

Review Article

Beyond screen time: artificial intelligence, algorithmic media and the future of child health

Venugopal Reddy I.*

Department of Pediatrics, Longevia Clinics, Bangalore, Karnataka, India

Received: 28 August 2026

Accepted: 05 October 2026

*Correspondence:

Dr. Venugopal Reddy I.,

E-mail: drivgr@gmail.com

Copyright: © the author(s), publisher and licensee Medip Academy. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License, which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

ABSTRACT

Digital media has evolved from passive screen viewing into an algorithmically curated ecosystem of social platforms, short form video, games, generative artificial intelligence (AI), conversational agents, connected toys and educational technologies. These systems can support learning, creativity, communication, disability access and healthcare; however, engagement optimized design, commercial surveillance and synthetic content create risks that are not adequately captured by screen-time measures alone. This narrative review examines the effects of contemporary digital ecosystems on child and adolescent health and outlines implications for pediatric practice. PubMed/MEDLINE, Google Scholar and guidance from the World Health Organization, United Nations Children's Fund, UNESCO and the American Academy of Pediatrics were reviewed, with emphasis on evidence published from 2019 to June 2026. Associations have been reported between problematic digital media use and sleep disruption, reduced physical activity, visual and musculoskeletal symptoms, obesity related behaviours, anxiety, depressive symptoms, cyberbullying, disordered eating and impaired attention. Causal interpretation remains difficult because effects are heterogeneous, often small, bidirectional and strongly modified by age, content, context, displacement, family relationships and pre-existing vulnerability. AI adds distinct concerns: persuasive personalization, inaccurate health information, anthropomorphic dependency, deepfakes, sexual exploitation, biased outputs, privacy loss and erosion of learning through uncritical outsourcing. Benefits are also substantial when technologies are developmentally appropriate, evidence-based, inclusive and used with adult support. Pediatric counselling should shift from counting hours alone toward assessing the child's digital ecosystem, sleep, function, content, compulsivity, safety and relationships. Effective protection requires shared family practices, school digital literacy, safety by design, age-appropriate assurance, transparent algorithms, data minimization and independent research. The goal is not a screen free childhood but a child centred digital environment that supports health, agency and development.

Keywords: Artificial intelligence, Child health, Digital media, Social media, Screen time, Algorithms, Mental health, Digital safety

INTRODUCTION

Digital media now shapes how children learn, play, socialize, seek health information and construct identity. The familiar television screen has expanded into a network of smartphones, social platforms, games, wearable devices, connected toys, virtual communities, recommendation engines and generative artificial intelligence (AI). A child does not merely choose content; automated systems predict preferences, rank information,

generate responses and optimize the next interaction. The relevant exposure is therefore a digital ecosystem rather than a single device or number of hours.^{1,2}

This transformation has created genuine benefits. Video communication sustains relationships, online communities can reduce isolation, high-quality programs support learning, assistive tools increase participation, and AI can translate, tutor or adapt content. Digital health can improve access where specialists are scarce. Yet the same

technologies can intensify attention capture, commercial profiling, misinformation and harmful social comparison. Their scale and speed exceed the evidence base and the capacity of families to manage risk alone.¹⁻⁴

Public discussion often polarizes between technological optimism and moral panic. Neither position serves pediatric practice. Average associations between screen exposure and wellbeing are often modest and heterogeneous; vulnerable children may experience disproportionate harm, while purposeful use may benefit others. Directionality is frequently bidirectional: distress can increase problematic use, which may then worsen sleep or functioning.^{3,5} This review evaluates emerging risks without treating every use as harmful and proposes a child-centred framework for clinical and public-health action.

METHODS

A narrative review was undertaken using PubMed/MEDLINE and Google Scholar, supplemented by policy statements and reports from WHO, UNICEF, UNESCO, the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) and other authoritative organisations. Literature published mainly from January 2019 through June 2026 was prioritised, with seminal earlier sources retained. Searches combined child, adolescent or pediatric with digital media, screen time, social media, gaming, recommender algorithm, artificial intelligence, generative AI, chatbot, mental health, sleep, obesity, vision, attention, misinformation, privacy, cyberbullying, sexual exploitation and digital literacy.

Priority was given to systematic reviews, meta-analyses, longitudinal cohorts, consensus guidance and studies that distinguished media content or context. Evidence was synthesised thematically because exposure and outcome definitions were highly variable. Adult-only evidence was not used to assert pediatric effects. This is a narrative rather than registered systematic review; incomplete retrieval and selection bias are possible.

FROM SCREEN TIME TO THE DIGITAL ECOSYSTEM

Duration remains relevant because digital use can displace sleep, movement, face to face interaction and study. However, two hours of a video call with grandparents, creative coding, cyberbullying exposure or compulsive short video scrolling are not equivalent. Health effects depend on the four Cs: child, content, context and consequences. Age, temperament, neurodevelopment, family stress and existing symptoms shape susceptibility; content may be educational, social, commercial or harmful; context includes co-use and time of day; consequences include sleep loss, conflict, distress or functional impairment.^{1,2}

Engagement-based design changes the exposure. Infinite scroll, autoplay, streaks, intermittent rewards, notifications and personalized recommendations reduce natural stopping cues. Platforms learn from pauses, searches and social networks, then refine content in real time. Revenue models based on attention, advertising and data collection may conflict with developmental needs. Individual self-control cannot fully counter systems deliberately optimized to prolong engagement.¹

Generative AI adds conversational and synthetic layers. Children can ask a chatbot intimate question, obtain plausible but false explanations, create images, simulate relationships or outsource schoolwork. Outputs vary with prompts and training data, and safeguards may fail. Because fluent language is easily mistaken for understanding or authority, developmental capacity to judge reliability becomes central.^{4,6}

PHYSICAL HEALTH EFFECTS

Sleep is the most consistent clinical pathway. Evening use delays bedtime, displaces sleep and exposes users to emotional arousal and light. Notifications fragment sleep, and devices in bedrooms weaken boundaries. Insufficient or irregular sleep affects mood, attention, learning, appetite and cardiometabolic health. The practical target is not light alone but the full bedtime ecology: stimulating content, social expectations, device proximity and family routines.^{7,8}

Sedentary use can displace moderate-to-vigorous physical activity, although a child may be both highly active and a heavy media user. Passive viewing, snacking and targeted marketing of foods high in fat, salt and sugar can promote adverse dietary patterns. Associations with adiposity are influenced by sleep, eating, socioeconomic conditions and content; simple duration thresholds do not capture these mechanisms.^{9,10}

Prolonged near work and limited outdoor time are associated with myopia risk, while dry eye, headache and transient visual discomfort may follow sustained viewing and reduced blinking. Neck, shoulder, back and hand symptoms relate to posture, device size and uninterrupted use. Pediatric advice should include outdoor activity, ergonomic positioning, regular distance viewing and symptom-based eye assessment rather than unsupported claims that screens permanently damage every child's eyes.^{11,12}

Digital use may also expose children to loud audio, distracted walking or driving, and interrupted meals. Conversely, active games, exercise applications and accessibility tools can support movement or participation.

The relevant clinical question is whether technology promotes or displaces healthy behaviour.

MENTAL HEALTH, ATTENTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Observational studies link problematic social-media use with depressive symptoms, anxiety, low life satisfaction and self-harm-related outcomes, but average effects vary and causation is unresolved. Selection, reporting bias and unmeasured family factors complicate estimates. Vulnerable adolescents including those experiencing bullying, discrimination, body dissatisfaction or preexisting mental illness may encounter greater harm. At the same time, identity-affirming communities and peer support may protect marginalised young people.^{3,5,13}

Mechanisms include social comparison, quantifiable popularity, fear of missing out, cyberbullying, exposure to self-harm or eating-disorder content, and sleep disruption. Algorithmic systems can amplify a fleeting interest into a repetitive feed. Risk assessment should therefore ask what the child sees, how it makes them feel and whether the platform repeatedly recommends distressing material not merely how long they are online.^{1,14}

Rapidly changing streams of rewards may fragment attention and encourage task switching. Evidence linking digital media to attention problems is mixed and vulnerable to reverse causation because children with attention difficulties may prefer highly stimulating media. For young children, background media and caregiver distraction can interfere with conversational turns and shared attention; high-quality co viewing can instead support language and learning.^{15,16}

Problematic gaming is characterised by impaired control, priority over other activities and continuation despite harm, rather than enthusiasm alone. Functional impairment, deception, sleep reversal, academic decline and withdrawal from offline life are warning signs. Gaming may also provide mastery, friendship and stress relief, so assessment must distinguish intensive engagement from disorder.¹⁷

AI-SPECIFIC EMERGING RISKS

AI companions and chatbots can be responsive, nonjudgmental and always available. These qualities may support practice or disclosure, but they can foster anthropomorphism and emotional dependency, particularly in lonely or developmentally vulnerable children. A system does not possess duty of care, stable memory, confidentiality or clinical judgment. In crisis situations, inconsistent responses can be dangerous. Children should know when they are interacting with AI and have accessible routes to human support.^{4,6}

Generative models can produce confident misinformation about vaccination, nutrition, sexuality, mental health or medication. Personalized falsehood may feel credible because it is conversational and tailored. Deepfakes and synthetic voices enable impersonation, fraud, bullying and

non-consensual sexual imagery. Generative tools can scale child sexual abuse material and make verification more difficult. Safety education must avoid blaming victims and must include rapid reporting, evidence preservation and trauma-informed support.^{18,19}

Educational risks include fabrication, plagiarism, automation bias and loss of productive struggle. If AI supplies finished answers, children may bypass retrieval, reasoning, writing and uncertainty tolerance. Used transparently as a tutor that asks questions, provides feedback and adapts accessibility, it can be beneficial. Schools need explicit rules distinguishing permitted assistance, required disclosure and prohibited substitution.^{6,20}

AI systems inherit bias from data and design. Speech, language, disability, skin tone, gender and cultural context can affect performance. Children may be misclassified by emotion-recognition, proctoring or surveillance tools, with limited opportunity to contest decisions. Pediatric AI used for diagnosis or triage requires age-representative validation, human oversight, monitoring and clear accountability.^{21,22}

PRIVACY, COMMERCIALIZATION AND DIGITAL INEQUALITY

Children generate behavioural, location, biometric, social and health data before they can meaningfully understand consent. Connected toys, educational platforms and wellness applications may collect more data than necessary. Inferences about mood, interests or vulnerability can be used to personalize advertising or content. Data persist, can be breached and may shape opportunities later. Child privacy should be a design default, not a responsibility hidden in unreadable terms.^{23,24}

Digital marketing blurs content and commerce. Influencers, advergames and personalized advertising promote unhealthy foods, nicotine products, gambling like purchases, beauty ideals and supplements. Young children have limited ability to recognize persuasive intent; adolescents may recognize advertising yet remain susceptible to social influence. Disclosure labels alone are unlikely to neutralize algorithmic targeting.^{10,25}

Digital inequality includes lack of devices or connectivity, but also unsafe access, low-quality content, limited parental time and exclusion by language or disability. Blanket restriction may remove educational or social benefits from disadvantaged children while leaving commercial systems unchanged. Policies should pursue meaningful access and protection simultaneously.²⁶

CLINICAL APPROACH FOR PEDIATRICIANS

Digital health history can be integrated into developmental and adolescent consultations. Useful domains are sleep

and bedroom devices; school performance; movement and outdoor time; family conflict; content and contacts; cyberbullying; sexual or financial exploitation; compulsive use; mood before and after use; and the child's use of AI for health advice, companionship or schoolwork. Confidential adolescent discussion is important, while imminent safety concerns require appropriate escalation.

Red flags include loss of sleep, meals or hygiene; failed attempts to cut back; withdrawal from valued activities; marked distress when disconnected; escalating secrecy; exposure to self-harm or eating-disorder communities; sexual coercion; financial exploitation; and functional decline. Clinicians should assess depression, anxiety, attention problems, family stress and bullying rather than assuming the device is the sole cause.

Counselling should be collaborative. Establish device-free sleep routines and meals; turn off nonessential notifications; use charging locations outside bedrooms; encourage outdoor activity; choose high-quality content; co-use media with younger children; discuss advertising and AI fallibility; and rehearse how to block, report and seek help. Family adults should model the practices they request. The AAP family media plan can support shared decisions, but rigid rules should be adapted to development and family circumstances.^{1,27}

Pediatricians should avoid unvalidated 'digital detox' prescriptions or punitive removal that isolates a child from support. Where functional impairment is significant, a graded plan with family collaboration, school involvement and mental-health referral may be needed. Immediate action is required for suicidality, exploitation, credible threats or abuse.

ROLES OF FAMILIES, SCHOOLS, INDUSTRY AND GOVERNMENT

Families need practical controls but cannot carry sole responsibility. Shared routines, open conversation and trust are more durable than covert surveillance. Parental controls should be developmentally adjusted and accompanied by explanation. Schools should teach information verification, privacy, consent, respectful communication, advertising literacy and responsible AI use across subjects not only during a one-time safety session.^{20,28}

Platforms should implement safety by design: high privacy defaults, minimal data collection, age-appropriate experiences, friction before risky sharing, effective reporting, transparent recommender controls and restrictions on manipulative design. Independent researchers need privacy-preserving access to platform data. Risk assessments should evaluate foreseeable effects on sleep, mental health, discrimination and exploitation.^{23,29}

Governments should establish enforceable child-rights standards, age-appropriate assurance, limits on profiling and targeted marketing, rapid remedies for image-based abuse, and accountability for algorithmic risks. Age assurance itself must minimize surveillance and avoid excluding children without formal identification. Global principles require local adaptation, including Indian languages, shared-device use and differing school resources.^{24,26}

DEVELOPMENTAL STAGE AND DIFFERENTIAL VULNERABILITY

Development changes both exposure and capacity. Infants and toddlers depend on contingent, face-to-face interaction for language and emotional regulation. Media is most likely to support learning when content is slow, age appropriate and accompanied by an adult who connects it to real life. Background television and caregiver phone absorption can reduce responsive interaction even when the child is not directly watching. Video chat is a useful exception because live social contingency helps young children engage.^{15,16}

School-age children gain educational independence but may not reliably distinguish advertising, misinformation or simulated social behaviour. Games and online groups become important settings for friendship and competence. Risks include in-app spending, persuasive design, contact with strangers and the migration of conversations to less moderated platforms. Caregivers should gradually transfer responsibility while retaining clear routes for disclosure without immediate punishment.

Adolescence combines heightened peer sensitivity and reward seeking with developing executive control. Social feedback, appearance-based comparison and public metrics may therefore carry particular weight. Autonomy and privacy are also developmentally appropriate, so blanket surveillance can undermine trust and drive secret accounts. Collaborative boundaries, confidential clinical inquiry and transparent safety exceptions are preferable. AI companions may feel especially compelling during identity exploration or loneliness; clinicians should ask about their emotional role without ridicule.

Children with autism, attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder, chronic illness, disability or social anxiety may obtain substantial connection and accessibility benefits online, yet may also be more vulnerable to compulsive patterns, manipulation or exploitation. Recommendations must preserve assistive and community functions. A functional assessment what the technology enables and what it displaces is more equitable than universal restriction.

POSITIVE USES OF AI AND DIGITAL MEDIA

A risk-focused review should not obscure opportunity. High-quality digital content can support literacy, language

practice, creativity and collaboration. Captioning, text-to-speech, image description, translation and alternative input systems can increase inclusion. Telehealth can reduce travel and connect families to pediatric, developmental and mental health expertise, although privacy, clinical appropriateness and continuity must be maintained.^{4,26}

AI-supported education can adapt explanations, generate practice questions and provide feedback. In healthcare, AI may assist imaging, risk prediction, documentation and decision support. These uses require pediatric validation because children differ from adults in disease prevalence, physiology, communication and developmental trajectories. A model that performs well on retrospective data may fail after deployment or across hospitals. Human clinicians and teachers remain accountable for interpretation and decisions.^{21,22}

Online communities can normalize help-seeking, sustain friendships during illness and offer identity-affirming support. Digital tools may deliver evidence-based behavioural interventions or symptom monitoring. Benefit is more likely when tools have a clear purpose, transparent evidence, minimal data collection, escalation to human care and safeguards against excessive engagement. The correct comparison is often not digital versus ideal in-person care, but digital support versus no accessible support.

Pediatricians can help families identify beneficial use by asking whether it is purposeful, age appropriate, socially connected, creative rather than exclusively consumptive, and followed by improved rather than diminished functioning. Technology that supports a child's goals should not be treated as equivalent to use that repeatedly overrides them.

RELEVANCE TO INDIA AND OTHER LOW- AND MIDDLE-INCOME COUNTRIES

India's rapid smartphone adoption, low-cost data and multilingual digital ecosystem have expanded access to education and health information. Shared devices and intermittent connectivity remain common, and digital competence varies within families. Children may encounter global platforms alongside regional-language creators, coaching applications, gaming communities and informal health advice. Policies designed for one-device-per-child settings may not translate directly.

Digital media can bridge geographic gaps, but unequal device quality, bandwidth, electricity, disability access and parental digital literacy can widen educational disparities. School requirements that presume uninterrupted home access may disadvantage children already facing social inequity. Public digital initiatives should provide accessible content, offline options, teacher training and safe community access rather than equating connectivity with meaningful inclusion.

Health misinformation can circulate rapidly in local languages while automated moderation and fact-checking are less robust than in English. Generative AI may produce culturally fluent but incorrect advice about vaccination, nutrition, puberty or medication. Pediatric associations and public-health agencies should publish searchable, shareable, multilingual information and respond quickly to emerging narratives. Trusted clinicians can pre-bunk common misinformation by explaining how to verify sources before a crisis occurs.^{18,39}

Regulation and enforcement must address targeted marketing, gaming-like financial features, deepfake abuse and children's data without criminalising ordinary adolescent behaviour. Research should include rural, low-income and regional-language populations. Indian pediatric practice can contribute by documenting locally relevant exposures and testing brief digital-health counselling within busy outpatient settings.

A PRACTICAL CHILD-CENTRED FRAMEWORK

A useful clinical formulation can be organised around five questions. First, purpose: what need does the activity serve learning, connection, entertainment, coping or avoidance? Second, pattern: when, where and with whom does use occur, and can the child stop? Third, content and contacts: what is being recommended and who can communicate with the child? Fourth, displacement: what happens to sleep, movement, meals, schoolwork and relationships? Fifth, consequence: is the child safer, more capable and connected, or increasingly distressed and impaired?

Intervention should target the mechanism identified. Bedtime use calls for environmental changes; cyberbullying calls for safety planning and school action; compulsive gaming may require mental-health assessment; misinformation requires source evaluation; family conflict requires negotiated expectations. A generic instruction to reduce screen time may miss the actual risk and is difficult to sustain.

Follow-up should assess function rather than demand perfection. A two- to four-week plan can specify one or two changes, such as bedroom charging and notification reduction, with sleep, mood and school attendance as outcomes. Children should participate in choosing the plan. When platforms or peers create the problem, the child should not carry sole responsibility for solving it.

EVIDENCE GAPS AND RESEARCH PRIORITIES

Research must move beyond cross-sectional screen-time surveys. Longitudinal and experimental designs should measure platforms, features, content, timing, co-use and displacement, while accounting for baseline mental health and family context. Outcomes should include benefits, not only harms. Standard definitions of problematic use and transparent reporting would improve synthesis.

AI evolves faster than conventional study cycles. Continuous post-deployment monitoring, red-team testing with developmental expertise and rapid incident reporting are necessary. Studies should include children with disabilities, diverse languages and low-resource settings. Youth participation must be meaningful, compensated and safeguarded.

Intervention trials should examine notification reduction, recommender controls, school curricula, family routines and clinician counselling, using sleep, functioning and wellbeing rather than minutes alone. Conflicts of interest and access restrictions must be disclosed.

CONCLUSION

Children have moved from watching screens to inhabiting algorithmically shaped environments. Digital media and AI can expand learning, creativity, connection and healthcare, but engagement-driven design, synthetic content, commercial surveillance and unequal safeguards create emerging health risks. Current evidence supports concern about sleep, displacement, problematic use and harmful content, while cautioning against simple causal claims based on duration alone.

Pediatric practice should assess the whole digital ecosystem: child, content, context and consequences. Families and schools need usable guidance, but durable protection requires industry design changes, enforceable governance and independent evidence. The objective is neither unrestricted adoption nor a screen-free childhood. It is a digital environment in which children's health, rights, development and agency take priority over engagement and profit.

Funding: No funding sources

Conflict of interest: None declared

Ethical approval: Not required

REFERENCES

1. Munzer T, Parga-Belinkie J, Milkovich LM, Tomopoulos S, Ajumobi T, Cross C, et al. Digital ecosystems, children, and adolescents: policy statement. *Pediatrics*. 2026;157:e2025075320.
2. Munzer T, Milkovich LM, Madigan S, Tomopoulos S, Parga-Belinkie J, Ajumobi T, et al. Digital ecosystems, children, and adolescents: technical report. *Pediatrics*. 2026;157(2):e2025075321.
3. World Health Organization. Addressing the digital determinants of youth mental health and well-being. 2025. Available at: <https://www.who.int/europe/publications/i/item/WHO-EURO-2025-12187-51959-79685>. Accessed on 10 August 2026.
4. World Health Organization. Ethics and governance of artificial intelligence for health. 2021. Available at: <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240029200>. Accessed on 10 August 2026.
5. Odgers CL, Jensen MR. Annual Research Review: Adolescent mental health in the digital age: facts, fears, and future directions. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry*. 2020;61(3):336-48.
6. UNESCO. Guidance for generative AI in education and research. 2026. Available at: <https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/guidance-generative-ai-education-and-research>. Accessed on 10 August 2026.
7. Carter B, Rees P, Hale L, Bhattacharjee D, Paradkar MS. Association Between Portable Screen-Based Media Device Access or Use and Sleep Outcomes: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2016;170:1202-8.
8. Janssen X, Martin A, Hughes AR, Hill CM, Kotronoulas G, Hesketh KR. Associations of screen time, sedentary time and physical activity with sleep in under 5s: a systematic review. *Sleep Med Rev*. 2020;49:101226.
9. Stiglic N, Viner RM. Effects of screen time on health and well-being of children and adolescents: umbrella review. *BMJ Open*. 2019;9:e023191.
10. World Health Organization. Monitoring and restricting digital marketing of unhealthy products to children and adolescents. 2023. Available at: <https://www.who.int/europe/activities/monitoring-and-restricting-digital-marketing-of-unhealthy-products-to-children-and-adolescents>. Accessed on 10 August 2026.
11. Morgan IG, Wu PC, Ostrin LA, Tideman JWL, Yam JC, Lan W, et al. IMI Risk Factors for Myopia. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci*. 2021;62:3.
12. Lanca C, Saw SM. The association between digital screen time and myopia: A systematic review. *Ophthalmic Physiol Opt*. 2020;40(2):216-29.
13. Keles B, McCrae N, Grealish A. Social media and adolescent depression, anxiety and psychological distress: systematic review. *Int J Adolesc Youth*. 2020;25:79-93.
14. Valkenburg PM, Meier A, Beyens I. Social media use and its impact on adolescent mental health: umbrella review. *Curr Opin Psychol*. 2022;44:58-68.
15. Madigan S, Browne D, Racine N, Mori C, Tough S. Association between screen time and children's performance on developmental screening tests. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2019;173:244-50.
16. Radesky JS, Christakis DA. Increased screen time: implications for early childhood development and behavior. *Pediatr Clin North Am*. 2016;63:827-39.
17. World Health Organization. International Classification of Diseases 11: gaming disorder. 2019. Available at: <https://www.who.int/standards/classifications/frequently-asked-questions/gaming-disorder>. Accessed on 10 August 2026.
18. UNICEF. Policy guidance on AI for children. Version 2.0. 2021. Available at: <https://www.unicef.org/innocenti/media/1341/file/UNICEF-Global-Insight-policy-guidance-AI-children-2.0-2021.pdf>. Accessed on 10 August 2026.
19. WeProtect Global Alliance. Global threat assessment 2023: assessing the scale and scope of child sexual

- exploitation and abuse online. 2023. Available at: <https://www.weprotect.org/global-threat-assessment-23/>. Accessed on 10 August 2026.
20. UNESCO. AI competency frameworks for students and teachers. 2024. Available at: <https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/ai-competency-framework-teachers>. Accessed on 10 August 2026.
21. World Health Organization. Regulatory considerations on artificial intelligence for health. 2023. Available at: <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240078871>. Accessed on 10 August 2026.
22. Rajkomar A, Hardt M, Howell MD, Corrado G, Chin MH. Ensuring fairness in machine learning to advance health equity. *Ann Intern Med*. 2018;169:866-72.
23. United Nations. General comment No. 25 on children's rights in relation to the digital environment. 2021. Available at: <https://www.ohchr.org/en/documents/general-comments-and-recommendations/general-comment-no-25-2021-childrens-rights-relation>. Accessed on 10 August 2026.
24. UNICEF. The State of the World's Children 2017: children in a digital world. 2017. Available at: <https://www.unicef.org/reports/state-worlds-children-2017>. Accessed on 10 August 2026.
25. World Health Organization. Tackling food marketing to children in a digital world. Available at: <https://iris.who.int/bitstreams/614d4e56-64ff-4ea1-9132-7c38b7c18507/download>. 2016. Accessed on 10 August 2026.
26. UNICEF. Child protection in digital education. 2024. Available at: <https://www.unicef.org/documents/child-protection-digital-education>. Accessed on 10 August 2026.
27. American Academy of Pediatrics. Family Media Plan. 2024. Available at: <https://publications.aap.org/pediatrics/article/154/6/e2024067417/199968/The-Family-Media-Plan?autologincheck=redirected>. Accessed on 10 August 2026.
28. OECD. Children and young people's mental health in the digital age. 2018. Available at: https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/children-and-young-people-s-mental-health-in-the-digital-age_488b25e0-en.html. Accessed on 10 August, 2026.
29. 5Rights Foundation. Child online safety toolkit. 2024. Available at: <https://childonlinesafetytoolkit.5rightsfoundation.com/>. Accessed on 10 August 2026.
30. US Surgeon General. Social media and youth mental health: advisory. 2023. Available at: <https://www.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/sg-youth-mental-health-social-media-advisory.pdf>. Accessed on 10 August 2026.
31. American Psychological Association. Health advisory on social media use in adolescence. 2023. Available at: <https://www.apa.org/topics/social-media-internet/health-advisory-adolescent-social-media-use>. Accessed on 10 August 2026.
32. United Nations. The right to privacy in the digital age. 2022. Available at: <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/1640588?ln=en&v=pdf>. Accessed on 10 August 2026.
33. Livingstone S, Stoilova M, Nandagiri R. Children's data and privacy online. The London School of Economics and Political Science. 2019. Available at: <https://www.lse.ac.uk/my-privacy-uk/Assets/Documents/Childrens-data-and-privacy-online-report-for-web.pdf>. Accessed on 10 August 2026.
34. Nesi J. The impact of social media on youth mental health: challenges and opportunities. *N C Med J*. 2020;81:116-21.
35. Orben A. Teenagers, screens and social media: a narrative review of reviews and key studies. *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol*. 2020;55:407-14.
36. Huang C. A meta-analysis of the problematic social media use and mental health. *Int J Soc Psychiatry*. 2022;68:12-33.
37. World Health Organization. Guidelines on physical activity and sedentary behaviour. 2020. Available at: <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240015128>. Accessed on 10 August 2026.
38. UNICEF Innocenti. Child well-being in an unpredictable world: Report Card 19. 2025. Available at: <https://www.unicef.org/innocenti/reports/child-well-being-unpredictable-world>. Accessed on 10 August 2026.
39. PMNCH. When health misinformation meets artificial intelligence. 2026. Available at: [https://pmnch.who.int/news-and-events/news/item/23-01-2026-when-health-misinformation-meets-artificial-intelligence-\(ai\)-why-parliamentary-leadership-matters](https://pmnch.who.int/news-and-events/news/item/23-01-2026-when-health-misinformation-meets-artificial-intelligence-(ai)-why-parliamentary-leadership-matters). Accessed on 10 August 2026.
40. European Commission. Ethics guidelines for trustworthy AI. 2019. Available at: <https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/library/ethics-guidelines-trustworthy-ai>. Accessed on 10 August 2026.

Cite this article as: Venugopal RI. Beyond screen time: artificial intelligence, algorithmic media and the future of child health. *Int J Contemp Pediatr* 2026;13:2379-85.