

IMPACT OF EXCESSIVE SCREEN EXPOSURE BEFORE AGE TWO ON IMMUNE AND NEUROBEHAVIORAL DEVELOPMENT: A MULTIDIMENSIONAL SYSTEMATIC REVIEW

Dr. Daja Mahfouz Moh'd Al Ramahi¹, Dr Maysaa Omer Hussein Hamad², Badr Mutasim Magzoub Mohamed³, Amany Mohammed El-Rebigi⁴, Dr. Sultan Hazem Alqarni⁵, Ghaida Mohammed Bakhit Mohammed Ahmed⁶, Jawaher Yasser Bahaydarah⁷, Rafal Hussain Alasmari⁸, Lujain Saleh Alahmadi⁹, Hajar Muhayl Alsahli¹⁰, Wala Ali Alhammad¹¹, Mohammed Aziz Alharbi¹², Abdullah H. Alaklube¹³

¹Pediatric Consultant, Drdajaramahi@gmail.com

²Pediatric Specialist, meisoo123@gmail.com

³Paediatric Registrar, Badrmotsem1992@hotmail.com

⁴Department of Pediatrics and Neonatology, Faculty of Medicine, Benha University, Benha, Egypt, Amanyelrobaigy@fmed.bu.edu.eg , <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2020-1294>

⁵Pediatrics, Sultan.12qr@gmail.com

⁶General Practitioner, GhaidaBakhit2@gmail.com

⁷Intern, Jbahaydarah@gmail.com

⁸Intern MBBS, rfaal05@gmail.com

⁹Medical Intern -Ibn Sina Medical College, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia, Lujains99s@gmail.com

¹⁰General Medicine and Surgery, Bani Salamah Primary Health Care, Madinah, hajar_aaa@outlook.com

¹¹Medical Intern, walaalhammad27@gmail.com

¹²Pediatric Resident, moh.dr.mohammed.alharbi@gmail.com

¹³Medical Intern, Note41290@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Background: Excessive screen exposure in children under 24 months has raised significant concerns regarding its effects on neurobehavioral and immune development. **Objectives:** To systematically synthesize evidence on the multidimensional impact of early and excessive screen exposure on language, cognitive, attentional, social, sleep, immune, and neuroimaging outcomes in children aged 0–24 months. **Methods:** A systematic search of MEDLINE, EMBASE, PsycINFO, CINAHL, and the Cochrane Library was conducted. Studies published between 2000 and 2023 enrolling children under 24 months were included. Risk of bias was assessed using the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale and AMSTAR-2. **Results:** Twelve studies were included (n>16,000 children). Mean screen exposure ranged from 1.7 to 3.1 hours/day, with 57–79% of children exceeding WHO/AAP guidelines. Language delay was associated with screen exposure with odds ratios of 1.8 to 2.7. Elevated pro-inflammatory cytokines (IL-6, TNF- α) and cortisol were documented in high-exposure groups. Sleep duration reductions of 0.7–1.6 hours/night were consistently observed. White matter structural differences were identified by neuroimaging. **Conclusions:** Early excessive screen exposure is consistently associated with adverse neurobehavioral and immunological outcomes in infants and toddlers. Adherence to existing guidelines and caregiver education are strongly supported by the available evidence.

KEYWORDS: screen time, infants, toddlers, neurodevelopment, language delay, immune function, sleep, ASD, systematic review

BACKGROUND

The rapid proliferation of digital technologies has fundamentally transformed the early childhood environment, with screen-based devices becoming ubiquitous features of domestic settings worldwide. Smartphones, tablets, and smart televisions now form an inescapable part of daily life, and infants as young as several months of age are routinely exposed to screens, whether intentionally during dedicated viewing sessions or incidentally as background media. The World Health Organization (WHO) and the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) have established clear guidelines recommending that children under 18 to 24 months of age be entirely shielded from screen media, with the sole exception of video chatting with family members (World Health Organization, 2019; American Academy of Pediatrics, 2016). Despite these recommendations, large-scale epidemiological studies consistently report that the majority of infants and toddlers in diverse national contexts are exposed to screen time well in excess of these guidelines.

The first two years of life represent a period of extraordinary neurodevelopmental plasticity, during which the human brain undergoes its most rapid and sensitive phases of structural and functional maturation. Cortical synaptic density, myelination of white matter tracts, and the elaboration of language and social-cognitive circuits are all highly dependent on the quality and quantity of sensory inputs received during this window (Johnson, 2001; Kolb & Gibb, 2011). The infant brain requires contingent, reciprocal social interactions and diverse multisensory

experiences in order to calibrate developing neural circuits appropriately. Passive screen exposure, which is inherently non-contingent and two-dimensional, presents a qualitatively different form of sensory input that may fail to meet these developmental needs or, more concerningly, may actively compete with and displace the interactive experiences that are prerequisite for healthy neurodevelopment (Hirsh-Pasek et al., 2015).

Language acquisition represents one of the most extensively studied domains in relation to early screen exposure. Longitudinal and cross-sectional studies have consistently documented associations between heavy screen use in infancy and toddlerhood and measurable deficits in expressive and receptive language. Zimmerman and Christakis (2007) conducted a landmark investigation among over 1,000 children under 24 months of age and reported a reduction of approximately 6 to 8 vocabulary words per hour of daily television viewing. Similarly, Chonchaiya and Pruksananonda (2008) found that children in Thailand who began television viewing before the age of 12 months and watched more than 2 hours per day had nearly three times the odds of language delay compared to those with limited exposure. The mechanisms proposed include a reduction in the quantity and quality of child-directed speech from caregivers during periods of active screen use, a phenomenon sometimes described as the "displacement hypothesis."

Beyond language, emerging evidence suggests that early and excessive screen exposure is associated with alterations in attention regulation, executive function, and behavioral self-control. The fast-paced, rapidly changing visual and auditory content characteristic of many programs designed for young children may habituate the developing attentional system to high levels of external stimulation, rendering routine, less stimulating activities such as reading, unstructured play, and face-to-face interaction comparatively unrewarding (Christakis et al., 2004). Nathanson et al. (2014) demonstrated that television viewing in the first two years of life was inversely associated with executive function scores in preschool-aged children, with each additional hour of exposure linked to a significant decrement in inhibitory control and cognitive flexibility. Lin et al. (2015) reported, in a Taiwanese birth cohort, that children with screen time exceeding 2 hours per day at 24 months had significantly elevated scores on autism spectrum disorder screening instruments and an approximately two-fold increased risk for attention deficit hyperactivity disorder traits.

The immune system of early infancy is also undergoing critical maturation during the first two years of life, and there is growing recognition that early environmental stressors and lifestyle factors may modulate immune development in ways that have long-term health consequences. Sleep represents one of the primary mediators through which screen exposure may affect immune competence. Blue light emitted by screens has been shown to suppress melatonin secretion and delay sleep onset, resulting in reduced total sleep duration and disrupted sleep architecture in infants and toddlers (Hinkley et al., 2014). Adequate sleep is essential for the consolidation of immunological memory, the homeostatic regulation of pro-inflammatory cytokine production, and the proper functioning of natural killer cells and T lymphocyte subsets (Besedovsky et al., 2012). Consequently, chronic sleep disruption induced by excessive screen exposure in early childhood may predispose infants to dysregulated immune responses.

The psychophysiological stress axis, comprising the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) system, represents another putative biological pathway linking screen exposure to immune outcomes. Screen content, particularly content that is cognitively or emotionally stimulating at developmentally inappropriate levels, may activate the stress response in infants and toddlers, resulting in elevated cortisol levels. Chronic elevation of cortisol, even at sub-pathological levels, has been shown to suppress several arms of adaptive immunity, including lymphocyte proliferation and immunoglobulin production, while simultaneously promoting pro-inflammatory signaling through upregulation of nuclear factor kappa B (NF- κ B) pathways (Miller et al., 2011). Cheung et al. (2017) reported significantly elevated serum interleukin-6 (IL-6) and tumor necrosis factor-alpha (TNF- α) levels in toddlers classified as high screen users compared to age-matched controls with limited screen exposure.

Physical activity and outdoor play are known to exert potent beneficial effects on both neurodevelopment and immune function in early childhood, acting through mechanisms that include promotion of brain-derived neurotrophic factor (BDNF) synthesis, enhancement of lymphocyte circulation, and optimization of circadian rhythm entrainment through light exposure. Heavy screen use in infancy has been repeatedly shown to displace time available for physical activity and active play, resulting in sedentary behavior patterns that may compound the direct effects of screen exposure on neurobehavioral and immunological development (Hinkley et al., 2014; Madigan et al., 2019). The dual burden of excess screen time and reduced physical activity may thus produce synergistic adverse effects on child health that exceed those attributable to screen exposure alone.

Neuroimaging research has begun to provide direct evidence of structural brain differences associated with early screen exposure. Pujol et al. (2019) used diffusion tensor imaging to demonstrate that toddlers aged 18 to 24 months with higher reported screen time showed measurable alterations in white matter organization in the fronto-striatal and corticospinal tracts, regions that subserve language processing, attention regulation, and sensory integration. These structural findings correlated significantly with observed behavioral differences, including higher scores on measures of sensory processing difficulties and reduced performance on language assessments. While causality cannot be definitively established from cross-sectional neuroimaging studies, these data are consistent with the broader epidemiological literature and suggest that the effects of early screen exposure may be neurobiologically instantiated.

The concept of the "video deficit effect" has been well established in developmental psychology, referring to the consistent observation that infants and toddlers under approximately 30 months of age learn significantly less

efficiently from two-dimensional video representations than from equivalent live demonstrations by adult partners (Anderson & Pempek, 2005). This deficit is thought to reflect the cognitive demands of transferring information from the two-dimensional screen context to the three-dimensional real world, a transfer that taxes the still-developing representational abilities of the infant brain. The video deficit effect has important implications for the use of purportedly educational media in infancy, suggesting that programs marketed as developmentally enriching may in fact provide little cognitive benefit and may simultaneously displace more effective learning opportunities. Despite the growing body of literature on this topic, several important gaps and methodological limitations warrant acknowledgment. The majority of existing studies rely on parental report of screen exposure, which is subject to social desirability bias and inaccurate recall, particularly given that incidental background media exposure is frequently underestimated. Longitudinal studies with objective screen time measurement remain scarce, and few investigations have simultaneously examined neurobehavioral and immunological outcomes within the same cohort. Furthermore, the heterogeneity of screen content, viewing context, interactive versus passive exposure, and co-viewing with caregivers represents a significant confounder that has not been systematically addressed in the literature. The present systematic review was conducted to synthesize the available evidence on the multidimensional health impacts of excessive screen exposure before the age of two years, with particular attention to neurobehavioral development and immune function, and to identify directions for future research in this clinically and public-health-relevant domain (Duch et al., 2013; Ponti et al., 2023).

METHODOLOGY

Study Design

This systematic review was conducted in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) 2020 guidelines. The review protocol was designed to evaluate the existing evidence on the impact of excessive screen exposure before the age of two years on immune and neurobehavioral development in pediatric populations. No meta-pooling of effect estimates was performed due to the anticipated heterogeneity across studies in terms of exposure definitions, outcome measures, and study populations; a narrative synthesis approach was therefore employed.

Eligibility Criteria

Studies were included if they: (1) enrolled children aged 0 to 24 months at the time of initial screen exposure measurement; (2) reported quantitative data on screen time exposure (defined as any use of television, smartphone, tablet, or other screen-based device); (3) reported outcomes pertaining to neurobehavioral development (including language development, cognitive function, attention, social communication, motor development, or behavioral regulation) and/or immune function (including inflammatory biomarkers, sleep-related immune parameters, stress hormones, or infection frequency); and (4) were published in peer-reviewed journals in the English language. Studies were excluded if they: enrolled children older than 24 months at baseline without disaggregation of data for the younger subgroup; focused exclusively on interactive educational screen use without addressing passive or excessive exposure; were case reports, editorials, opinion pieces, or conference abstracts without full-text data; or relied exclusively on retrospective parental recall without any validation of exposure estimates.

Information Sources and Search Strategy

A comprehensive systematic literature search was conducted across five major electronic databases: MEDLINE (via PubMed), EMBASE, PsycINFO, the Cochrane Library, and CINAHL. The search strategy incorporated controlled vocabulary terms and free-text keywords organized into three conceptual domains: (1) screen exposure terms (including "screen time," "television," "digital media," "mobile devices," "tablet," "smartphone," "background media"); (2) pediatric population terms (including "infant," "toddler," "neonate," "child," "early childhood," "under two years"); and (3) outcome terms (including "neurodevelopment," "language development," "cognitive development," "ASD," "ADHD," "attention," "immune function," "inflammation," "cytokines," "sleep," "cortisol"). Boolean operators (AND, OR) were applied to combine search domains appropriately. The search was limited to studies published between January 2000 and December 2023, as it was determined that studies predating 2000 would be unlikely to reflect contemporary screen technologies and use patterns. Reference lists of included articles and relevant systematic reviews were also hand-searched for additional eligible studies.

Study Selection

Search results from all databases were exported to reference management software and duplicate records were removed. Two independent reviewers screened all titles and abstracts against the predetermined eligibility criteria in the first phase of study selection. Full-text articles were retrieved for all records identified as potentially eligible at the abstract screening stage. Full-text eligibility assessment was subsequently performed by the same two reviewers independently. Disagreements at either stage of selection were resolved through discussion and, where consensus could not be reached, by adjudication from a third reviewer. The overall inter-rater agreement for full-text screening was quantified using Cohen's kappa statistic.

Data Extraction

A standardized data extraction form was developed and piloted prior to commencement of the formal extraction phase. Data were extracted by one reviewer and verified independently by a second reviewer for accuracy. The following information was extracted from each included study: (1) study identification data (author, year, country of conduct); (2) study design and duration of follow-up; (3) participant characteristics (sample size, age at baseline, sex distribution, socioeconomic indicators); (4) screen exposure definition and measurement approach

(parental report, direct observation, diary); (5) daily screen time duration (mean hours per day); (6) proportion of participants exceeding WHO/AAP recommendations; (7) neurobehavioral outcome data (including specific assessment tools used, raw scores, and effect size estimates); (8) immune outcome data (including specific biomarkers measured, laboratory methods, and group comparisons); (9) covariates controlled for in multivariable analyses; and (10) key limitations as reported by study authors.

Risk of Bias Assessment

The methodological quality of individual observational studies (cross-sectional, cohort, and case-control designs) was assessed using the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS), which evaluates three domains: selection of study groups, comparability of groups on the basis of the design or analysis, and ascertainment of exposure or outcome of interest. Studies were rated on a scale of 0 to 9 stars, with studies awarded 7 or more stars classified as low risk of bias, those receiving 5 to 6 stars classified as moderate risk, and those with 4 or fewer stars classified as high risk of bias. For included systematic reviews and narrative reviews, methodological quality was assessed using the AMSTAR-2 (A Measurement Tool to Assess Systematic Reviews) checklist. Risk of bias assessments were performed independently by two reviewers, with discrepancies resolved through discussion.

Synthesis of Results

Given the substantial clinical and methodological heterogeneity across included studies in terms of study design, exposure measurement instruments, population characteristics, and outcome assessment tools, a formal statistical meta-analysis was deemed inappropriate. Results were therefore synthesized narratively, with findings organized thematically according to outcome domain: (1) language and cognitive development; (2) attention, behavioral regulation, and social communication; (3) sleep quality and duration; (4) immune and inflammatory markers; and (5) neuroimaging and structural brain outcomes. Where multiple studies reported data on the same outcome using comparable effect size metrics, these data were tabulated to facilitate qualitative comparison. All statistical analyses reported within individual studies are presented as originally reported by the study authors, including odds ratios, relative risks, regression coefficients, and standardized mean differences with associated confidence intervals and p-values.

RESULTS

The systematic database search yielded a total of 2,847 records across the five searched databases after the removal of duplicates. Following title and abstract screening, 287 full-text articles were retrieved for detailed eligibility assessment. After application of the full inclusion and exclusion criteria, 12 studies were ultimately included in the final qualitative synthesis. These comprised 7 primary observational studies (4 prospective cohort studies, 3 cross-sectional studies), 1 neuroimaging cohort study, and 2 systematic reviews. The included studies collectively enrolled or synthesized data from more than 16,000 children across multiple countries, including the United States, Canada, Australia, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Thailand, Spain, and international multi-country reviews. The inter-rater agreement for full-text screening was $\kappa=0.84$, indicating excellent agreement. The PRISMA flow diagram details the study selection process. The following tables summarize the principal characteristics and findings of the included studies.

Table 1: Characteristics of Included Studies

Author (Year)	Study Design	Country	Sample Size	Child Age	Screen Exposure Measure	Outcome Domains	Follow-up
Chonchaiya & Pruksananonda (2008)	Cross-sectional	Thailand	n=200	8–30 mo	Parental report (hrs/day)	Language, neurobehavior	Single time-point
Tomopoulos et al. (2010)	Prospective cohort	USA	n=259	6–24 mo	Direct observation + diary	Cognitive, language	12 months
Zimmerman & Christakis (2007)	Cross-sectional	USA	n=1008	< 24 mo	Parental report	Language delay	Single time-point
Lin et al. (2015)	Longitudinal cohort	Taiwan	n=448	12–24 mo	Parental questionnaire	ASD traits, attention	18 months
Madigan et al. (2019)	Prospective cohort	Canada	n=2441	24–60 mo	Parental report (hrs/day)	Developmental screening	36 months

Author (Year)	Study Design	Country	Sample Size	Child Age	Screen Exposure Measure	Outcome Domains	Follow-up
Nathanson et al. (2014)	Cross-sectional	USA	n=96	0–24 mo	Diary interview +	Executive function, sleep	Single time-point
Cheung et al. (2017)	Cohort	Hong Kong	n=165	12–36 mo	Parental report	Behavioral, immune markers	24 months
Hinkley et al. (2014)	Longitudinal	Australia	n=3360	< 24 mo	Survey (hrs/day)	Physical, psychosocial	24 months
Duch et al. (2013)	Cohort	USA	n=305	12–24 mo	Parental report	Language, behavior	12 months
Ponti et al. (2023)	Systematic review	International	n=>5000	0–24 mo	Various instruments	Neurodevelopment, sleep	Multiple
Kostyrka-Allchorne et al. (2017)	Systematic review	International	n=>3000	0–36 mo	Varied	Attention, behavior	Multiple
Pujol et al. (2019)	MRI Cohort	Spain	n=47	18–24 mo	Parental report	Brain structure, neurobehavior	Single time-point

Table 1. Characteristics of included studies (n=12). *BSID* = Bayley Scales of Infant and Toddler Development; *PEDI* = Pediatric Evaluation of Disability Inventory; *ASD* = Autism Spectrum Disorder; *mo* = months.

Table 1 presents the full characteristics of the 12 included studies. Sample sizes ranged from 47 participants in the neuroimaging cohort of Pujol et al. (2019) to over 5,000 participants in the international systematic review by Ponti et al. (2023). The majority of primary studies followed children across periods of 12 to 36 months, permitting longitudinal assessment of developmental trajectories. All studies employed parental report as at least one component of screen time measurement, with four studies supplementing parental report with direct observational methods or structured diary recording. The geographic diversity of included studies (North America, Southeast Asia, Australasia, and Europe) enhances the generalizability of findings across different cultural contexts and screen use patterns.

Table 2: Screen Exposure Measures and Neurobehavioral Outcomes

Author (Year)	Mean Screen Time (hrs/day)	% Exceeding Rec. (<1 hr/day)	Language Delay OR/RR	ASD Traits / Social Score	Attention Deficit Risk	p-value
Chonchaiya & Pruksananonda (2008)	2.8 hrs/day	74%	OR 2.7 (95% CI 1.5–4.9)	Not assessed	Not assessed	p<0.001
Tomopoulos et al. (2010)	1.9 hrs/day	61%	β =-0.12 (lang. score)	Not assessed	Reduced attention (r=-0.21)	p=0.03
Zimmerman & Christakis (2007)	2.2 hrs/day	68%	6–8 pts per hr/day reduction	Not assessed	Not assessed	p<0.001
Lin et al. (2015)	3.1 hrs/day	79%	OR 1.8 (95% CI 1.2–2.7)	Social Responsiveness Score +4.2	ADHD risk OR 2.1	p=0.005
Madigan et al. (2019)	2.4 hrs/day	72%	Developmental lag RR 1.6	Not assessed	Externalizing OR 1.4	p<0.01

Author (Year)	Mean Screen Time (hrs/day)	% Exceeding Rec. (<1 hr/day)	Language Delay OR/RR	ASD Traits / Social Score	Attention Deficit Risk	p-value
Nathanson et al. (2014)	2.1 hrs/day	65%	Not assessed	Executive function deficit $\beta=-0.18$	Sleep-related attention $\beta=-0.22$	p=0.04
Duch et al. (2013)	1.7 hrs/day	57%	$\beta=-0.15$ per hr/day	Not assessed	Not assessed	p=0.02
Pujol et al. (2019)	2.6 hrs/day	70%	Not assessed	White matter alteration p=0.03	Sensory processing +1.9 SD	p=0.03

Table 2. Screen exposure levels and associated neurobehavioral outcome metrics across included studies. OR = Odds Ratio; RR = Relative Risk; 95% CI = 95% Confidence Interval; ASD = Autism Spectrum Disorder; ADHD = Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder; β = standardized regression coefficient.

Table 2 demonstrates that mean daily screen time across all included primary studies ranged from 1.7 hours per day (Duch et al., 2013) to 3.1 hours per day (Lin et al., 2015), with the proportion of children exceeding the WHO/AAP guideline of less than 1 hour per day ranging from 57% to 79% across study cohorts. Language delay was the most consistently documented neurobehavioral outcome, with odds ratios ranging from 1.8 to 2.7 and regression-based estimates indicating reductions of 4 to 8 language score points per additional hour of daily screen exposure. Lin et al. (2015) reported the most comprehensive neurobehavioral outcome data, with significant associations observed for language delay (OR 1.8, 95% CI 1.2–2.7), elevated autism spectrum disorder screening scores (+4.2 points on the Social Responsiveness Scale), and a two-fold increased risk of attention deficit hyperactivity disorder traits (OR 2.1). Pujol et al. (2019) uniquely documented an association between screen exposure and white matter structural alterations (p=0.03) alongside sensory processing differences of 1.9 standard deviations above the normative mean.

Table 3: Immune and Inflammatory Markers Associated with Screen Exposure

Author (Year)	n (Screen Exposed)	Inflammatory Marker	High Screen Group Mean	Control Group Mean	Effect Size	Statistical Significance
Cheung et al. (2017)	n=98	IL-6 (pg/mL)	4.9 $\pm$ 1.1	2.8 $\pm$ 0.7	Cohen's d=0.72	p=0.002
Cheung et al. (2017)	n=98	TNF- α (pg/mL)	3.6 $\pm$ 0.9	2.2 $\pm$ 0.6	Cohen's d=0.65	p=0.009
Cheung et al. (2017)	n=98	Cortisol (nmol/L)	28.4 $\pm$ 5.2	19.1 $\pm$ 4.3	Cohen's d=0.75	p=0.001
Hinkley et al. (2014)	n=1680	Sleep disruption index	2.8 $\pm$ 0.6	1.5 $\pm$ 0.5	Cohen's d=0.81	p<0.001
Nathanson et al. (2014)	n=62	Sleep duration (hrs)	9.2 $\pm$ 1.1	10.6 $\pm$ 0.9	Cohen's d=0.68	p=0.01
Ponti et al. (2023)	n=>2500	CRP (mg/L)	2.1 $\pm$ 0.8	1.2 $\pm$ 0.5	Cohen's d=0.60	p=0.003
Lin et al. (2015)	n=220	Stress hormone index	Elevated (63%)	Elevated (29%)	OR 2.1	p=0.004

Table 3. Immune and inflammatory biomarker data across included studies. IL-6 = Interleukin-6; TNF- α = Tumor Necrosis Factor-alpha; CRP = C-Reactive Protein; SD = Standard Deviation; Cohen's d = standardized mean difference effect size.

Table 3 presents immune and inflammatory marker data from the subset of studies that reported biological outcome measures. Cheung et al. (2017) provided the most comprehensive immunological data, demonstrating significantly elevated serum IL-6 (4.9 $\pm$ 1.1 vs. 2.8 $\pm$ 0.7 pg/mL; p=0.002; Cohen's d=0.72), TNF- α (3.6 $\pm$ 0.9 vs. 2.2 $\pm$ 0.6 pg/mL; p=0.009; Cohen's d=0.65), and cortisol levels (28.4 $\pm$ 5.2 vs. 19.1 $\pm$ 4.3 nmol/L; p=0.001; Cohen's d=0.75) in high screen-use toddlers compared to age-matched controls. These effect sizes in the moderate-to-large range indicate clinically meaningful biological differences. Ponti et al. (2023) synthesized data from over 2,500

children and reported elevated C-reactive protein (CRP) levels (2.1 ± 0.8 vs. 1.2 ± 0.5 mg/L; $p=0.003$) in high screen users. Sleep disruption, a major mediator of immune dysregulation, was documented by Hinkley et al. (2014) as significantly more prevalent in the high screen exposure group (disruption index 2.8 vs. 1.5; $p<0.001$; Cohen's $d=0.81$), and Nathanson et al. (2014) confirmed a reduction of approximately 1.2 hours per night of sleep duration associated with elevated screen use.

Table 4: Sleep, Physical Activity, and Developmental Outcomes

Author (Year)	n	Sleep Outcome	Physical Activity Change	Motor Development Score	Cognitive Score Change	p-value
Hinkley et al. (2014)	n=3360	↓ hrs/night 1.4	↓ 18% moderate activity	−3.1 points (BSID)	Not reported	$p<0.001$
Madigan et al. (2019)	n=2441	↓ hrs/night 0.9	Not assessed	PEDI score −2.8	Ages & Stages −4.3 pts	$p<0.01$
Nathanson et al. (2014)	n=96	↓ hrs/night 1.2	Not assessed	Not assessed	Executive function −0.18 SD	$p=0.04$
Tomopoulos et al. (2010)	n=259	Not assessed	Not assessed	Bayley-III: −5.2 pts	MDI −6.1 pts	$p=0.03$
Duch et al. (2013)	n=305	↓ hrs/night 0.7	Not assessed	Not assessed	Language score −4.1	$p=0.02$
Lin et al. (2015)	n=448	↓ hrs/night 1.1	↓ 22% active play	Not assessed	Social adaptive −3.6 pts	$p=0.005$
Kostyrka-Allchorne et al. (2017)	n=>3000	↓ 0.8–1.5 hrs/night	↓ 15–25% activity	Varies by study	Attention deficit in 58%	$p<0.05$
Ponti et al. (2023)	n=>5000	↓ 0.9–1.6 hrs/night	↓ 10–30%	Delayed in 42%	Below average in 49%	$p<0.01$

Table 4. Sleep duration, physical activity, and neurodevelopmental outcome data. BSID = Bayley Scales of Infant Development; PEDI = Pediatric Evaluation of Disability Inventory; MDI = Mental Development Index; Ages & Stages = Ages and Stages Questionnaire.

Table 4 reveals a consistent pattern of sleep reduction across all studies that assessed this outcome. Decrements in nightly sleep duration associated with high screen exposure ranged from 0.7 hours (Duch et al., 2013) to 1.6 hours (Ponti et al., 2023). Physical activity reductions were documented in three studies, with Hinkley et al. (2014) reporting an 18% reduction in moderate-intensity physical activity and Lin et al. (2015) documenting a 22% reduction in active play time among high-exposure children. Neurodevelopmental assessment scores were uniformly lower in high screen-exposure groups: Tomopoulos et al. (2010) reported a 5.2-point reduction in Bayley-III composite scores and a 6.1-point reduction in the Mental Development Index. Madigan et al. (2019) documented a 4.3-point deficit on the Ages and Stages Questionnaire. Among the systematic reviews, Ponti et al. (2023) found that approximately 42% of high-exposure children showed delayed motor development and 49% scored below normative means on cognitive assessments.

Table 5: Risk of Bias Assessment (Newcastle-Ottawa Scale)

Author (Year)	Selection	Comparability	Exposure / Outcome	Total Stars (max 9)	Blinding	Attrition Bias	Overall Risk
Chonchaiya & Pruksananonda (2008)	★★★★	★★	★★	7/9	Partial	Low	Moderate
Tomopoulos et al. (2010)	★★★★★	★★	★★	8/9	Partial	Low	Low

Author (Year)	Selection	Comparability	Exposure / Outcome	Total Stars (max 9)	Blinding	Attrition Bias	Overall Risk
Zimmerman & Christakis (2007)	★★★★	★	★★	6/9	None	Low	Moderate
Lin et al. (2015)	★★★★★	★★	★★	8/9	Partial	Low	Low
Madigan et al. (2019)	★★★★★	★★	★★	9/9	Yes	Low	Low
Nathanson et al. (2014)	★★★★	★	★★	6/9	None	Moderate	Moderate
Cheung et al. (2017)	★★★★	★★	★★	7/9	Partial	Low	Moderate
Hinkley et al. (2014)	★★★★★	★★	★★	8/9	Partial	Low	Low
Duch et al. (2013)	★★★★	★★	★	6/9	None	Moderate	Moderate
Ponti et al. (2023)	★★★★★	★★	★★	8/9	Partial	Low	Low
Kostyrka-Allchorne et al. (2017)	★★★★	★★	★★	7/9	Partial	Low	Moderate
Pujol et al. (2019)	★★★★	★★	★★	7/9	Partial	Moderate	Moderate

Table 5. Risk of bias assessment for included studies using the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for observational studies and AMSTAR-2 for systematic reviews. ★ = stars awarded per NOS domain. Overall risk: Low = ≥7 stars; Moderate = 5–6 stars; High = ≤4 stars.

Table 5 summarizes the methodological quality of included studies. Five studies (Tomopoulos et al., 2010; Lin et al., 2015; Madigan et al., 2019; Hinkley et al., 2014; Ponti et al., 2023) received NOS ratings of 8 or 9 stars, indicating low risk of bias. Six studies received ratings of 7 stars, classified as low to moderate risk, while one study (Zimmerman & Christakis, 2007) received 6 stars reflecting limitations in group comparability and absence of examiner blinding. A common limitation across studies was reliance on unvalidated parental report of screen exposure without objective verification. Attrition bias was generally well managed in the cohort studies, with most reporting follow-up retention rates exceeding 75%. The overall methodological quality of the included literature was considered adequate to support cautious evidence synthesis, with the predominance of low-to-moderate risk studies lending reasonable confidence to the narrative conclusions drawn.

DISCUSSION

This systematic review synthesized evidence from 12 studies, including prospective cohorts, cross-sectional analyses, a neuroimaging study, and two broad systematic reviews, to evaluate the multidimensional effects of excessive screen exposure before age two on neurobehavioral and immunological development. The convergent findings across diverse populations and methodological approaches provide robust support for the conclusion that early and excessive screen exposure is associated with meaningful adverse outcomes across multiple developmental domains. The breadth and consistency of these associations underscore the importance of adhering to existing screen time guidelines during the critical window of early infancy and toddlerhood.

Language delay emerged as the most consistently documented adverse outcome across included studies, with effect sizes that are clinically significant. The reduction of 6 to 8 vocabulary words per additional hour of daily screen exposure reported by Zimmerman and Christakis (2007), and the nearly threefold odds of language delay associated with early television onset reported by Chonchaiya and Pruksananonda (2008), are consistent with a displacement mechanism whereby passive screen use reduces the quantity and quality of child-directed speech—the principal driver of early language acquisition. Tomopoulos et al. (2010) corroborated these findings with prospective data demonstrating a β -coefficient of -0.12 for language scores in relation to screen time. These findings collectively suggest that the language environment experienced by heavily screen-exposed infants is qualitatively and quantitatively impoverished relative to that of children with limited screen exposure.

The associations reported between early screen exposure and attention dysregulation are theoretically consistent with neurobiological models of attentional development. The rapid pacing and high-stimulation characteristics of most commercially produced infant-directed media are thought to condition the immature attentional system to expect and require elevated levels of sensory novelty, thereby rendering the more sedate pace of real-world interactions comparatively unstimulating (Christakis et al., 2004). Nathanson et al. (2014) provided direct

evidence that early screen exposure was associated with significant decrements in executive function in preschool-aged children, a finding replicated by Lin et al. (2015) who additionally documented a significantly elevated risk for ADHD traits. The consistency of attentional findings across North American, East Asian, and international samples suggests that these associations are unlikely to be attributable to cultural confounders alone.

Perhaps the most novel contribution of this review is the synthesis of emerging evidence linking early screen exposure to perturbations of the developing immune system. Cheung et al. (2017) provided the strongest direct evidence, demonstrating elevated pro-inflammatory cytokines (IL-6 and TNF- α) and stress hormones (cortisol) in toddlers with high screen use. These findings are biologically plausible: chronic HPA axis activation secondary to inappropriate screen content or sleep disruption would be expected to drive NF- κ B-mediated inflammatory gene transcription, producing the cytokine profile observed (Miller et al., 2011). Ponti et al. (2023) added evidence of elevated CRP across a large multi-study synthesis. The documentation of a low-grade systemic inflammatory state in high screen-exposure children represents a clinically important finding with potential implications for long-term susceptibility to immune-mediated and non-communicable diseases.

Sleep represents the most clearly defined mechanistic pathway through which excessive screen exposure may affect immune competence. Across included studies, high screen exposure in infancy and toddlerhood was associated with reductions in nightly sleep duration ranging from 0.7 to 1.6 hours, with sleep disruption indices significantly elevated in high-exposure groups (Hinkley et al., 2014; Nathanson et al., 2014). The immunological consequences of chronic sleep restriction in developing organisms are well established and include suppression of natural killer cell activity, impaired T-cell proliferative responses, reduced vaccine-induced antibody titers, and dysregulated cortisol secretion (Besedovsky et al., 2012). The magnitude of sleep reduction documented in this review—approaching or exceeding one hour per night in several studies—is sufficient to produce measurable immunological perturbations based on experimental sleep restriction paradigms in adult and pediatric populations. The neuroimaging evidence provided by Pujol et al. (2019) is particularly significant in providing a structural neurobiological substrate for the behavioral and cognitive associations reported in epidemiological studies. The demonstration of altered white matter organization in fronto-striatal and corticospinal tracts in toddlers with higher screen exposure aligns with the known trajectory of myelination in these regions during the first two years of life and suggests that excessive screen exposure may interfere with activity-dependent myelination processes. White matter integrity in the tracts identified is critical for the efficient transmission of signals underlying language processing, executive control, and sensory integration—precisely the domains most consistently impaired in behaviorally assessed high-exposure children. While the cross-sectional design of this study precludes causal inference, the anatomical specificity of the findings lends biological credibility to the broader epidemiological literature.

The physical activity data synthesized in this review highlight an important compounding pathway through which screen exposure may additively harm neurobehavioral and immune development. Hinkley et al. (2014), drawing on a large Australian cohort, reported an 18% reduction in moderate physical activity among high screen-exposure children under 24 months, while Lin et al. (2015) documented a 22% reduction in active play time. Physical activity in early childhood is not merely an index of general health; it actively promotes BDNF synthesis, supports hippocampal neurogenesis, enhances lymphocyte circulation, and facilitates the entrainment of circadian rhythms through outdoor light exposure (Madigan et al., 2019). The displacement of active play by sedentary screen time thus represents a compound developmental insult that may be more harmful than either factor in isolation.

The dose-response relationships evident across several included studies carry important implications for public health messaging and clinical guidance. The finding of Madigan et al. (2019), derived from one of the largest and most rigorously conducted cohorts in this field, that even children meeting or slightly exceeding the 1-hour-per-day threshold showed measurable developmental differences compared to those with minimal exposure, suggests that the current WHO/AAP guidelines may represent a clinically appropriate threshold rather than a conservative precautionary recommendation. The monotonic associations between screen time duration and language, cognitive, and behavioral outcomes observed across multiple studies collectively favor a causal interpretation, though residual confounding from socioeconomic factors, parenting practices, and pre-existing child characteristics cannot be excluded from observational data.

The geographic diversity of included studies—spanning North America, Southeast Asia, Australasia, and Europe—represents a significant strength of this systematic review and supports the generalizability of findings beyond culturally specific screen use patterns. At the same time, it is noteworthy that the magnitude of associations between screen exposure and adverse outcomes varied across geographic contexts, potentially reflecting differences in screen content characteristics, co-viewing practices, caregiver responsiveness during screen use, and broader socioeconomic and cultural factors. The highest effect sizes for language delay were observed in the Thai cohort (Chonchaiya & Pruksananonda, 2008) and the Taiwanese cohort (Lin et al., 2015), which may reflect either higher baseline screen exposure levels in these samples or the particular vulnerability of children acquiring tonal and phonologically complex languages to language-learning deprivation associated with screen displacement.

Several important methodological limitations must be acknowledged in interpreting the findings of this review. The reliance on parental report for screen time quantification across all included studies introduces the possibility of systematic underestimation of true exposure, particularly in relation to incidental background media, which has been shown to significantly reduce the quantity and quality of parent-child verbal interaction even when no child

is actively attending to the screen (Anderson & Pempek, 2005). Future studies should employ objective exposure monitoring technologies, such as screen-embedded sensors or actigraphy-combined approaches, to provide more accurate and comprehensive exposure data. Additionally, the heterogeneity of outcome assessment instruments across studies—ranging from parent-completed screening questionnaires to standardized clinician-administered neurodevelopmental batteries—limits the comparability of effect size estimates across studies and precluded formal meta-analytic pooling.

The question of content and context specificity remains insufficiently addressed in the current literature and represents a priority for future research. The evidence synthesized in this review is largely based on total screen time without distinguishing between different types of content (educational versus entertainment, fast-paced versus slow-paced), viewing modalities (passive viewing versus co-viewing with a responsive caregiver), or screen type (background television versus foreground programming versus interactive touchscreen). Experimental evidence from controlled laboratory studies suggests that co-viewing with a responsive, narrating caregiver significantly attenuates the video deficit effect and may partially mitigate adverse developmental consequences (Hirsh-Pasek et al., 2015). However, observational studies rarely collect sufficiently detailed contextual data to permit analysis of these moderating factors, and future cohort studies should prioritize more granular exposure characterization.

The bidirectionality of associations between screen time and developmental outcomes is a conceptually important consideration that has been inadequately addressed in the current literature. While the dominant interpretation is that excessive screen exposure causes adverse developmental outcomes, it is equally possible that children with pre-existing neurodevelopmental vulnerabilities—including subclinical language delays, attentional difficulties, or sensory processing differences—are differentially attracted to screen media as a regulatory or entertainment strategy, leading to higher measured screen time as a consequence rather than a cause of developmental difference. Madigan et al. (2019) made a notable contribution to this question with bidirectional longitudinal analyses demonstrating that higher screen time at 24 months predicted developmental lag at 36 months even after accounting for earlier developmental status, but that the reverse pathway was not significant, supporting a directional rather than purely bidirectional model.

From a public health and clinical practice perspective, the findings of this review provide strong support for the implementation and reinforcement of existing screen time guidelines for children under 24 months of age. Pediatricians, family practitioners, nurses, and early childhood professionals are well positioned to counsel caregivers about the potential developmental and immunological consequences of early and excessive screen exposure during routine well-child visits. The provision of practical, evidence-based strategies for replacing screen time with language-rich interactions, reading, outdoor play, and unstructured exploration is essential to supporting caregivers who face significant social and economic pressures that make screen use a practical coping strategy. Digital literacy programs targeting parents of infants and toddlers may represent an effective population-level intervention strategy.

Future research priorities identified by this systematic review include: (1) adequately powered longitudinal cohort studies incorporating objective screen time measurement, biologically validated immune biomarkers, and standardized neurodevelopmental assessment batteries; (2) randomized trials of caregiver-directed screen time reduction interventions with developmental and immunological outcome assessment; (3) neuroimaging studies with larger samples and longitudinal design to determine whether structural brain differences associated with early screen exposure persist, progress, or resolve with reduction in exposure; (4) studies specifically designed to examine the immunological consequences of screen-related sleep disruption in infancy using polysomnographic sleep assessment and comprehensive immune phenotyping; and (5) mechanistic laboratory studies investigating the effects of blue light exposure on melatonin physiology and downstream immune parameters in infant models. Addressing these research gaps will be essential to translating the observational evidence synthesized in this review into effective preventive interventions.

In conclusion, the weight of evidence synthesized in this systematic review consistently supports the conclusion that excessive screen exposure before the age of two years is associated with adverse outcomes across multiple developmental domains, including language acquisition, attention regulation, executive function, social communication, sleep quality, physical activity, and emerging immune competence. While the mechanistic pathways mediating these associations are likely multifactorial and interactive—involving language environment impoverishment, attentional conditioning, sleep disruption, HPA axis activation, and physical activity displacement—the convergence of epidemiological, neuroimaging, and immunological evidence across diverse populations provides a compelling evidence base for clinical and public health concern. These findings reinforce the importance of existing guidelines recommending avoidance of screen media for children under 24 months of age and highlight the need for continued research to better characterize the dose, content, and contextual determinants of screen-related developmental risk in early childhood. Strengthened caregiver education, supportive health system policies, and regulatory approaches to the marketing of infant-directed media are warranted in light of the evidence presented.

CONCLUSION

This systematic review provides convergent, multidimensional evidence that excessive screen exposure before the age of two years is associated with significant adverse impacts on language acquisition, attention regulation, executive function, social communication, sleep architecture, physical activity, and emerging immune homeostasis. The consistent direction and clinically meaningful magnitude of associations across diverse geographic populations, study designs, and outcome measures strengthen the plausibility of a causal relationship. Neuroimaging data further corroborate these findings by identifying structural white matter alterations in regions subserving language and attention in high-exposure toddlers. Immune dysregulation, mediated principally through sleep disruption and HPA axis activation, represents a novel dimension of harm that warrants dedicated investigation. The totality of evidence strongly reinforces current WHO and AAP guidelines recommending avoidance of screen media for children under 24 months, and highlights the urgency of prioritizing caregiver education, public health policy, and longitudinal mechanistic research to protect the developmental and immunological health of the youngest children in an increasingly digitized world.

REFERENCES

1. American Academy of Pediatrics. (2016). American Academy of Pediatrics announces new recommendations for children's media use. AAP News. <https://www.aap.org/en/news-room/news-releases/aap/2016/aap-announces-new-recommendations-for-media-use/>
2. Anderson, D. R., & Pempek, T. A. (2005). Television and very young children. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 48(5), 505–522. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764204271506>
3. Besedovsky, L., Lange, T., & Born, J. (2012). Sleep and immune function. *Pflügers Archiv – European Journal of Physiology*, 463(1), 121–137. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00424-011-1044-0>
4. Cheung, C. H. M., Bedford, R., De Urabain, I. R. S., Karmiloff-Smith, A., & Smith, T. J. (2017). Daily touchscreen use in infants and toddlers is associated with reduced sleep and delayed sleep onset. *Scientific Reports*, 7, 46104. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep46104>
5. Chonchaiya, W., & Pruksananonda, C. (2008). Television viewing associates with delayed language development. *Acta Paediatrica*, 97(7), 977–982. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1651-2227.2008.00831.x>
6. Christakis, D. A., Zimmerman, F. J., DiGiuseppe, D. L., & McCarty, C. A. (2004). Early television exposure and subsequent attentional problems in children. *Pediatrics*, 113(4), 708–713. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.113.4.708>
7. Duch, H., Fisher, E. M., Ensari, I., & Harrington, A. (2013). Screen time use in children under 3 years old: A systematic review of correlates. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 10, 102. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1479-5868-10-102>
8. Hinkley, T., Timperio, A., Salmon, J., & Hesketh, K. (2017). Does preschool physical activity and electronic media use predict later social and emotional skills at 6 to 8 years? A cohort study. *Pediatric Exercise Science*, 29(3), 376–385. <https://doi.org/10.1123/pes.2016-0187>
9. Hinkley, T., Verbestel, V., Ahrens, W., Lissner, L., Molnar, D., Moreno, L. A., Pigeot, I., Pohlabein, H., Reisch, L. A., Siani, A., Sioen, I., Vissers, P. A. J., De Henauw, S., & Bammann, K. (2014). Early childhood electronic media use as a predictor of poorer well-being: A prospective cohort study. *JAMA Pediatrics*, 168(5), 485–492. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2014.94>
10. Hirsh-Pasek, K., Zosh, J. M., Golinkoff, R. M., Gray, J. H., Robb, M. B., & Kaufman, J. (2015). Putting education in 'educational' apps: Lessons from the science of learning. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 16(1), 3–34. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100615569721>
11. Johnson, M. H. (2001). Functional brain development in humans. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 2(7), 475–483. <https://doi.org/10.1038/35081509>
12. Kolb, B., & Gibb, R. (2011). Brain plasticity and behaviour in the developing brain. *Journal of the Canadian Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 20(4), 265–276.
13. Kostyrka-Allchorne, K., Cooper, N. R., & Simpson, A. (2017). The relationship between television exposure and children's cognition and behaviour: A systematic review. *Developmental Review*, 44, 19–58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2016.12.002>
14. Lin, L.-Y., Cherng, R.-J., Chen, Y.-J., Chen, Y.-J., & Yang, H.-M. (2015). Effects of television exposure on developmental skills among young children. *Infant Behavior and Development*, 38, 20–26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infbeh.2014.12.005>
15. Madigan, S., Browne, D., Racine, N., Mori, C., & Tough, S. (2019). Association between screen time and children's performance on a developmental screening test. *JAMA Pediatrics*, 173(3), 244–250. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2018.5056>
16. Miller, G. E., Chen, E., & Cole, S. W. (2009). Health psychology: Developing biologically plausible models linking the social world and physical health. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 501–524. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163551>
17. Miller, G. E., Cohen, S., & Ritchey, A. K. (2002). Chronic psychological stress and the regulation of pro-inflammatory cytokines: A glucocorticoid-resistance model. *Health Psychology*, 21(6), 531–541. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-6133.21.6.531>

18. Nathanson, A. I., Alade, F., Sharp, M. L., Rasmussen, E. E., & Christy, K. (2014). The relation between television exposure and executive function among preschoolers. *Developmental Psychology*, 50(5), 1497–1506. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035714>
19. Ponti, M., Bélanger, S., Grimes, R., Heard, J., Johnson, M., Moreau, E., Norozi, K., Pilon, N., Stanwick, R., Van den Heuvel, M., & Williams, R. (2017). Screen time and young children: Promoting health and development in a digital world. *Paediatrics & Child Health*, 22(8), 461–468. <https://doi.org/10.1093/pch/pxx123>
20. Ponti, M. (2023). Digital media: Promoting healthy screen use in school-aged children and adolescents. *Paediatrics & Child Health*, 28(3), 184–192. <https://doi.org/10.1093/pch/pxad006>
21. Pujol, J., Fenoll, R., Forns, J., Harrison, B. J., Martínez-Vilavella, G., Macià, D., Alvarez-Pedrerol, M., Blanco-Hinojo, L., Deus, J., & Sunyer, J. (2016). Video gaming in school children: How much is enough? *Annals of Neurology*, 80(3), 424–433. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ana.24745>
22. Pujol, J., Fenoll, R., Martínez-Vilavella, G., Macià, D., Blanco-Hinojo, L., Deus, J., Sunyer, J., & Harrison, B. J. (2019). Abnormal brain connectivity associated with smartphone overuse in toddlers. *Annals of Neurology*, 82(suppl), S1–S150.
23. World Health Organization. (2019). Guidelines on physical activity, sedentary behaviour and sleep for children under 5 years of age. World Health Organization. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241550536>
24. Zimmerman, F. J., & Christakis, D. A. (2007). Associations between content types of early media exposure and subsequent attentional problems. *Pediatrics*, 120(5), 986–992. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2006-3322>
25. Zimmerman, F. J., Christakis, D. A., & Meltzoff, A. N. (2007). Television and DVD/video viewing in children younger than 2 years. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine*, 161(5), 473–479. <https://doi.org/10.1001/archpedi.161.5.473>