

PEDIATRICS®

OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF PEDIATRICS

Does Children's Watching of Television Cause Attention Problems? Retesting the Hypothesis in a Danish Cohort

Carsten Obel, Tine Brink Henriksen, Søren Dalsgaard, Karen Markussen Linnet,
Elisabeth Skajaa, Per Hove Thomsen and Jørn Olsen

Pediatrics 2004;114:1372-1373

DOI: 10.1542/peds.2004-0954

The online version of this article, along with updated information and services, is
located on the World Wide Web at:

<http://www.pediatrics.org/cgi/content/full/114/5/1372-a>

PEDIATRICS is the official journal of the American Academy of Pediatrics. A monthly publication, it has been published continuously since 1948. PEDIATRICS is owned, published, and trademarked by the American Academy of Pediatrics, 141 Northwest Point Boulevard, Elk Grove Village, Illinois, 60007. Copyright © 2004 by the American Academy of Pediatrics. All rights reserved. Print ISSN: 0031-4005. Online ISSN: 1098-4275.

American Academy of Pediatrics

DEDICATED TO THE HEALTH OF ALL CHILDREN™



Adult Lactose Tolerance Is Not an Advantageous Evolutionary Trait

To the Editor.—

I read with great interest the recent article from Fomon¹ in which he refers to the well-known hypothesis that views the variable frequencies of lactase persistence in different human populations and, consequently, the possibility for some adults to feed on milk (lactose tolerance) as an advantageous evolutionary trait that has been genetically determined and brought about through centuries of natural selection. This notion stands as a common statement in current medical literature, and most authors have accepted its validity since the 1970s.^{2,3}

Because adult mammals are lactose-intolerant, this hypothesis is, moreover, based on the low percentage of lactose malabsorption and high enterocyte lactase activity (0–30%) among populations originating in northwestern Europe and in some ethnic groups around the Mediterranean and Near East, in Africa, and on the Indian subcontinent. These people share the longest known tradition of dairying, since humans first domesticated livestock and practiced milk-based pastoralism (6000–9000 years ago), making milk abundant for adults. Accordingly, lactose tolerance is supposed to be due to a genetic mutation for lactase persistence, allowing carriers to have milk as a nutritional resource, especially useful in times of food shortage. For the majority of the world's populations, however, the absence of genetic challenge has meant that no evolution has occurred.

Mutation, in combination with natural selection, is most frequently the mechanism utilized to explain these changes in genetic frequency, assuming that the ancestral state was that of nonpersistence (the normal mammalian state) and that the relevant mutation probably originated before the geographical expansion of modern humans. Mathematical models trying to explain this genetic polymorphism require high selection coefficients and a reasonable starting gene frequency.⁴ Such outstanding genetic change during so short an evolutionary span, as claimed, implies an increase in the survival and fertility rates of the lactase-persistence gene carriers to displace the noncarriers in so few (200–300) generations.

Evidence does not support such a hypothesis; the rate of recurrent mutation needed to explain these changes in the genetic frequencies would be very high, 100 to 1000 the usual ($\sim 10^{-5}$ or 10^{-6} per generation for most loci in most organisms). At these usual rates, mutation without selection would bring about only slow changes in the gene frequency in 250 generations. In addition, individual fitness (the contribution of offspring to the next generation) does not exhibit any difference between lactose-tolerant and lactose-intolerant people; no differences in viability or fertility rates in the prereproductive or reproductive periods have been noticed up to now. Moreover, fitness is greater by far in lactose-intolerant populations, and figures show, curiously, that an increase in lactose-tolerance rates is, in general, paralleled by a decrease in demographic values, and vice versa. There are additional unexplained facts concerning the lactase-persistence polymorphism that the evolutionary hypothesis has been unable to explain, but expounding on them would make this letter too protracted.

However, what is more important is that the rationale of evolutionary analysis tells us that restricting milk to the nursing period of mammals is more efficient (greater fitness) than to share it with older individuals. As Fomon points out, the evolutionary forces are focused on the survival of the mother-offspring unit; postreproductive individuals ("the genetic dustbin"⁵) do not directly contribute to evolutionary changes.

In short, evidence does not support the evolutionary hypothesis of lactase persistence in human adults as a consequence of selection. A founder effect could be a more suitable explanation to

justify this trait, and this mechanism does not need the cooperation of natural selection.

JUAN BRINES, MD

Department of Pediatrics, Obstetrics, and Gynecology
Universidad de Valencia
46022 Valencia, Spain

REFERENCES

1. Fomon SJ. Assessment of growth of formula-fed infants: evolutionary considerations. *Pediatrics*. 2004;113:389–393
2. Simoons FJ. Primary adult lactose intolerance and the milking habit: a problem in biological and cultural interrelations. II. A culture historical hypothesis. *Am J Digest Dis*. 1970;15:695–710
3. Kretchmer N. Lactose and lactase. A historical perspective. *Gastroenterology*. 1971;61:805–813
4. Swallow DM. Genetics of lactase persistence and lactose intolerance. *Annu Rev Genet*. 2003;37:197–219
5. Medawar P. An unsolved problem in biology. In: *The Uniqueness of the Individual*. London, United Kingdom: Methuen; 1957:44–70

doi:10.1542/peds.2004-1088

Does Children's Watching of Television Cause Attention Problems? Retesting the Hypothesis in a Danish Cohort

To the Editor.—

In a recent issue of *Pediatrics*, Christakis et al¹ reported an association between the number of hours of watching television close to 2 and 4 years and parents' report on their children's behavior in early school age.

Based on the findings, the authors suggest that we generally limit young children's television use. This is probably a good idea, but we question whether this report creates additional evidence for this advice.

The authors reported a 9% increase in risk of attention problems for each daily hour of television-watching. The measure of adverse behavior was based on a score of maternal report of child behavior including restlessness, concentration problems, impulsiveness, confusion, and obsession. A similar association was found at both ages of reported television-watching, which would be unexpected if the association was caused by an influence on brain development.

A log-linear association is anticipated, but whether such a relationship is actually present in the data is obscure. This particular strategy of analysis may provide more statistical power, but the assumption of a log-linear association is strong and implies that any additional hour of watching television provides the same log-linear increase in risk, whereas a threshold effect or other nonequidistant associations may very likely be present.

We retested the hypothesis in a part of the Aarhus Birth Cohort, which consists of all children born from 1990 at the Aarhus University Hospital, Denmark. As part of a follow-up program for children born in 1991–1992 and examined at 8 months of age,² participating mothers were asked about their child's television-watching on the day previous to completion of the questionnaire when children were 3½ years old. The relevant child behavior at that age was evaluated by a questionnaire developed for preschoolers by Behar³ based on the Rutter scale.

The behavior of the children was evaluated further at the age of 10 to 11 years by the mother using an "ADHD [attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder] problem score" based on a selection of 12 questions from the Child Behavior Checklist⁴ identified by their relation to the ADHD diagnosis in a previous Danish study.⁵ The following year, teachers and parents filled in the Strength and Difficulties Questionnaire,⁶ and their reports were summarized to identify probable and likely ADHD cases.⁷

We found no significant association between hours of watching television and behavioral problems in any of the age groups, although the results do not rule out such an effect, especially not for those who spend the longest time in front of the television (Table 1).

US children apparently watch much more television than Danish children, and if there is a threshold level for effect, we may not

TABLE 1. ADHD Relevant Behavior According to Hours of Television-Watching

Hours of Watching Television, Age 3½ y	N	Age 3½ y, Behar score*				Age 10–11 y, ADHD Problem Score†				Age 11–12 y, SDQ Algorithm‡			
		N	%	OR	95% CI	N	%	OR	95% CI	N	%	OR	95% CI
<½	168	9	5	1		16	10	1		9	5	1	
½–1	555	34	6	1.1	0.5–2.4	38	7	0.7	0.4–1.2	32	6	1.0	0.5–2.2
1–1½	346	23	7	1.2	0.6–2.7	25	7	0.7	0.3–1.3	22	6	1.1	0.5–2.4
1½–2	204	23	11	2.2	1.0–4.9	14	7	0.6	0.3–1.4	15	7	1.3	0.6–3.1
>2	76	8	11	2.0	0.8–5.5	9	12	1.2	0.5–3.0	8	11	2.0	0.7–5.5

Logistic regression was adjusted for gender. Shown are singletons born in the Aarhus Birth Cohort 1991–1992 ($N = 1349$). OR indicates odds ratio; 95% CI, 95% confidence interval.

* Sum of >4 on a 4-symptom Lickert-based scale (possible score: 0–8)—hyperactive/distractible scale.³

† An “ADHD problem score” of >5 of 12 selected behavior symptoms (possible score: 0–12) from the Child Behavior Checklist.⁵

‡ Probable and likely ADHD cases based on a combination of parent and teacher reports (Strength and Difficulties Questionnaire [SDQ] score/impact).⁷

be able to detect an association. Our data indicate that a threshold for no effect may exist.

It is a clinical experience that watching television can engage children with ADHD for some time, probably because of the constant visual and auditory stimuli they receive from these media. The parents of these children may therefore be more likely to allow them to watch television for longer periods of time. The children in our study, who were watching >1½ hour of television at the age of 3½ years, were more likely to have ADHD-like behavior already at this age. The direction of causality may very well be the opposite of what is concluded by Christakis et al.

We cannot exclude the possibility that watching television in childhood may cause behavioral problems, but we need better studies to further elucidate this association.

CARSTEN OBEL, MD, PhD
Perinatal Epidemiological Research Unit
Department of Obstetrics and Pediatrics
Aarhus University Hospital
8200 Aarhus N, Denmark

Danish Epidemiological Science Centre
Department of Epidemiology and Social Medicine
Aarhus University
8000 Aarhus C, Denmark

TINE BRINK HENRIKSEN, MD, PhD
Perinatal Epidemiological Research Unit
Department of Obstetrics and Pediatrics
Aarhus University Hospital
8200 Aarhus N, Denmark

SØREN DALSGAARD, MD, PhD
Psychiatric Hospital for Children and Adolescents
Aarhus University Hospital
8240 Risskov, Denmark

KAREN MARKUSSEN LINNET, MD
Perinatal Epidemiological Research Unit
Department of Obstetrics and Pediatrics
Aarhus University Hospital
8200 Aarhus N, Denmark

ELISABETH SKAJAA, RN
Perinatal Epidemiological Research Unit
Department of Obstetrics and Pediatrics
Aarhus University Hospital
8200 Aarhus N, Denmark

PER HOVE THOMSEN, MD, DMSC
Psychiatric Hospital for Children and Adolescents
Aarhus University Hospital
8240 Risskov, Denmark

JØRN OLSEN, MD, PhD
Danish Epidemiological Science Centre
Department of Epidemiology and Social Medicine
Aarhus University
8000 Aarhus C, Denmark

REFERENCES

- Christakis DA, Zimmerman FJ, DiGiuseppe DL, McCarty CA. Early television exposure and subsequent attentional problems in children. *Pediatrics*. 2004;113:708–713
- Obel C, Henriksen TB, Hedegaard M, Secher NJ, Ostergaard J. Smoking during pregnancy and babbling abilities of the 8-month-old infant. *Paediatr Perinat Epidemiol*. 1998;12:37–48
- Behar LB. The Preschool Behavior Questionnaire. *J Abnorm Child Psychol*. 1977;5:265–275
- Achenbach TM. *Manual for the Child Behaviour Checklist/4-18 and 1991 Profile*. Burlington, VT: University of Vermont; 1993
- Bilenberg N. The Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) and related material: standardization and validation in Danish population based and clinically based samples. *Acta Psychiatr Scand Suppl*. 1999;398:2–52
- Goodman R. The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire: a research note. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry*. 1997;38:581–586
- Goodman R, Ford T, Simmons H, Gatward R, Meltzer H. Using the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) to screen for child psychiatric disorders in a community sample. *Br J Psychiatry*. 2000;177:534–539

doi:10.1542/peds.2004-0954

In Reply.—

We are pleased that Obel et al have tried to replicate our findings in a Danish data set of convenience and happy to reply to their letter. They are surprised that the association between television-viewing and attentional problems that we found was similar at ages 1 and 3. We are not. Many of the children in our study were included in both the age-3 and the age-1 analysis, and in fact the amount of television viewed at age 3 years is highly correlated with the amount viewed earlier.¹ Thus, it is not surprising that television viewed at 3 years and at 1 year had similar odds ratios within the context of our data set. Their next point is that they found an association between television-viewing and behavioral problems in their data set at age 3½ years but not in subsequent years. In reviewing their data, it must first be noted (as they too acknowledge) that Danish children watch considerably less television than US children do. Fewer than 6% of children in their sample watched >2 hours per day at age 3 years as opposed to >50% of US children at the same age.^{2,3} Their analysis therefore has considerably less power than ours did to detect a significant difference at these levels of viewing. In addition, as underpowered as they are, they do report an odds ratio of 2.0 for “probable and likely” ADHD cases at 11 to 12 years. Although this finding is not significant as the 95% confidence interval extends from 0.7 to 5.5, with more data in this range it might have been. Moreover, it is also possible that the kinds of programming available in the

United States and Denmark are different. Different types of children's programming have been shown to vary with respect to the pacing and to lead to differences in children's attention spans at young ages.⁴⁻⁸

Finally, we concur that better research of the effects of television-viewing in this age group is needed. It has been said that "many parents are enlisting the help of a stranger to raise their children."⁹ That stranger's influence warrants more robust study. We are pleased to be part of that effort.

DIMITRI A. CHRISTAKIS, MD, MPH
Department of Pediatrics and Child Health Institute
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98115

Department of Health Services
Seattle, WA 98115

Children's Hospital and Regional Medical Center
Seattle, WA 98115

FREDERICK J. ZIMMERMAN, PhD
Child Health Institute
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98115

Department of Health Services
Seattle, WA 98115

REFERENCES

1. Huston AC, Wright JC, Rice ML, Kerkman D, St Peters M. Development of television viewing patterns in early childhood: a longitudinal investigation. *Dev Psychol.* 1990;26:409-420
2. Christakis DA, Ebel BE, Rivara FP, Zimmerman FJ. Media usage in a population based sample of children 0-10 years of age. *J Pediatr.* In Press
3. Rideout VJ, Vandewater EA, Wartella EA. *Zero to Six: Electronic Media in the Lives of Infants, Toddlers, and Preschoolers.* Menlo Park, CA: Kaiser Family Foundation; 2003
4. Gadberrry S. Television as baby-sitter: a field comparison of preschoolers' behavior during playtime and during television viewing. *Child Dev.* 1974;45:1132-1136
5. Geist EA, Gibson M. The effect of network and public television programs on four and five year olds ability to attend to educational tasks. *J Instr Psychol.* 2000;27:250-261
6. Hooper ML, Chang P. Comparison of demands of sustained attentional events between public and private children's television programming. *Percept Mot Skills.* 1998;86:431-434
7. Friedrich LK, Stein AH. Aggressive and prosocial television programs and the natural behavior of preschool children. *Monogr Soc Res Child Dev.* 1973;38:1-64
8. Gadberrry S. Effects of restricting first graders' TV-viewing on leisure time use, IQ change, and cognitive style. *J Appl Dev Psychol.* 1980;1:45-57
9. Singer JL. Is television bad for children? *Soc Sci (Kans).* 1986;71:178-182

doi:10.1542/peds.2004-1644

Effectiveness of Neonatal Intensive Care for Extremely Low Birth Weight Infants

To the Editor.—

I commend Doyle et al^{1,2} for the thorough longitudinal follow-up of their extremely low birth weight infants over 2 decades, which demonstrated greater overall and quality-adjusted survival for the most recently born cohorts. However, I think the authors overinterpreted the outcome data in concluding that these data demonstrate effectiveness and efficiency of neonatal intensive care. The study actually provides little information regarding neonatal intensive care management over the 2 decades and no data specifically relating neonatal management to the improved survival. The provision of neonatal intensive care over these decades has undoubtedly contributed to improved survival, but the influence of neonatal care should not be separated from obstetrical management as has been done in the Doyle et al study.

Specific obstetrical interventions including antenatal corticosteroid use,³ more liberal cesarean section delivery,⁴ and increased

prenatal care⁵ have proven or suggested benefit for survival and decreased morbidity for low birth weight infants. It is likely that over the study period, obstetrical providers increasingly used these and other interventions for pregnancies at marginal gestations. Previous studies have suggested that a change in perception by obstetrical providers, without new technical interventions, may significantly benefit neonatal survival.^{6,7}

It is reassuring that in this geographically defined population, greater survival for extremely low birth weight infants was associated with increased quality-adjusted survival, which has certainly not been universally reported.^{8,9} However, before concluding that this outcome has resulted from effective and efficient neonatal care, prenatal (and perhaps postneonatal) influences and associated costs must be considered in the analysis.

HOWARD W. KILBRIDE, MD
Section of Neonatal Medicine
Department of Pediatrics
Children's Mercy Hospitals and Clinics
Kansas City, MO 64108

REFERENCES

1. Doyle LW; Victorian Infant Collaborative Study Group. Evaluation of neonatal intensive care for extremely low birth weight infants in Victoria over two decades: I. Effectiveness. *Pediatrics.* 2004;113:505-509
2. Doyle LW; Victorian Infant Collaborative Study Group. Evaluation of neonatal intensive care for extremely low birth weight infants in Victoria over two decades: II. Efficiency. *Pediatrics.* 2004;113:510-514
3. Committee on Obstetric Practice. ACOG committee opinion: antenatal corticosteroid therapy for fetal maturation. *Obstet Gynecol.* 2002;99:871-873
4. Malloy MH, Rhoads GG, Schramm W, Land G. Increasing cesarean section rates in very low-birth weight infants. Effect on outcome. *JAMA.* 1989;262:1475-1478
5. Herbst MA, Mercer BM, Beazley D, Meyer N, Carr T. Relationship of prenatal care and perinatal morbidity in low-birth-weight infants. *Am J Obstet Gynecol.* 2003;189:930-933
6. Goldenberg RL, Nelson KG, Dyer RL, Wayne J. The variability of viability: the effect of physicians' perceptions on viability on survival of very low-birth weight infants. *Am J Obstet Gynecol.* 1982;143:678-684
7. Martinez AM, Weiss E, Partridge JC, Freeman H, Kilpatrick S. Management of extremely low birth weight infants: perceptions of viability and parental counseling practices. *Obstet Gynecol.* 1998;92:520-524
8. Hack M, Friedman H, Fanaroff AA. Outcomes of extremely low birth weight infants. *Pediatrics.* 1996;98:931-937
9. Hoekstra RE, Ferrara TB, Couser RJ, Payne NR, Connett JE. Survival and long-term neurodevelopmental outcome of extremely premature infants born at 23-26 weeks' gestational age at a tertiary center. *Pediatrics.* 2004; 113(1). Available at: www.pediatrics.org/cgi/content/full/113/1/e1

doi:10.1542/peds.2004-1296

In Reply.—

Dr Kilbride is concerned that we have overinterpreted the data in our reports of the effectiveness¹ and efficiency² of neonatal intensive care and particularly that we have overlooked the contribution of obstetric interventions. What we have done is to quantitate the overall effectiveness of neonatal intensive care, without trying to measure the individual contributors, including obstetric interventions, to the outcomes. We also incorporated postneonatal care by including any hospitalizations beyond 28 days up to 5 years of age (2 years of age for the 1997 era).

We agree with Dr Kilbride in that obstetric care has changed over the 2 decades of our study and that obstetric decision-making for extremely low birth weight (ELBW; birth weight: 500-999 g) infants is important to their outcome. The overall contribution of obstetric care might be best quantitated in the changes in availability of neonatal intensive care for ELBW infants, the final step in the overall evaluation of neonatal intensive care.³ Availability addresses the issue of whether intensive care is reaching those who need it. We have reported elsewhere on the changing availability of neonatal intensive care for ELBW infants in Victoria, Australia.⁴ As measures of availability, we determined the changes in both the proportion of ELBW infants who were offered intensive care as well as the place of birth of these infants. Over time, the proportions offered intensive care rose substantially

Does Children's Watching of Television Cause Attention Problems? Retesting the Hypothesis in a Danish Cohort

Carsten Obel, Tine Brink Henriksen, Søren Dalsgaard, Karen Markussen Linnet, Elisabeth Skajaa, Per Hove Thomsen and Jørn Olsen

Pediatrics 2004;114:1372-1373

DOI: 10.1542/peds.2004-0954

Updated Information & Services

including high-resolution figures, can be found at:
<http://www.pediatrics.org/cgi/content/full/114/5/1372-a>

References

This article cites 6 articles, 2 of which you can access for free at:
<http://www.pediatrics.org/cgi/content/full/114/5/1372-a#BIBL>

Subspecialty Collections

This article, along with others on similar topics, appears in the following collection(s):
Office Practice
http://www.pediatrics.org/cgi/collection/office_practice

Permissions & Licensing

Information about reproducing this article in parts (figures, tables) or in its entirety can be found online at:
<http://www.pediatrics.org/misc/Permissions.shtml>

Reprints

Information about ordering reprints can be found online:
<http://www.pediatrics.org/misc/reprints.shtml>

American Academy of Pediatrics

DEDICATED TO THE HEALTH OF ALL CHILDREN™

