time to PE did not have a detrimental effects on children’s academic performance. A weak but positive association was found between</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Physical fitness and cognitive functioning in young people with the strongest correlations being with cardiovascular fitness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Study Type</th>
<th>Dates Covered</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Exercise Type</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tomporowski et al. [27]</td>
<td>Systematic review</td>
<td>Dates covered not stated</td>
<td>8-16 yrs</td>
<td>PA (Chronic exercise): Strength training; aerobic; running</td>
<td>Prospective and experimental</td>
<td>K=15</td>
<td>2 of 4 studies showed improvements in intelligence; 3 of 6 for cognition; 1 of 6 for academic achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trudeau and Shephard [26]</td>
<td>Systematic review</td>
<td>1966-2007</td>
<td>5-16 yrs</td>
<td>PA (PE activities; school sport)</td>
<td>PA and academic achievement: Allocating up to an additional hour per day of curricular time to PA programmes did not affect academic performance of primary school students. Children, in the experimental group, whose academic tuition was reduced achieved equally as the control group. PA and classroom behaviour: PA significantly improved concentration and classroom behaviour. Fitness and Academic Achievement: A positive but weak relationship.</td>
<td>K=17</td>
<td>Limited studies were used to assess the effect of fitness on academic achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibley and Etnier [25]</td>
<td>Meta-analysis</td>
<td>Up to 2001</td>
<td>4-18 yrs</td>
<td>PA: aerobic; resistance training; perceptual motor; PE programs</td>
<td>PA significantly associated with better cognitive functioning (ES=0.32). No effect for memory tests and only a small effect for verbal tests. Results were similar for healthy subjects, subjects with mental impairments and subjects with physical disabilities.</td>
<td>K=16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The influence of PA on cognitive functioning was not moderated by the type of research design, participant health and PA type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shephard [24] Dates covered not stated</th>
<th>Narrative review</th>
<th>&lt;20yrs</th>
<th>PA: PE activities</th>
<th>Cross-sectional; longitudinal</th>
<th>Academic performance is maintained or even enhanced by an increased level of PA.</th>
<th>Narrative review only.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K=3 longitudinal studies highlighted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 5. Primary studies investigating sedentary behaviour and mental health in young people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Sample characteristics</th>
<th>Design/Method</th>
<th>Sedentary Behaviour Exposure Variables</th>
<th>Mental Health Outcome Variables</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murdey et al. [37]</td>
<td>N= 119 UK youth. 64 boys and 55 girls across three school year cohorts: Yr 6 (10.0–10.9y); Year 8 (12.0–12.9 years); Year 10 (14.0–14.9 years).</td>
<td>Cross-sectional phase of longitudinal study.</td>
<td>Free-time sedentary behaviour assessed by momentary time sampling paper diary.</td>
<td>Body image (body attractiveness subscale of Physical Self-Perception Profile for Children; PSPP-C)</td>
<td>Small negative association only for girls between sedentary behaviour and body image: $r=-0.23$, $p=0.05$</td>
<td>PA not accounted for in analyses. Only study to assess and aggregate multiple sedentary behaviours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathers et al. [38]</td>
<td>N= 925 Australian adolescents (mean age = 16.1y)</td>
<td>Cross-sectional data from the third (2005) wave of the longitudinal Health of Young Victorians Study.</td>
<td>Electronic media use (EMU) assessed with MARCA – Multimedia Activity Recall for Children and Adolescents, a computerised time-use diary.</td>
<td>Health-related quality of life (HRQoL; KIDSCREEN); health status (Pediatric Quality of Life Inventory 4.0; PedsQL); depression/anxiety (Kessler-10); behaviour problems (Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire - SDQ).</td>
<td>Higher EMU associated with poorer HRQoL and more behaviour problems. High video game use associated with worse HRQoL</td>
<td>PA not accounted for in analyses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Sample characteristics</td>
<td>Design/Method</td>
<td>Sedentary Behaviour Exposure Variables</td>
<td>Mental Health Outcome Variables</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Europe, South Europe, West Europe, East Europe.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>relationships in three regions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iannotti, Kogan, et al. [40]</td>
<td>N=22,084 American and Canadian youth aged ~11-15y as part of Health Behaviour in School-Aged Children (HBSC) study.</td>
<td>Cross-sectional self-report survey of health behaviours, including physical activity and screen time.</td>
<td>Screen-based media sedentary behaviour (SBM) in hours/day.</td>
<td>Physical Self-Image: Perception (of body size); Life Satisfaction; Quality of Family Relationships; Quality of Peer Relationships.</td>
<td>More frequent SBM associated with poorer Life Satisfaction and family relationships. Poorer self-image only significant for Canadian youth. Higher SBM associated with higher ratings of peer relationships.</td>
<td>PA accounted for as a confounder. May include some participants from Iannotti, Janssen et al. (2009). Not possible to tell.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamer et al. [41]</td>
<td>N=1486 Scottish children aged 4 to 12y (mean age=8.5y)</td>
<td>Cross sectional assessment of psychological well-being, sedentary behaviour and physical activity</td>
<td>Parent reported TV and screen entertainment (TVSE).</td>
<td>Psychological well-being (Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire)</td>
<td>Higher SDQ scores associated with greater TVSE time independently of PA and after controlling for confounders. TVSE and PA interact to be associated with higher levels of psychological distress.</td>
<td>PA accounted for as a confounder. Parental proxy reports likely to have poor validity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russ et al. [42]</td>
<td>N=54,863 American youth aged 6-17y.</td>
<td>Cross-sectional assessment of media</td>
<td>Parent reported media use (TV, computers, Parent reported social-emotional problems of</td>
<td>Significant association between</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Sample characteristics</td>
<td>Design/Method</td>
<td>Sedentary Behaviour Exposure Variables</td>
<td>Mental Health Outcome Variables</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holder et al. [43]</td>
<td>N=514 Canadian children aged ~9-11y.</td>
<td>Cross-sectional assessment of screen time and phone used, self-concept and happiness</td>
<td>Self and parent reported sedentary behaviour (TV, computer, computer games, phone)</td>
<td>Piers-Harris Children’s Self-Concept Scale 2 Happiness/satisfaction (from Piers-Harris) Self-reported happiness using a faces scale</td>
<td>Screen time (but not phone) had small but significant association with both child and parent reported happiness (faces scale) No associations with self-concept.</td>
<td>Markers of PA assessed but not used as covariates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primack et al. [36]</td>
<td>N=4142 American adolescents (Grades 7-12; aged ~12-17y at baseline)</td>
<td>Longitudinal cohort study with 7y follow-up. Analyses included only those not depressed at baseline.</td>
<td>Self-report of ‘last week’ exposure to 4 types of electronic media: TV, video, computer games, radio</td>
<td>Centers for Epidemiologic Studies – Depression Scale (CES-D)</td>
<td>Significantly increased odds of depression at follow up for each additional hour of TV viewing (OR=1.08). No effect for other media.</td>
<td>PA not accounted for in analyses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Sample characteristics</td>
<td>Design/Method</td>
<td>Sedentary Behaviour Exposure Variables</td>
<td>Mental Health Outcome Variables</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page et al. [44]</td>
<td>N=1013 UK youth (mean age=10.95y)</td>
<td>Cross sectional assessment of psychological well-being, sedentary behaviour and physical activity</td>
<td>Self-reported daily TV hours and computer use. Total sedentary time also assessed with accelerometer.</td>
<td>Psychological well-being (Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire)</td>
<td>Children who spent more than 2h/day watching TV or using a computer were at increased risk of high levels of psychological difficulties.</td>
<td>PA accounted for as a confounder.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>