

**OXFORD**  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

International Journal of Epidemiology

**Changes in millennial adolescent mental health and health related behaviours over ten years: a population cohort comparison study**

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Epidemiology</i>
Manuscript ID	IJE-2018-08-1015.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Patalay, Praveetha; University College London, Gage, S; University of Liverpool
Key Words:	depression, smoking, alcohol, sleep, ALSPAC, Millennium Cohort Study

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3 **Changes in millennial adolescent mental health and health related behaviours over**  
4  
5 **ten years: a population cohort comparison study**  
6  
7  
8

9 Praveetha Patalay\*<sup>1,2</sup>, Suzanne H Gage<sup>1</sup>  
10  
11

12  
13 <sup>1</sup>Institute of Psychology, Health and Society, University of Liverpool, Bedford Street South,  
14  
15 Liverpool, UK  
16

17  
18 <sup>2</sup>Centre for Longitudinal Studies and MRC Unit for Lifelong Health and Ageing, UCL, Gower  
19  
20 Street, London, UK  
21  
22

23  
24  
25 Word count: 4116  
26  
27

28 \*Correspondence to:  
29 Praveetha Patalay,  
30 Centre for longitudinal studies,  
31 20 Bedford Way  
32 London  
33 Tel: 02076126051  
34 Email: p.patalay@ucl.ac.uk  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For Review Only

## Abstract

**Background:** There is evidence that mental health problems are increasing and substance use behaviours are decreasing. This paper aimed to investigate recent trends in mental ill-health and health-related behaviours in two cohorts of UK adolescents in 2005 and 2015.

**Method:** Prevalences in mental health (depressive symptoms, self-harm, anti-social behaviours, parent reported difficulties) and health related behaviours (substance use, weight, weight perception, sleep, sexual intercourse) were examined at age 14 in two UK birth cohorts; Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC, N=5627, born 1991-92) and Millennium Cohort Study (MCS, N=11318, born 2000-02). Prevalences and trend estimates are presented unadjusted and using propensity score matching and entropy balancing to account for differences between samples.

**Results:** Depressive symptoms (9% to ~15%) and self-harm (11.8% to ~14.5%) were higher in 2015 compared to 2005. Parent-reported emotional difficulties, conduct problems, hyperactivity and peer problems were higher in 2015 compared to 2005 (5.7 – 9% to 9 – 18%). Conversely, substance use (tried smoking 9% to 3%; tried alcohol 52% to ~43%, cannabis 4.6% to ~4%), sexual activity (2% to ~1%) and anti-social behaviours (6.2 – 40.1% to 1.6 – 28%) were less common or no different. Adolescents in 2015 were spending less time sleeping (<8 hours 5.7% to 11.5%), had higher BMIs (obese, 3.8% to ~7.3%) and a greater proportion perceived themselves as overweight (26.5% to 32.9). The findings should be interpreted bearing in mind limitations in ability to adequately harmonize certain variables and account for differences in attrition rates and generalizability of the two cohorts.

**Conclusion:** Given health-related behaviours are often cited as risk-factors for poor mental health, our findings suggest relationships between these factors might be more complex and dynamic in nature than currently understood. Striking increases in mental health difficulties, BMI and poor sleep related behaviours highlight an increasing public health challenge.

1  
2  
3 **Keywords:** depression, smoking, alcohol, sleep, ALSPAC, Millennium Cohort Study,  
4  
5 adolescence  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10

11 **Key messages**  
12

- 13 - Large increases are observed in some mental health difficulties (depression, self-  
14 harm), obesity and poorer sleeping habits in the ten years between 2005 and 2015,  
15 while antisocial behaviour and substance use seem to be decreasing or are  
16 unchanged.  
17  
18 - Given health-related behaviours are often cited as risk-factors for poor mental health,  
19 our findings suggest relationships between these factors might be changing over time  
20  
21 - The findings have important implications for policy and public health planning related  
22 to mental health and substance use.  
23  
24 - Our findings also present data on changes in sleep behaviours and weight  
25 perceptions, highlighting the need for further research into the role these behaviours  
26 might play in the rising mental health difficulties observed in today's adolescents.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



## Introduction

The focus on adolescent health has been increasing in recent years,<sup>1</sup> with a growing recognition that these years are pivotal in the development and maintenance of health behaviours and outcomes through the lifecourse.<sup>2, 3</sup> Adolescence is a key period for mental health disorder onset with half of lifetime onset by age 14.<sup>4</sup> Research over previous decades suggests that the prevalences of mental health problems are increasing in UK teenagers,<sup>5, 6</sup> which is mirrored in studies across different countries.<sup>7, 8</sup> An international systematic review investigating secular trends in adolescent mental health from the previous century into the start of this century concluded that internalizing symptoms seem to be increasing, finding more consistent evidence for increases in girls compared to boys.<sup>9</sup> Most studies in this review focussed on internalizing symptoms or general psychological distress, making conclusions about externalising behaviours less possible. There are few studies comparing changing trends in the millennial generations, and prevalence studies suggest that mental health problems in mid-adolescence might have increased even further in recent years.<sup>10 11</sup>

In contrast, while prevalence of internalizing mental health problems seems to be increasing, young people in the UK are becoming less likely to be underage substance users. Office for National Statistics reports collected from secondary school pupils in England have found prevalence of alcohol use, smoking, cannabis use and other drug use among 14 year old pupils have consistently fallen since 1982 when the survey was first undertaken.<sup>12</sup> For example, in 1982 16% of 14 year olds described themselves as regular smokers. In 2014 this had fallen to just 4%, and the drop was consistent across genders. This decrease in use has become particularly pronounced since the early 2000s.<sup>12</sup>

Given that various health behaviours including but not limited to substance use are implicated in risk for poor mental health,<sup>13-18</sup> investigating the relationships between these secular trends is important to explore causal relationships, the aetiology of mental ill-health,

1  
2  
3 and potentially to inform interventions to try and reverse the increasing prevalence of mental  
4 health problems. It is therefore surprising that to date there has been little attempt to  
5 combine investigations of secular trends in mental health with changes in health related  
6 behaviours. We also know little about trends in other health related behaviours such as  
7 sleep, risky sexual behaviour, body satisfaction and physical activity that might also be  
8 causal risk factors for mental ill-health and substance use.<sup>13-18</sup>  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

18 In the current study we use two cohorts of UK adolescents born a decade apart (1991/92  
19 and 2000/02) in order to identify changes in mental health, considering both internalizing and  
20 externalizing symptoms, and a number of related health behaviours including substance use,  
21 sleep behaviours, weight, physical and sexual activity. In particular we attempt to make the  
22 variables and datasets as comparable as possible by harmonizing the variables and  
23 performing two different techniques (propensity score matching and entropy balancing) to  
24 increase the comparability of the cohorts. The prevalence of a number of these behaviours  
25 differ between males and females, and some studies report different trends in males and  
26 females.<sup>6</sup> We therefore also empirically examine sex differences in changes over time in  
27 these outcomes.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Method

### Participants

**Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC)** is a cohort born in 1991-92. ALSPAC recruited 14,541 pregnant women resident in Avon, UK with expected dates of delivery 1st April 1991 to 31st December 1992. When the oldest children were approximately 7 years of age, an attempt was made to bolster the initial sample with eligible cases who had failed to join the study originally. The total sample size for analyses using any data collected after the age of seven is therefore 15,247 pregnancies, resulting in 15,458 fetuses. Of this total sample of 15,458 fetuses, 14,775 were live births and 14,701 were alive at 1 year of age.<sup>19, 20</sup> The study website contains details of all the data that is available through a fully searchable data dictionary and variable search tool (<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/alspac/researchers/our-data/>). Ethics approval for the study was obtained from the ALSPAC Ethics and Law Committee and the Local Research Ethics Committees. Data were collected frequently via different modalities, with clinic visits and postal questionnaires having taken place in adolescence every year. This study uses data from ages 13, 14 and 15. In the current study, data were available from 6132 participants at age 14 representing 41.7% of the 14701 participants alive past 1 year. Attrition is predicted by a range of variables in ALSPAC including lower educational level, male gender, non-White ethnicity, and eligibility for free school meals.<sup>19</sup>

**Millennium Cohort Study (MCS)** is a cohort of 19,517 children born in 2000-02 sampled from the whole of the UK.<sup>21</sup> Data so far have been collected in 6 sweeps at ages 9 months, 3, 5, 7, 11 and 14 years. The [study website \(https://cls.ucl.ac.uk/cls-studies/millennium-cohort-study/\)](https://cls.ucl.ac.uk/cls-studies/millennium-cohort-study/) contains details regarding all the data available and information on accessing the datasets. Ethics approval for the age 14 sweep was obtained from the National Research Ethics Service Research Ethics Committee. At the age 14 sweep, 15415 families were issued into the field (those not issued due to emigration, permanent refusal,

1  
2  
3 untraceability), of which 11726 families participated in the age 14 sweep (representing  
4  
5 60.9% of the original sample).<sup>22</sup> Attrition at the age 14 sweep compared to the full sample is  
6  
7 predicted by a range of demographic variables including male gender, Black ethnicity, lower  
8  
9 occupational and educational level and single parent family.<sup>23</sup>  
10

11  
12  
13 For this study, we analysed data from participants who had provided data on at least one of  
14  
15 the outcome variables at the age 14 sweeps of the studies (depressive symptoms, smoking,  
16  
17 alcohol, cannabis and other drugs; ALSPAC N= 6132, MCS N= 11351). Furthermore,  
18  
19 participants without the demographic data required for increasing the comparability of the  
20  
21 datasets (sex, ethnicity, age, maternal education and maternal age) were excluded, resulting  
22  
23 in an analysis sample of 5627 from ALSPAC and 11318 from MCS.  
24  
25

26  
27  
28 There have been changes in socio-demographic characteristics of the country in the ten  
29  
30 years between these cohorts (e.g. higher proportion ethnic minorities, higher education  
31  
32 levels) and in addition the two cohorts represent different regions that might have different  
33  
34 characteristics with ALPSAC being a regional and MCS a national cohort. For instance,  
35  
36 around one-fifth of the MCS sample are ethnic minorities compared to around 4% in  
37  
38 ALSPAC. To minimise the bias in estimates that socio-demographic differences in the  
39  
40 samples might cause, we control for socio-demographic factors in analysis and in addition  
41  
42 employ two additional approaches (propensity score matching and entropy balancing) to  
43  
44 increase the comparability of the cohorts.  
45  
46  
47  
48

## 49 **Measures**

50  
51 The measures used in this study (Table 1) include socio-demographic indicators (used for  
52  
53 increasing cohort comparability), mental ill-health (depressive symptoms, self-harm, parent  
54  
55 reported difficulties), substance use (alcohol, smoking, cannabis and other drugs), antisocial  
56  
57 behaviours (assault, graffiti, vandalism, shoplifting and rowdy behaviour) and other health  
58  
59 related behaviours (including sleep, weight, weight perception and sexual activity). In a few  
60



1  
2  
3 instances (self-harm, sleep behaviours, parent-rated difficulties), the variables of interest  
4  
5 were not available in ALSPAC at age 14, but available in the sweep immediately before (age  
6  
7 13) or afterwards (age 15) and where this is the case is clearly indicated in the table. Table 1  
8  
9 also presents the details of the harmonised variables that were subsequently used in  
10  
11 analysis. Some of the variables were more readily comparable than others, for instance both  
12  
13 studies used the Short Moods and Feelings Questionnaire<sup>24</sup> to assess depressive  
14  
15 symptoms, parent-rated Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire<sup>25</sup> to measure difficulties and  
16  
17 the same set of questions to record sexual activity. Other variables were harmonised  
18  
19 through a process of creating new, comparable variables across the datasets (e.g. alcohol,  
20  
21 smoking). For self-harm, even after harmonisation the resulting variable is not truly  
22  
23 comparable due to different time scales of the question asked, which needs to be borne in  
24  
25 mind when interpreting findings. Lastly, some health related behaviours that we planned to  
26  
27 harmonise and investigate (physical activity) were substantially differently measured and  
28  
29 harmonised measures could not be derived.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

## 39 **Analysis**

### 43 ***Increasing comparability of the datasets***

45 To increase comparability of the samples by accounting for key socio-demographic  
46  
47 differences between these samples, participants from the larger MCS sample were matched  
48  
49 or weighted to make them comparable to the ALSPAC sample on key demographic factors  
50  
51 including sex, age, ethnicity, maternal education and maternal age at birth. This was done  
52  
53 using two approaches: propensity score matching<sup>26</sup> and entropy balancing.<sup>27</sup> Both  
54  
55 approaches aim to reduce the probability that differences between samples on outcomes of  
56  
57 interest are because of sample differences on relevant demographic variables.<sup>27</sup> Table S1  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 shows the differences in these characteristics in the samples before and after these  
4  
5 procedures were applied.  
6  
7  
8

9 *Propensity score matching* is based on a propensity score, which is derived from weighting  
10 schemes based on the criteria that are to be matched to identify individuals from the larger,  
11 control group that are most like each of the individuals in the treatment group (in this case  
12 ALSPAC) across a range of variables as specified. Propensity score matching was  
13  
14 conducted in STATA using `psmatch2`.<sup>28</sup>  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 *Entropy balancing* is a multivariate reweighting method that calibrates unit weights such that  
23 two samples are balanced on a range of pre-specified variables, hence increasing  
24 comparability for the estimation of treatment, or in this case cohort, effects.<sup>27</sup> The application  
25 of this approach creates an entropy balancing weight value for all participants in the MCS  
26 sample, which is then used as a weight when estimating prevalences in the MCS sample.  
27 This approach allows the utilisation of the full available MCS cohort, instead of selecting a  
28 matched sub-sample like the propensity score matching approach. Entropy balancing was  
29 conducted in STATA using `ebalance`.<sup>29</sup>  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

#### 41 **Missing data**

42 In ALSPAC 15.6% of the total cells were missing (ranging from <1% for substance use,  
43 1.8% for mental health, ~24% for antisocial behaviours and ~26% for sleep behaviours). In  
44 the MCS samples, 1% of cells were missing in the MCS propensity matched sample and  
45 1.2% in the full MCS sample. Multiple imputations (20 imputations) were carried out using  
46 chained equations separately in the two cohorts.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

#### 56 **Estimating cohort differences**

57 Four estimates (ALSPAC, MCS nationally representative, MCS propensity matched and  
58 MCS entropy balanced) of the prevalences and descriptive statistics (means and % with  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 95% CIs) for each of the harmonised outcome variables were first estimated. In addition, we  
4  
5 estimated odds ratios (Figure 1) of the cohort effects (MCS compared to ALSPAC) for the  
6  
7 prevalence of high mental health or risky health behaviours using logistic regressions. Lastly,  
8  
9 we also examined sex into cohort interactions with the *ebalancing* weight to examine  
10  
11 whether any outcomes different extent of change in males and females.  
12  
13  
14  
15

16 For ease of interpretation for the reader, throughout the rest of the paper we refer to the  
17  
18 ALSPAC variables year of collection as 2005 and the MCS variables as 2015.  
19  
20  
21

## 22 **Results**

23  
24  
25  
26 There were no differences between the samples in sex distribution and maternal age at birth  
27  
28 (Table S1). Regarding the other characteristics, as expected, MCS had higher proportions of  
29  
30 ethnic minorities and higher levels of maternal higher education. Of the two approaches  
31  
32 used to increase comparability, the propensity matching resulted in the two samples  
33  
34 becoming more similar, for example ethnic minorities were less than 4% in the ALSPAC  
35  
36 cohort compared to more than 20% in the full MCS cohort, while the propensity matched  
37  
38 MCS cohort consisted of around 10% of minority ethnic individuals. In contrast, the entropy  
39  
40 balancing (based on the generated entropy weights) resulted in matched estimates across  
41  
42 demographic characteristics in the two cohorts.  
43  
44  
45  
46

47  
48 Estimates from the propensity score matched sample and the entropy balancing in the MCS  
49  
50 were very similar in most cases and for most outcomes, different from the MCS nationally  
51  
52 representative estimates, indicating the relevance of adjusting the estimates when  
53  
54 estimating cohort differences. The descriptive statistics indicated that there were more young  
55  
56 people with mental health problems, as indicated by greater proportion above depression  
57  
58 threshold and reporting self-harming, in 2015 compared to 2005 (but note the self-harm  
59  
60 behaviour question was limited to past 12 months in 2015 compared to lifetime in 2005).

1  
2  
3 Antisocial behaviour and substance use rates were lower in 2015 compared to 2005. Parent  
4 reported difficulties highlighted higher rates of emotional, conduct and hyperactivity  
5 symptoms and greater levels of problems getting along with peers in 2015 compared to  
6 2005. With regards to the health-related behaviours, the more recent cohort had a higher  
7 BMI on average and larger numbers also perceived themselves to being overweight. The  
8 data on sleep behaviours indicated that on weekdays young people in 2015 were more likely  
9 to sleep later and more likely to wake up earlier. Weekend sleep and wake times were more  
10 similar between the cohorts. A greater proportion of adolescents in 2005 reported having  
11 had sexual intercourse by this age compared to in 2015. Due to the higher comparability and  
12 complete sample size using entropy weights and the similar estimates produced with entropy  
13 and propensity adjustment, entropy balancing is used for subsequent regression analyses  
14 comparing the two cohorts and the sex by cohort interactions.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 Figure 1 illustrates odds of outcomes in the MCS sample (2015) compared to the ALSPAC  
34 sample (2005) using both a direct comparison approach and using estimates applying the  
35 entropy balancing weights. Estimates were similar for most of the mental health and some  
36 health related behaviour outcomes based on the two approaches, but there was some  
37 noticeable upward or downward bias for some outcomes, for instance with entropy balancing  
38 the lower odds in 2015 compared to 2005 are more stark for antisocial and risky health  
39 behaviours; highlighting the potential relevance of using methods to increase the  
40 comparability of cohorts when estimating cohort differences.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

54 Descriptives stratified by sex are presented in Table 4. Depressive symptoms, self-harm,  
55 overweight perception were higher in females and antisocial behaviours, peer problems  
56 higher in males., Regression analysis with the entropy balancing weight were estimated to  
57 examine sex-by-cohort interactions. Most health-related behaviours showed little or no sex  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 differences in prevalence. There were no sex-by-cohort interactions for most of the  
4  
5 variables included in this study, indicating that rates of change or increased/decreased odds  
6  
7 were similar in males and females. There was evidence of sex differences in cohort effects  
8  
9 for some antisocial behaviours (e.g. assault  $OR_{\text{male}} = 0.66$ ,  $OR_{\text{female}} = 0.45$ ), parent-reported  
10  
11 conduct problems ( $OR_{\text{male}} = 2.74$ ,  $OR_{\text{female}} = 1.38$ ) and having tried alcohol ( $OR_{\text{male}} = 0.85$ ,  
12  
13  $OR_{\text{female}} = 0.59$ ), where odds of these behaviours in 2015 compared to 2005 were lower in  
14  
15 females compared to males (irrespective of whether overall odds were lower or higher in  
16  
17 2015). Odds ratios separately by sex were estimated and presented in Figure 2.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For Review Only

## Discussion

The current study examined changes in a range of mental health and health related behaviour outcomes in mid-adolescence over ten years (2005 to 2015) using two key UK birth cohort studies. Importantly, the study investigated this range of outcomes within the same analytic framework, and employed methodological techniques to provide comparable estimates across the different health outcomes.

Prevalence of depressive symptoms, self-harm and parent reported mental health difficulties were all higher in 2015 compared to 2005, whereas anti-social behaviours were lower in 2015. Changes in these mental health outcomes were substantial, with a 6% increase (9% in 2005, 14.9% in 2015) in those above the threshold for depression and 20% decrease in those reporting physically assaulting anyone at age 14 (40.1% in 2005, ~28% in 2015). Most antisocial behaviours reported were substantially lower in 2015 compared to 2005 and there was a sex interaction whereby the cohort difference was larger in females. Trends in externalising behaviours have been understudied in cohort comparisons and this data provides clear evidence for changes in antisocial behaviours in the decade between these cohorts.

The increase in internalising mental health problems was consistent by sex, suggesting that increases in psychological distress and self-harming behaviour are not increasing at higher rates in females. This finding is in contrast to some other studies of adolescent trends that indicated that increases in internalising problems were more consistent and greater in females.<sup>6, 9, 11</sup> For instance, previous research has reported odds in 2006 compared to 1986 at age 16 of 0.9 in males and 1.5 in females,<sup>6</sup> compared to the increased odds in this study of ~1.8 in both males and females in 2015 compared to 2005. It is striking that the rate of increase of high depressive symptoms is more than 60% in just one decade. Poor mental

1  
2  
3 health at this age predicts a host of lifelong negative consequences such as poorer health,  
4 social and economic outcomes,<sup>3, 30</sup> and therefore this sharp increase should cause concern.  
5  
6  
7

8  
9 Results for health related behaviours were mixed with less young people having tried  
10 alcohol, binge drinking, smoking and having sex by mid adolescence in 2015 but being more  
11 likely to have later bedtimes and wake up earlier, sleep less than the recommended 8 hours  
12 likely to have later bedtimes and wake up earlier, sleep less than the recommended 8 hours  
13 for adolescents<sup>31</sup> and to perceive themselves as overweight and to have higher BMIs. It is  
14 relevant to note that although fewer young people had tried smoking cigarettes in 2015,  
15 there was no cohort difference in the proportion smoking weekly at this age, although in  
16 absolute terms the number of individuals smoking weekly at age 14 was small  
17 (approximately 2% in both cohorts). In terms of sex differences in these cohort effects, the  
18 odds for some antisocial behaviours and ever trying alcohol in 2015 compared to 2005 were  
19 even lower in females compared to males, indicating that for some of these behaviours the  
20 decreasing prevalences over time were more marked in females. Some of these findings  
21 (e.g. underage substance use, sexual activity) are in line with research that demonstrates a  
22 decrease in 'adult activities' among adolescents in recent decades,<sup>32</sup> however, this  
23 explanation does not help understand shorter sleeptimes, lower anti-social behaviours and  
24 poorer weight related outcomes observed in this study.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 The health-related behaviours identified in this study are all known risk factors for mental ill-  
44 health.<sup>13-15, 18</sup> In some instances the increasing trends in risky health behaviours such as  
45 decreasing sleep times, increasing weight, and perceived overweight status might help  
46 explain the increasing mental health difficulties experienced by adolescents. Where the  
47 trends are moving in opposite directions (substance use, antisocial behaviours), the  
48 interpretation becomes more complicated. It may suggest that the associations between  
49 these behaviours and mental health are not consistent over generations and might be  
50 changing over time. This is important with regards to trying to identify causal risk factors for  
51 poor adolescent health outcomes. Unexpected patterns such as those seen in our study,  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 could indicate that associations between, for example, cannabis use and depression could  
4 be due to residual confounding rather than true causality. However, other factors not  
5 included in the study are also likely to have changed over the ten years of investigation,  
6 which may also impact on these associations. Understanding the dynamic relationships  
7 between health behaviours and mental health should be a priority as adolescent mental  
8 health problems increase, in order to identify suitable targets for interventions to prevent this  
9 upward trend from continuing.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20 In addition to effectively using two large contemporary birth cohort studies, the study makes  
21 several methodological advancements in improving our understanding of changing trends in  
22 UK adolescents. Variables in the two cohorts, where dissimilar, were carefully harmonised to  
23 ensure comparisons could be made. Unfortunately, this harmonisation could not be achieved  
24 for certain variables of interest (physical activity), which we were therefore unable to include.  
25 Similarly, for other variables the harmonisation is imperfect either owing to different time  
26 periods of reference in the questions (e.g. self-harm) or availability only at a slightly different  
27 age in the ALSPAC cohort (e.g. sleep times) and this must be borne in mind when  
28 interpreting findings. In both these cases, however, the direction of bias is likely to be an  
29 underestimation of the increased poorer outcomes in 2015, for instance, with self-harm we  
30 estimate lifetime prevalence in ALSPAC and previous year prevalence in MCS. Although  
31 ALSPAC and MCS are large and detailed birth cohorts, one is a regional cohort (ALSPAC)  
32 and one is a national cohort (MCS), which could bias our findings. However, regional  
33 variation in these outcomes was estimated and was found to be minimal (<1% for mental  
34 health, sex, weight variables, <3% for substance use and sleep). Albeit employing multiple  
35 techniques to increase the comparability of the cohorts, it is possible that some of the  
36 differences observed are due to changes in demographic composition over the decade,  
37 differences in the study samples, or the different rates and predictors of attrition between the  
38 two studies. The nationally representative estimates for the MCS at age 14 indicate that  
39 across all the investigated variables the comparable estimates were slightly different from  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 the nationally representative ones, highlighting the value of applying techniques to increase  
4 the comparability of these cohorts, but at the same time limiting the generalisability of our  
5 secular trend estimates to the UK as a whole. It is also important to note that missing data  
6 was higher in ALSPAC than MCS, and although we conducted multiple imputation with  
7 socio-demographic and all examined variables informing the imputation to reduce bias in  
8 estimates, some estimates might remain biased due to unmeasured factors associated with  
9 missingness and their potential association with our outcomes of interest. Finally, two of the  
10 measures used in this study are psychometric surveys (SDQ and SMFQ) and our findings  
11 assume measurement invariance for these. However we have not tested this, and there is a  
12 possibility that the surveys are not measuring the same constructs across the two cohorts.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 There are a number of implications highlighted by our findings. Most importantly, the rapidly  
27 increasing prevalence of depressive symptoms, self-harm, parent-reported mental health  
28 problems, obesity and lesser sleep in adolescents over the past decade is an important  
29 finding, and the reasons why this has occurred need thorough investigation. Identifying  
30 further factors that have changed over the decade that might have resulted in UK young  
31 people having less support and being at higher risk should be undertaken as a public health  
32 priority. A further implication arising from our findings is that while certain mental health  
33 problems are increasing, other problems and health related behaviours, thought to predict  
34 poor mental health, are decreasing. Understanding the nature of these associations and  
35 their dynamic nature over time could be extremely valuable in identifying causal risk factors  
36 for mental health and potential targets for interventions. Identifying explanations for these  
37 high prevalences and changing time trends are key for preventing further increases in poor  
38 mental health and health outcomes for future generations of young people.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

56 To conclude, in a large well-powered study across two key UK birth cohorts born a decade  
57 apart, depressive symptoms and self-harm behaviours have increased between 2005 and  
58 2015. Adolescents are spending less time sleeping and have higher BMIs. In contrast, other  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 health related behaviours such as substance use and antisocial behaviours have decreased  
4  
5 over the same time period, suggesting that links between mental health problems and health  
6  
7 related behaviours might be more complex and dynamic in nature than currently predicted.  
8  
9 The data provide important evidence to understand health behaviours in millennials and how  
10  
11 these are changing, permitting the planning of policy and public health provision.  
12  
13  
14

## 15 **Acknowledgments**

16  
17 We are extremely grateful to all the families who took part in this study, the midwives for their  
18  
19 help in recruiting them, and the whole ALSPAC team, which includes interviewers, computer  
20  
21 and laboratory technicians, clerical workers, research scientists, volunteers, managers,  
22  
23 receptionists and nurses.  
24  
25  
26

27  
28 The authors are grateful for the cooperation of the Millennium Cohort Study families who  
29  
30 voluntarily participate in the study. They would also like to thank a large number of  
31  
32 stakeholders from academic, policy-maker and funder communities and colleagues at the  
33  
34 Centre for Longitudinal Studies involved in data collection and management.  
35

36  
37 We would also like to thank Dr David Bann (UCL) and Dr Andrew Jones (University of  
38  
39 Liverpool) for their helpful comments on an initial draft of this manuscript.  
40  
41  
42

## 43 **Funding**

44  
45 This work did not receive specific funding. The UK Medical Research Council and Wellcome  
46  
47 (Grant ref: 102215/2/13/2) and the University of Bristol provide core support for ALSPAC. A  
48  
49 comprehensive list of grants funding is available on the ALSPAC website  
50  
51 (<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/alspac/external/documents/grant-acknowledgements.pdf>). The  
52  
53 Millennium Cohort Study is supported by the Economic and Social Research Council and a  
54  
55 consortium of UK government departments. The funders had no role in study design, data  
56  
57 collection, data analysis, data interpretation, or writing of this report.  
58  
59  
60

### Authors contributions

PP and SG, planned the study, analysed the data and prepared the manuscript for publication. Both PP and SG have full access to the data presented in this report and act as guarantors for the paper.

**Declaration of Interests:** All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at [www.icmje.org/coi\\_disclosure.pdf](http://www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf) and declare: no support from any organisation for the submitted work; no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous three years; no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

## References

1. Patton GC, Sawyer SM, Santelli JS, Ross DA, Afifi R, Allen NB, et al. Our future: a Lancet commission on adolescent health and wellbeing. *Lancet*. 2016;387:2423-78.
2. Kessler RC, Avenevoli S, Costello EJ, Georgiades K, Green JG, Gruber MJ, et al. Prevalence, persistence, and sociodemographic correlates of DSM-IV disorders in the National Comorbidity Survey Replication Adolescent Supplement. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2012;69:372-80.
3. Colman I, Murray J, Abbott RA, Maughan B, Kuh D, Croudace TJ, et al. Outcomes of conduct problems in adolescence: 40 year follow-up of national cohort. *Bmj*. 2009;338:a2981.
4. Kessler RC, Berglund P, Demler O, Jin R, Merikangas KR, Walters EE. Lifetime prevalence and age-of-onset distributions of DSM-IV disorders in the National Comorbidity Survey Replication. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2005;62:593-602.
5. Fink E, Patalay P, Sharpe H, Holley S, Deighton J, Wolpert M. Mental health difficulties in early adolescence: A comparison of two cross-sectional studies in England from 2009 to 2014. *J Adolesc Health*. 2015;56:502-7.
6. Collishaw S, Maughan B, Natarajan L, Pickles A. Trends in adolescent emotional problems in England: a comparison of two national cohorts twenty years apart. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry*. 2010;51:885-94.
7. Twenge JM, Gentile B, DeWall CN, Ma D, Laceyfield K, Schurtz DR. Birth cohort increases in psychopathology among young Americans, 1938–2007: A cross-temporal meta-analysis of the MMPI. *Clinical psychology review*. 2010;30:145-54.
8. Hagquist C. Discrepant trends in mental health complaints among younger and older adolescents in Sweden: an analysis of WHO data 1985–2005. *J Adolesc Health*. 2010;46:258-64.
9. Bor W, Dean AJ, Najman J, Hayatbakhsh R. Are child and adolescent mental health problems increasing in the 21st century? A systematic review. *Aust N Z J Psychiatry*. 2014;48:606-16.
10. Patalay P, Fitzsimons E. *Mental ill-health among children of the new century: trends across childhood with a focus on age 14*. London: Centre for Longitudinal Studies, 2017.
11. Mojtabai R, Olfson M, Han B. National Trends in the Prevalence and Treatment of Depression in Adolescents and Young Adults. *Pediatrics*. 2016;138.
12. Agalioti-Sgompou V, Christie S, Fiorini P, Hawkins V, Hinchliffe S, Lepps H, et al. *Smoking, Drinking and Drug Use Among Young People in England - 2014*. Health and Social Care Information Centre, 2015.
13. Winsler A, Deutsch A, Vorona RD, Payne PA, Szklo-Coxe M. Sleepless in Fairfax: the difference one more hour of sleep can make for teen hopelessness, suicidal ideation, and substance use. *J Youth Adolesc*. 2015;44:362-78.
14. Sharpe H, Patalay P, Choo T-H, Wall M, Mason SM, Goldschmidt AB, et al. Bidirectional associations between body dissatisfaction and depressive symptoms from adolescence through early adulthood. *Dev Psychopathol*. 2017:1-12.
15. Kelly Y, Patalay P, Montgomery S, Sacker A. BMI Development and Early Adolescent Psychosocial Well-Being: UK Millennium Cohort Study. *Pediatrics*. 2016:e20160967.
16. Jerstad SJ, Boutelle KN, Ness KK, Stice E. Prospective reciprocal relations between physical activity and depression in female adolescents. *J Consult Clin Psychol*. 2010;78:268.
17. Degenhardt L, Hall W, Lynskey M. Exploring the association between cannabis use and depression. 2003;98:1493-504.
18. Farrell M, Howes S, Bebbington P, Brugha T, Jenkins R, Lewis G, et al. Nicotine, alcohol and drug dependence, and psychiatric comorbidity--results of a national household survey. *Int Rev Psychiatry*. 2003;15:50-6.

19. Boyd A, Golding J, Macleod J, Lawlor DA, Fraser A, Henderson J, et al. Cohort profile: the 'children of the 90s'—the index offspring of the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2013;42:111-27.
20. Fraser A, Macdonald-Wallis C, Tilling K, Boyd A, Golding J, Davey Smith G, et al. Cohort Profile: the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children: ALSPAC mothers cohort. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2013;42:97-110.
21. Connelly R, Platt L. Cohort profile: UK millennium Cohort study (MCS). *Int J Epidemiol.* 2014;43:1719-25.
22. Fitzsimons E. Millennium Cohort Study Sixth Survey 2015-2016: User Guide (First Edition). London: Centre for Longitudinal Studies, 2017.
23. Mostafa T, Ploubidis GB. Millennium Cohort Study, Sixth Survey 2015-2016: Technical report on response (Age 14). London: Centre for Longitudinal Studies, 2017.
24. Angold A, Costello EJ, Messer SC, Pickles A, Winder F, Silver D. The development of a short questionnaire for use in epidemiological studies of depression in children and adolescents. *Int J Methods Psychiatr Res.* 1995;5:237-49.
25. Goodman R. The strengths and difficulties questionnaire: a research note. 1997;38:581-86.
26. Dehejia RH, Wahba S. Propensity Score-Matching Methods For Nonexperimental Causal Studies. *Rev Econ Stat.* 2002;84:151-61.
27. Hainmueller J. Entropy balancing for causal effects: A multivariate reweighting method to produce balanced samples in observational studies. *Political Anal.* 2012;20:25-46.
28. Leuven E, Sianesi B. PSMATCH2: Stata module to perform full Mahalanobis and propensity score matching, common support graphing, and covariate imbalance testing. In: Components SS, editor. S432001. revised 19 Jul 2012 ed: Boston College Department of Economics; 2003.
29. Hainmueller J, Xu Y. Ebalance: A Stata package for entropy balancing. 2013.
30. Goodman A, Joyce R, Smith JP. The long shadow cast by childhood physical and mental problems on adult life. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America.* 2011;108:6032-7.
31. Paruthi S, Brooks LJ, D'Ambrosio C, Hall WA, Kotagal S, Lloyd RM, et al. Recommended amount of sleep for pediatric populations: a consensus statement of the American Academy of Sleep Medicine. *J Clin Sleep Med.* 2016;12:785-6.
32. Twenge JM, Park H. The Decline in Adult Activities Among U.S. Adolescents, 1976–2016. *Child Dev.* 2017;0.

1  
2  
3 **Figure 1. ORs (95% CI) for poorer outcomes in 2015 (MCS) vs. 2005 (ALSPAC). Unadjusted**  
4 **estimates and estimates using entropy balancing weights are both presented.**  
5

6 **Figure 2. ORs (95% CI) for poorer outcomes in 2015 (MCS) vs. 2005 (ALSPAC) for males and**  
7 **females**  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For Review Only

**Table 1. Measures in ALSPAC and MCS for each domain and the harmonised variable**

Outcome	ALSPAC (2005)	MCS (2015)	Harmonised variable
Depressive symptoms	<sup>a</sup> 13-item Short Moods and Feelings Questionnaire	<sup>b</sup> 13-item Short Moods and Feelings Questionnaire	Total depressive symptoms score (continuous) yes/no variable based on clinical threshold $\geq 12$
Self-harm	<sup>a</sup> (Measured at age 15) Over your whole lifetime have you ever tried to harm yourself or kill yourself?	<sup>b</sup> In the past year have you hurt yourself on purpose in any way?	0 Not self harmed 1 Have self harmed
Antisocial behaviours	<sup>b</sup> How often in the last year have you done any of the following? (categorical) - Not at all - Just once - 3-5 times - 6+ times  Hit kicked or punched someone on purpose  Been rowdy or rude in a public place so that people complained or you got in to trouble  Written things or sprayed paint on a property that did not belong to you  Deliberately damaged or destroyed property that did not belong to you  Taken something from a shop without paying for it  Other items included skipping school, breaking and stealing from various different places, carrying a knife or weapon for protection, setting fire, stealing a vehicle, not paying correct fare on public transport, using force to steal.	<sup>b</sup> In the last 12 months have you: (yes/no)  Pushed or shoved /hit/slapped/punched someone?  Been noisy or rude in a public place so that people complained or got you into trouble?  Written things or spray painted on a building, fence or train or anywhere else where you shouldn't have?  On purpose damaged anything in a public place that didn't belong to you, for example by burning, smashing or breaking things like cars, bus shelters and rubbish bins?  Taken something from a shop without paying for it?  Other items included using a weapon on someone, stealing from someone, hacking into computers, sending computer viruses.	0 No 1 Yes  Assault  Rowdy behaviour  Graffiti  Vandalism  Shoplifting
Parent rated difficulties	<sup>c</sup> (Measured at age 13) Strengths and difficulties Questionnaire	<sup>c</sup> Strengths and difficulties Questionnaire	5 continuous subscale scores 5 yes/no variables based on the 'abnormal' cutoff  Subscales: emotional symptom, conduct problems, hyperactivity, peer problems, prosocial behaviour
Alcohol use	<sup>a</sup> Have you ever tried alcohol with/without your parents' permission? (yes/no)  What is the most alcoholic drinks you've had in a single evening? (continuous variable)  How many times have you done this in the last year? (continuous variable)	<sup>b</sup> Have you ever had an alcoholic drink? That is more than a few sips. (yes/no)  How many times have you had an alcoholic drink in the last 12 months? (7 response options from never to over 40)  Have you ever had five or more alcoholic drinks at a time? A	0 Never drank a whole drink 1 Nothing in last 12 months/never drank 5 or more 2 1-2 times drank 5 or more alcoholic drinks in one evening 3 3 or more times drank 5 or more alcoholic drinks in one evening

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

		drink is half a pint of lager, beer or cider, one alcopop, a small glass of wine, or a measure of spirits. (yes/no)	
		How many times have you had five or more alcoholic drinks at a time in the last 12 months?	
		- Never - 1-2 times - 3-5 times - 6-9 times - 10 or more time	
Smoking frequency	<sup>a</sup> Frequency teenager has smoked cigarettes in the past 6 months: - 1-3 times; - >4 times; - once per week; - never.  Number of cigarettes smoked per week in the last 6 months for weekly users (continuous variable)	<sup>b</sup> Please read the following statements carefully and decide which one best describes you. Do not include electronic cigarettes (e-cigarettes). - I have never smoked cigarettes; - I have only ever tried smoking cigarettes once; - I used to smoke sometimes but I never smoke a cigarette now; - I sometimes smoke cigarettes now but I don't smoke as many as one a week; - I usually smoke between one and six cigarettes a week; - I usually smoke more than six cigarettes a week.	0 Non smoker 1 Occasional smoker, not weekly 2 Smokes 1-6 cigarettes a week 3 Smokes more than 6 cigarettes a week
Cannabis	<sup>a</sup> Have you ever used cannabis? (yes/no)	<sup>b</sup> Have you ever tried any of the following things? Cannabis (also known as weed, marijuana, dope, hash or skunk)? (yes/no)	0 Never used cannabis 1 Have tried cannabis
Other drugs	<sup>a</sup> Teenager has been offered drugs? (yes/no)  <if yes to above> Teenager has used drugs other than cannabis to feel good/get high? (yes/no)	<sup>b</sup> Have you ever tried any of the following things? Any other illegal drug (such as ecstasy, cocaine, speed)? (yes/no)	0 Never used other drugs 1 Have tried other drugs
BMI	<sup>a</sup> Height and weight measured by interviewer	<sup>a</sup> Height and weight measured by interviewer	BMI derived from height and weight Obese (0=no, 1=yes) derived using IOTF threshold
Weight perception	<sup>b</sup> How do you describe your weight? - Very underweight - Slightly underweight - About the right weight - Slightly overweight - Very overweight	<sup>b</sup> Which of these do you think you are? - Underweight - About the right weight - Slightly overweight - Very overweight	Perceive themselves: 1 Underweight 2 About the right weight 3 Slightly overweight 4 Very overweight
Sleep	<sup>b</sup> (Measured at age 15) What time do you usually get in to be on school days? (continuous - reported in hours and minutes am/pm)  What time do you usually get into bed on weekend days? (continuous - reported in hours and minutes am/pm)	<sup>b</sup> About what time do you usually go to sleep on a school night? About what time do you usually go to sleep on the nights when you do not have school the next day? - Before 9pm - 9 - 9.59pm - 10 - 10.59pm	4 categorical sleep variables:  Schoolday bedtime Non schoolday bedtime  1 Before 9pm 2 9 - 9.59pm 3 10 - 10.59pm 4 11pm - midnight 5 After midnight



		- 11pm - midnight - After midnight	(11 pm and later classified as late bedtime)
	What time do you usually wake up on school days? (continuous - reported in hours and minutes am/pm)	About what time do you usually wake up on a school day? - Before 6am	Schoolday waketime 1 Before 6am
	What time do you usually wake up on weekend days? (continuous - reported in hours and minutes am/pm)	- 6 - 6.59am - 7 - 7.59am - 8 - 8.59am - 9am or later	2 6 - 6.59am 3 7 - 7.59am 4 8 - 8.59am 5 9am or later (before 7 am classified as early waketime)
		About what time do you wake up in the morning on the days when you do not have school? - Before 8am - 8 - 8.59am - 9 - 9.59am - 10 - 10.59am - 11 - 11.59am - Midday or later	Non schoolday waketime 1 Before 8am 2 8 - 8.59am 3 9 - 9.59am 4 10 - 10.59am 5 11 - 11.59am 6 Midday or later (before 9 am classified as early waketime)
			Sleep duration weekdays: We estimate a sleep duration variable based on these categories (category mid-points are used and for earliest and latest times we use half hour pre/post stated time). Sleep less than 8 hours on weekdays is classified as insufficient sleep based on guidelines for adolescent sleep durations.
	Sexual intercourse	<sup>b</sup> Series of questions regarding intimate contact with someone else leading to: Have you had sexual intercourse with another person in the past year?	0 have not had sex 1 had sex
	Physical activity	<sup>b</sup> Series of questions regarding intimate contact with someone else leading to: In the last 12 months have you had sexual intercourse with another young person? <sup>b</sup> On how many days in the last week did you do a total of at least an hour of moderate to vigorous physical activity? By moderate to vigorous we mean any physical activity that makes you get warmer, breathe harder and makes your heart beat faster, e.g. riding a bike, running, playing football, swimming, dancing, etc. - Every day - 5-6 days - 3-4 days - 1-2 days - Not at all	Not harmonised

<sup>a</sup> Measured via interview; <sup>b</sup> Measured via self completion; <sup>c</sup>Parent reported

**Table 2.** Descriptive statistics for mental health outcomes in 2005 (ALSPAC) and 2015 (MCS)

Domain	Variable	2005		2015	
		ALSPAC N=5627	MCS [nationally representative estimates), N=11318	MCS [propensity score matched) N=5627	MCS [entropy balanced) N= 11318
		Mean or % [95% CI]	Mean or % [95% CI]	Mean or % [95% CI]	Mean or % [95% CI]
Depressive symptoms	SMFQ score	4.93[4.81,5.05]	5.72 [5.57,5.86]	5.44 [5.28,5.59]	5.41 [5.10,5.73]
	% above clinical cutoff	9.0 [8.3,9.8]	16.4 [15.5,17.3]	14.7 [13.8,15.6]	14.8 [12.7,16.8]
Self-harm	% Yes	11.9 [10.9,13.0]	15.4 [14.5,16.3]	14.8 [13.8,15.7]	14.4 [12.8,16.0]
Antisocial behaviours	% Assault	40.1 [38.5, 41.6]	31.6 [30.4, 32.7]	28.9 [27.8,30.2]	27.7 [25.5,29.8]
	% Rowdy behaviour	11.5 [10.6,12.4]	14.1 [13.2,14.9]	12.5 [11.6,13.3]	12.1 [10.4,13.9]
	% Graffiti	9.9 [8.9,10.9]	2.8 [2.5,3.2]	2.4 [2.0,2.8]	1.6 [1.3,2.0]
	% Vandalism	6.2 [5.6,7.0]	3.6 [3.1,4.1]	2.9 [2.5,3.3]	2.2 [1.7,2.7]
	% Shoplifting	8.0 [7.1,8.8]	3.6 [3.1,4.1]	3.0 [2.5,3.4]	2.5 [1.9,3.2]
Parent reported difficulties [SDQ)	Emotional symptoms	1.42[1.37,1.47]	2.08 [2.02,2.14]	2.02 [1.96,2.07]	2.03 [1.93,2.13]
	% above clinical cutoff	5.7 [5.1,6.3]	13.9 [13.0,14.8]	13.0 [12.2,13.9]	13.4 [11.6,15.2]
	Conduct problems	1.20[1.16,1.24]	1.53 [1.48,1.58]	1.39 [1.35,1.43]	1.44 [1.35,1.53]
	% above clinical cutoff	6.0 [5.3,6.6]	11.9 [11.0,12.7]	10.0 [9.2,10.8]	11.6 [9.8,13.4]
	Hyperactivity symptoms	2.85[2.79,2.91]	3.12 [3.06,3.18]	2.97 [2.91,3.04]	3.07 [2.95,3.19]
	% above clinical cutoff	6.2 [5.6,6.9]	10.0 [9.2,10.8]	8.7 [7.9,9.4]	9.7 [8.3,11.0]
	Peer problems	1.21[1.16,1.25]	1.82 [1.78,1.87]	1.73 [1.68,1.78]	1.85 [1.73,1.97]
% above clinical cutoff	8.9 [8.1,9.7]	16.8 [15.8,17.8]	15.0 [14.1,15.9]	17.7 [15.3,20.1]	
	Prosocial behaviours	8.26[8.21,8.31]	8.25 [8.20,8.30]	8.38 [8.34,8.43]	8.41 [8.32,8.49]
	% above clinical cutoff	1.2 [0.9,1.5]	1.9 [1.6,2.3]	1.4 [1.1,1.7]	1.4 [0.9,1.9]

**Table 3.** Descriptive statistics for health-related behaviours in 2005 (ALSPAC) and 2015 (MCS)

Domain	Variable	2005		2015	
		ALSPAC N=5627	MCS [nationally representative estimates) N=11318	MCS [propensity score matched) N=5627	MCS [entropy balanced) N= 11318
		Mean or % [95% CI]	Mean or % [95% CI]	Mean or % [95% CI]	Mean or % [95% CI]
Alcohol use	% never drank	47.9 [46.6,49.2]	51.8 [50.6,53]	57.8 [56.5,59.1]	56.5 [53.9,59.0]
	% nothing past 12 mo, never heavy drinking	42.1 [40.8,43.4]	38.3 [37.1,39.5]	34.7 [33.4,35.9]	37.2 [34.7,39.8]
	% heavy drinking 1-2 times in past 12 mo	6.7 [6,7.3]	6.2 [5.6,6.7]	4.8 [4.3,5.4]	3.9 [3.2,4.6]
	% heavy drinking >3 times in past 12 mo	3.4 [2.9,3.8]	3.7 [3.2,4.2]	2.6 [2.2,3.1]	2.4 [1.7,3.1]
Smoking	% non-smoker	90.8 [90,91.5]	95.3 [94.7,95.9]	97.0 [96.6,97.5]	97.1 [96.4,97.8]
	% occasional, not weekly	7.2 [6.5,7.8]	2.1 [1.7,2.5]	1.4 [1.1,1.7]	1.2 [0.8,1.6]
	% 1-6 cigarettes/week	0.6 [0.4,0.8]	0.9 [0.7,1.1]	0.6 [0.4,0.8]	0.4 [0.2,0.7]
	%>6 cigarettes/week	1.4 [1.1,1.7]	1.7 [1.4,2.1]	1.0 [0.8,1.3]	1.3 [0.7,1.9]
Cannabis	% tried	4.6 [4.0,5.1]	5.5 [4.9,6.1]	3.7 [3.2,4.2]	3.9 [2.6,5.2]
Other drugs	% tried	0.4 [0.2,0.6]	0.8 [0.6,1.0]	0.6 [0.4,0.8]	0.8 [0.3,1.2]
Weight	Mean BMI	20.32[20.23,20.41]	21.58[21.47,21.69]	21.36[21.25,21.47]	21.25[21.07,21.44]
	% obese	3.8 [3.3,4.3]	7.8 [7.1,8.5]	7.4 [6.7,8.0]	7.3 [6.1,8.5]
Weight Perception	% underweight	14.3 [13.2,15.4]	7.0 [6.4,7.6]	6.9 [6.2,7.6]	6.8 [5.7,7.9]
	% about right weight	59.3 [57.9,60.7]	59.4 [58.2,60.5]	60.3 [59.1,61.6]	60.2 [57.7,62.8]
	% overweight	23.0 [21.8,24.2]	28.7 [27.6,29.8]	28.4 [27.3,29.6]	28.8 [26.3,31.4]
	% very overweight	3.5 [2.9,4.0]	4.9 [4.4,5.5]	4.3 [3.7,4.8]	4.1 [3.3,4.9]
Sleep- Schoolday bedtime	before 9pm	0.9 [0.6,1.2]	5.0 [4.5,5.6]	4.9 [4.4,5.5]	6.0 [4.8,7.1]
	9-9.59 pm	15.3 [14.3,16.4]	29.2 [28.1,30.3]	30.1 [28.9,31.2]	33.1 [30.6,35.7]
	10-10.59 pm	64.9 [63.4,66.4]	39.7 [38.5,40.9]	39.9 [38.7,41.2]	37.0 [34.7,39.3]
	11-midnight after midnight	16.3 [15.2,17.4]	19.6 [18.6,20.5]	19.3 [18.3,20.4]	18.0 [16.0,20.0]
Sleep- Non schoolday bedtime	before 9pm	0.2 [0.1,0.3]	0.9 [0.6,1.1]	0.9 [0.6,1.1]	0.9 [0.4,1.3]
	9-9.59 pm	2.7 [2.2,3.2]	5.6 [5.1,6.1]	6.1 [5.4,6.7]	7.3 [5.6,9]
	10-10.59 pm	24.1 [22.9,25.3]	23.4 [22.4,24.4]	24.8 [23.7,26.0]	27.5 [25.3,29.8]
	11-midnight after midnight	42.3 [40.8,43.8]	36.2 [35.1,37.4]	36.8 [35.5,38.1]	33.7 [31.4,36.0]
Sleep- Schoolday waketime	before 6am	1.0 [0.7,1.3]	4.4 [3.9,5]	3.6 [3.1,4.0]	3.5 [2.6,4.5]
	6-6.59 am	28.4 [27.0,29.8]	42.3 [41.1,43.5]	38.8 [37.5,40.1]	38.4 [36.0,40.7]
	7-7.59 pm	66.1 [64.7,67.5]	49.4 [48.2,50.6]	53.5 [52.2,54.8]	54.4 [51.9,56.9]
	8-8.59am after 9am	4.2 [3.7,4.8]	3.1 [2.7,3.5]	3.5 [3.0,4.0]	3.2 [2.5,4.0]
Sleep- Non schoolday waketime	before 8am	0.3 [0.1,0.4]	0.9 [0.5,1.2]	0.6 [0.4,0.9]	0.5 [0.2,0.7]
	8-8.59 am	6.5 [5.8,7.3]	8.1 [7.4,8.7]	7.8 [7.1,8.5]	8.1 [6.6,9.6]
	9-9.59 pm	15.4 [14.3,16.5]	16.2 [15.3,17.1]	15.8 [14.9,16.8]	17.0 [14.9,19.0]
	10-10.59am	26.2 [24.8,27.5]	24.8 [23.8,25.8]	25.4 [24.2,26.5]	25.6 [23.4,27.9]
	11-11.59am after midday	31.1 [29.7,32.5]	29.0 [27.9,30.1]	29.8 [28.6,31.0]	27.9 [25.7,30.1]
Sleep duration (weekday)	Mean sleep duration	5.8 [5.1,6.5]	6.9 [6.3,7.6]	6.4 [5.8,7.0]	6.1 [4.9,7.4]
	% sleep less than 8 hours	8.70 [8.68,8.73]	8.60 [8.58,8.63]	8.68 [8.65,8.71]	8.74 [8.68,8.79]
Sexual intercourse	% yes	5.7 [5.1,6.4]	13.4 [12.6,14.3]	11.6 [10.7,12.4]	11.5 [10.0,13.1]
		2.1 [1.8,2.5]	2.0 [1.7,2.4]	1.2 [0.9,1.5]	0.9 [0.6,1.3]

**Table 4.** Descriptive statistics for mental health and health related behaviours in 2005 (ALSPAC) and 2015 (MCS) by sex

Domain	Variable	2005 ALSPAC		2015 MCS	
		Males	Females	Males	Females
		Mean or % [95% CI]	Mean or % [95% CI]	Mean or % [95% CI]	Mean or % [95% CI]
Depressive symptoms	SMFQ score	4.14 [3.99,4.28]	5.69 [5.51,5.87]	4.22 [4.05,4.39]	7.31 [7.08,7.54]
	% above clinical cutoff	5.65 [4.78,6.52]	12.4 [11.1,13.6]	9.19 [8.13,10.3]	24.0 [22.5,25.4]
Self-harm	% Yes	6.86 [5.67,8.05]	16.9 [15.2,18.6]	8.49 [7.51,9.47]	22.8 [21.3,24.2]
Antisocial behaviours	% Assault	48.1 [45.9,50.3]	32.3 [30.3,34.4]	41.4 [39.7,43.1]	21.1 [19.7,22.5]
	% Rowdy behaviour	11.0 [9.63,12.3]	12.0 [10.7,13.4]	15.3 [14.0,16.5]	12.7 [11.6,13.9]
	% Graffiti	9.01 [7.56,10.4]	10.7 [9.38,12.0]	3.17 [2.61,3.73]	2.47 [1.95,2.98]
	% Vandalism	7.70 [6.35,9.06]	4.73 [3.79,5.67]	4.44 [3.66,5.22]	2.76 [2.12,3.40]
	% Shoplifting	7.60 [6.44,8.76]	8.30 [7.14,9.46]	4.36 [3.67,5.04]	2.81 [2.25,3.38]
Parent reported difficulties [SDQ)	Emotional symptoms	1.23 [1.16,1.30]	1.60 [1.52,1.67]	1.78 [1.69,1.86]	2.41 [2.33,2.48]
	% above clinical cutoff	4.70 [3.89,5.50]	6.67 [5.73,7.61]	10.5 [9.35,11.7]	17.4 [16.1,18.8]
	Conduct problems	1.24 [1.18,1.30]	1.16 [1.10,1.22]	1.60 [1.53,1.67]	1.46 [1.40,1.51]
	% above clinical cutoff	6.42 [5.47,7.36]	5.55 [4.67,6.43]	13.7 [12.3,15.1]	9.89 [8.79,11.0]
	Hyperactivity symptoms	3.28 [3.19,3.37]	2.44 [2.36,2.52]	3.54 [3.45,3.63]	2.67 [2.59,2.75]
	% above clinical cutoff	8.81 [7.72,9.90]	3.69 [2.97,4.42]	13.4 [12.1,14.6]	6.41 [5.48,7.34]
	Peer problems	1.36 [1.29,1.43]	1.06 [0.99,1.12]	1.92 [1.85,1.99]	1.73 [1.67,1.79]
	% above clinical cutoff	11.2 [9.98,12.4]	6.71 [5.75,7.67]	18.5 [17.0,20.0]	14.9 [13.7,16.1]
Prosocial behaviours	% above clinical cutoff	8.01 [7.93,8.08]	8.50 [8.43,8.57]	8.02 [7.95,8.09]	8.49 [8.42,8.56]
	% above clinical cutoff	1.67 [1.17,2.18]	0.72 [0.39,1.05]	2.35 [1.78,2.92]	1.51 [1.03,1.99]
Alcohol use	% never drank	48.7 [46.8,50.6]	47.1 [45.2,48.9]	51.3 [49.6,53.0]	52.4 [50.7,54.1]
	% nothing past 12 mo, never heavy drinking	40.7 [38.9,42.6]	43.4 [41.6,45.3]	39.4 [37.7,41.1]	37.2 [35.6,38.8]
	% heavy drinking 1-2 times in past 12 mo	7.35 [6.37,8.33]	6.00 [5.11,6.89]	6.07 [5.26,6.88]	6.24 [5.38,7.10]
	% heavy drinking >3 times in past 12 mo	3.24 [2.58,3.91]	3.50 [2.81,4.19]	3.26 [2.60,3.92]	4.20 [3.48,4.92]
Smoking	% non-smoker	93.2 [92.2,94.1]	88.4 [87.3,89.6]	96.3 [95.6,97.0]	94.1 [93.2,95.0]
	% occasional, not weekly	5.15 [4.33,5.98]	9.14 [8.08,10.2]	1.61 [1.11,2.10]	2.59 [1.98,3.19]
	% 1-6 cigarettes/week	0.44 [0.19,0.69]	0.81 [0.48,1.14]	0.68 [0.39,0.97]	1.13 [0.75,1.51]
	% >6 cigarettes/week	1.24 [0.83,1.65]	1.61 [0.12,2.08]	1.39 [0.92,1.86]	2.15 [1.54,2.76]
Cannabis	% tried	5.32 [4.48,6.16]	3.86 [3.15,4.57]	5.57 [0.47,0.64]	5.43 [4.57,6.29]
Other drugs	% tried	0.45 [0.18,0.72]	0.34 [0.12,0.55]	0.81 [0.48,1.14]	0.79 [0.49,1.10]
Weight	Mean BMI	19.9 [19.8,20.1]	20.7 [20.6,20.8]	21.0 [20.9,21.2]	22.2 [22.0,22.3]
	% obese	3.93 [3.21,5.66]	3.66 [2.97,4.35]	7.64 [6.66,8.61]	7.92 [6.97,8.87]
Weight Perception	% underweight	17.3 [15.6,18.9]	11.4 [10.1,12.7]	9.36 [8.33,10.4]	4.58 [3.87,5.28]
	% about right weight	61.1 [59.1,63.1]	57.4 [55.4,59.5]	63.7 [62.0,65.3]	54.8 [53.2,56.5]
	% overweight	19.4 [17.8,21.0]	26.4 [24.7,28.2]	23.6 [22.2,25.1]	34.0 [32.4,35.6]
	% very overweight	2.20 [1.54,2.85]	4.68 [3.83,5.53]	3.34 [2.67,4.00]	6.59 [5.72,7.45]
Sleep-Schoolday	before 9pm	0.86 [0.47,1.26]	0.90 [0.52,1.28]	5.44 [4.64,6.23]	4.61 [3.88,5.35]
	9-9.59 pm	14.8 [13.3,16.2]	15.9 [14.5,17.3]	28.5 [27.0,30.0]	29.9 [28.4,31.4]

1						
2						
3	bedtime	10-10.59 pm	64.7 [62.5,67.0]	65.1 [63.2,67.1]	40.5 [38.8,42.2]	38.9 [37.3,40.6]
4		11-midnight	16.9 [13.1,18.6]	15.7 [14.2,17.2]	18.9 [17.5,20.2]	20.3 [19.0,21.7]
5		after midnight	2.76 [2.10,3.42]	2.37 [1.74,3.01]	6.74 [5.76,7.73]	6.21 [5.37,7.06]
6	Sleep-	before 9pm	0.18 [0.00,0.35]	0.22 [0.02,0.42]	0.88 [0.57,1.20]	0.82 [0.51,1.14]
7	Non	9-9.59 pm	2.45 [1.78,3.11]	2.92 [2.18,3.65]	5.89 [5.09,6.68]	5.30 [4.58,6.03]
8	schoolday	10-10.59 pm	22.5 [20.6,24.4]	25.7 [24.0,27.4]	22.5 [21.1,23.9]	24.4 [23.0,25.8]
9	bedtime	11-midnight	41.6 [39.4,43.7]	43.0 [40.8,45.1]	35.2 [33.6,36.8]	37.3 [35.7,38.9]
10		after midnight	33.3 [31.3,35.3]	28.2 [26.3,30.1]	35.5 [33.8,27.2]	32.1 [30.5,33.7]
11	Sleep-	before 6am	0.85 [0.47,1.21]	1.10 [0.68,1.53]	4.40 [3.61,5.18]	4.50 [3.77,5.24]
12	Schoolday	6-6.59 am	23.7 [21.7,25.7]	33.0 [31.1,34.8]	36.9 [35.2,38.6]	48.0 [46.3,49.7]
13	waketime	7-7.59 pm	69.2 [67.2,71.1]	63.1 [61.2, 65.0]	53.6 [51.8,55.3]	44.9 [43.2,46.5]
14		8-8.59am	5.91 [4.88,6.94]	2.63 [1.97,3.29]	4.02 [3.36,4.67]	2.05 [1.59,2.51]
15		after 9am	0.36 [0.10,0.63]	0.19 [0.00,0.39]	1.10 [0.46,1.74]	0.59 [0.35,0.84]
16	Sleep-	before 8am	7.70 [6.58,8.83]	5.36 [4.42,6.31]	9.74 [8.70,10.8]	6.31 [5.49,7.13]
17	Non	8-8.59 am	15.5 [13.9,17.0]	15.3 [13.9,16.8]	16.8 [15.5,18.1]	15.5 [14.3,16.8]
18	schoolday	9-9.59 pm	25.4 [23.4,27.4]	26.9 [25.0,28.7]	23.1 [21.7,24.5]	26.6 [25.1,28.0]
19	waketime	10-10.59am	29.9 [27.9,31.9]	32.3 [30.3,34.2]	28.0 [26.4,29.5]	30.1 [28.6,31.7]
20		11-11.59am	15.2 [13.8,16.6]	14.9 [13.4,16.4]	14.7 [13.5,16.0]	13.2 [13.0,16.5]
21		after midday	6.34 [5.35,7.32]	5.29 [4.37,6.20]	7.67 [6.58,8.76]	6.19 [5.37,7.00]
22	Sleep	Mean sleep duration	8.75 [8.72,8.79]	8.65 [8.62,8.68]	8.78 [8.71,8.86]	8.70 [8.61,8.78]
23	duration	% sleep less than 8	5.0 [4.0,5.9]	6.5 [5.5, 7.5]	11.0 [8.8,13.2]	12.0 [9.9,14.1]
24	(weekday)	hours				
25	Sexual	% yes	2.3 [1.7,2.8]	2.0 [1.5,2.6]	2.0 [1.4,2.5]	2.1 [1.6,2.6]
26	intercourse					
27						
28						
29						
30						
31						
32						
33						
34						
35						
36						
37						
38						
39						
40						
41						
42						
43						
44						
45						
46						
47						
48						
49						
50						
51						
52						
53						
54						
55						
56						
57						
58						
59						
60						

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For Review Only




Figure 1: ORs (95% CI) for poorer outcomes in 2015 (MCS) vs. 2005 (ALSPAC). Unadjusted estimates and estimates using entropy balancing weights are both presented.

503x335mm (72 x 72 DPI)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




Figure 2. ORs (95% CI) for poorer outcomes in 2015 (MCS) vs. 2005 (ALSPAC) for males and females

499x333mm (72 x 72 DPI)