



RESEARCH ARTICLE

REVISED **Large-scale assessment of 7-11-year-olds' cognitive and sensorimotor function within the Born in Bradford longitudinal birth cohort study [version 2; peer review: 3 approved, 1 approved with reservations]**

Liam JB Hill ¹⁻³, Katy A. Shire ¹⁻³, Richard J Allen ¹, Kirsty Crossley³, Megan L Wood^{1,3}, Dan Mason ³, Amanda H Waterman ^{1,2}

¹School of Psychology, University of Leeds, Leeds, West Yorkshire, LS29JT, UK

²Centre for Applied Education Research, Wolfson Centre for Applied Health Research, Bradford, West Yorkshire, BD96RJ, UK

³Born in Bradford, Bradford Institute for Health Research, Bradford, West Yorkshire, BD96RJ, UK

V2 **First published:** 10 Mar 2021, 6:53
<https://doi.org/10.12688/wellcomeopenres.16429.1>
Latest published: 09 Feb 2022, 6:53
<https://doi.org/10.12688/wellcomeopenres.16429.2>

Abstract

Background: Cognitive ability and sensorimotor function are crucial aspects of children's development, and are associated with physical and mental health outcomes and educational attainment. This paper describes cross-sectional sensorimotor and cognitive function data collected on over 15,000 children aged 7-10 years, collected as part of the Born in Bradford (BiB) longitudinal birth-cohort study. Methodological details of the large-scale data collection process are described, along with initial analyses of the data involving the relationship between cognition/sensorimotor ability and age and task difficulty, and associations between tasks.

Method: Data collection was completed in 86 schools between May 2016 and July 2019. Children were tested at school, individually, using a tablet computer with a digital stylus or finger touch for input. Assessments comprised a battery of three sensorimotor tasks (Tracking, Aiming, & Steering) and five cognitive tasks (three Working Memory tasks, Inhibition, and Processing Speed), which took approximately 40 minutes.

Results: Performance improved with increasing age and decreasing task difficulty, for each task. Performance on all three sensorimotor tasks was correlated, as was performance on the three working memory tasks. In addition, performance on a composite working memory score correlated with performance on both inhibition and processing speed. Interestingly, within age-group variation was much larger than between age-group variation.

Conclusions: The current project collected computerised measures of a range of cognitive and sensorimotor functions at 7-10 years of age

Open Peer Review

Approval Status ? ✓ ✓ ✓

	1	2	3	4
version 2 (revision) 09 Feb 2022			✓ view	✓ view
version 1 10 Mar 2021	? view	✓ view		

- 1. Beatrice Valentini** , University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland
Evie Vergauwe, University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland
- 2. James Tresilian**, University of Warwick, Coventry, UK
- 3. Mariza Kampouri** , Karolinska Institutet, Solna, Sweden
- 4. Sinead Rhodes**, The University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK

Any reports and responses or comments on the article can be found at the end of the article.

in over 15,000 children. Performance varied as expected by age and task difficulty, and showed the predicted correlations between related tasks. Large within-age group variation highlights the need to consider the profile of individual children in studying cognitive and sensorimotor development. These data can be linked to the wider BiB dataset including measures of physical and mental health, biomarkers and genome-wide data, socio-demographic information, and routine data from local health and education services.

Keywords

sensorimotor, cognition, cohort, longitudinal



This article is included in the [Born in Bradford gateway](#).

Corresponding author: Katy A. Shire (katy.shire@bthft.nhs.uk)

Author roles: **Hill LJ:** Conceptualization, Data Curation, Funding Acquisition, Methodology, Project Administration, Resources, Software, Supervision, Validation, Writing – Original Draft Preparation, Writing – Review & Editing; **Shire KA:** Investigation, Project Administration, Supervision, Writing – Original Draft Preparation, Writing – Review & Editing; **Allen RJ:** Conceptualization, Data Curation, Formal Analysis, Methodology, Resources, Software, Visualization, Writing – Original Draft Preparation, Writing – Review & Editing; **Crossley K:** Investigation, Project Administration, Supervision, Writing – Original Draft Preparation, Writing – Review & Editing; **Wood ML:** Data Curation, Formal Analysis, Visualization, Writing – Original Draft Preparation, Writing – Review & Editing; **Mason D:** Data Curation, Resources, Software, Validation, Writing – Review & Editing; **Waterman AH:** Conceptualization, Data Curation, Funding Acquisition, Methodology, Project Administration, Resources, Software, Supervision, Validation, Writing – Original Draft Preparation, Writing – Review & Editing

Competing interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

Grant information: Core support for this Born in Bradford research was provided by the Wellcome Trust (WT101597MA). This research was funded by a joint grant from the UK Medical Research Council and UK Economic and Social Science Research Council (MR/N024397/1). L.J.B. Hill, K.A. Shire and A.H. Waterman's involvement was also supported by the National Institute for Health Research Yorkshire and Humber ARC (reference: NIHR20016). M.L. Wood's contribution was supported by funding from the UK Economic and Social Science Research Council White Rose Doctoral Training Partnership studentship. The views expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the National Institute for Health Research or the Departments of Health and Social Care or Education.

The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Copyright: © 2022 Hill LJ *et al.* This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

How to cite this article: Hill LJ, Shire KA, Allen RJ *et al.* **Large-scale assessment of 7-11-year-olds' cognitive and sensorimotor function within the Born in Bradford longitudinal birth cohort study [version 2; peer review: 3 approved, 1 approved with reservations]** Wellcome Open Research 2022, 6:53 <https://doi.org/10.12688/wellcomeopenres.16429.2>

First published: 10 Mar 2021, 6:53 <https://doi.org/10.12688/wellcomeopenres.16429.1>

REVISED Amendments from Version 1

We have made changes in response to all the reviewer's comments. We have updated the abstract to make it clearer we are presenting cross-sectional data (collected as part of a wider longitudinal cohort study), rather than longitudinal data. We have also clarified a number of methodological details, corrected one incorrect reference and updated [Figure 14](#) with the correct figure image.

Any further responses from the reviewers can be found at the end of the article

Introduction

The Born in Bradford (BiB) longitudinal birth cohort study was established in 2007 to explore how behavioural, environmental, social, and genetic factors impact on developmental outcomes, including health and education ([Wright et al., 2013](#)). The study has recruited 13,776 children and their families, who reflect the city's multi-ethnic population. BiB has produced an extensive, connected dataset including measures of physical and mental health, biomarkers and genome-wide data, socio-demographic information, as well as data linkage to routine data from local health and education services.

In 2011, as the cohort began to approach school age, measurement of children's cognitive and sensorimotor abilities was of primary importance because these abilities are vital to educational success and to broader developmental outcomes ([Cameron et al., 2012](#); [Giles et al., 2018](#); [Lingam et al., 2012](#); [Marmot & Bell, 2012](#); [Moffit et al., 2011](#)). Poor sensorimotor function and impairments in cognitive ability in childhood are associated with a range of adverse outcomes, such as increased mental health problems, poorer physical health (including increased risk of obesity), lower academic attainment, and poorer quality of life ([Hill et al., 2016](#); [Marteau & Hall, 2013](#); [Stautz et al., 2016](#); [Zwicker et al., 2013](#)). Therefore, having large-scale, objective assessments of these essential skills in primary school children is invaluable to researchers, particularly given the ability to link these with the wide range of connected data available via BiB.

Consequently, between 2012 and 2014 the "Starting School" study recruited over 3,400 BiB children aged 4–5 years who were in their first year of schooling, collecting measures of school readiness including cognition and fine motor skills ([Shire et al., 2020](#)). This was followed in 2017 by the "Growing Up in Bradford" project, when the children were aged 7 to 11 years old. This large-scale multi-method programme of data collection involved children and their families in both the community and schools ([Bird et al., 2019](#)). Within this study, measuring children's cognitive and sensorimotor function continued to be a core priority, alongside assessing social and emotional wellbeing, growth, adiposity, and cardiometabolic health.

The current paper outlines in detail the recruitment, data collection, and initial results from the school-based measures of cognition and sensorimotor skills, which were undertaken during this project. Further, because this testing was done at a whole-class level it included responses from BiB children and

their classmates. This paper focuses on providing the detailed description of the methodology, and some initial, high-level analyses by key variables of this cross-sectional dataset, which will ultimately be linked to the wider BiB cohort data.

Sensorimotor function

Sensorimotor abilities underpin our capacity to execute sensory-guided movements that achieve goal-directed actions ([Tresilian, 2012](#)). As such, they are integral to manual manipulation, tactile and kinaesthetic processing, visual-motor integration and hand-eye coordination ([Goyen et al., 2011](#); [Krakauer & Mazzoni, 2011](#); [Snapp-Childs et al., 2013](#)). Proficient sensorimotor control is essential for a plethora of everyday tasks such as getting dressed, using cutlery, and manipulating a pen or pencil in the classroom ([Miller et al., 2001](#); [Prunty et al., 2013](#); [Wang et al., 2009](#)). These abilities develop throughout childhood ([Flatters et al., 2014](#); [Sugden et al., 2013](#)), with theory suggesting that competent sensorimotor control is vital for one's ability to interact with, and understand the environment through "purposeful, coordinated movements" ([Latash, 2012, p. 1](#); [Piaget, 1952](#)). For example, basic sensorimotor abilities in infancy and early childhood are associated with emerging cognitive abilities, such as sustained and joint visual attention and inhibitory control ([D'Souza et al., 2017](#); [Gottwald et al., 2016](#); [Yu & Smith, 2017](#); [Yuan et al., 2019](#)). There is also evidence for the importance of sensorimotor function later in childhood with studies showing the importance of the role of action in learning processes and the retention of information ([Gathercole et al., 2008](#); [James, 2017](#); [LeBarton et al., 2015](#); [Waterman et al., 2017](#); [Yang et al., 2017](#)).

Meanwhile, difficulties with sensorimotor control are documented as limiting the development of perception, cognition and motivation ([Leonard, 2016](#); [von Hofsten, 2004](#)). Coordination difficulties are also associated with an abundance of adverse developmental outcomes, including lower levels of physical activity ([Kwan et al., 2016](#)), obesity ([Augustijn et al., 2018](#)), social and emotional wellbeing ([Hill et al., 2016](#)), quality of life ([Zwicker et al., 2013](#)), and academic attainment ([Harrowell et al., 2017](#)).

Moreover, whilst clinically significant problems with sensorimotor control are associated with a concurrent increased risks of mental health problems ([Lingam et al., 2012](#)), difficulties with sensorimotor control are also frequently found to co-occur in children already diagnosed with a range of other specific genetic ([Cunningham et al., 2019](#); [Cunningham et al., 2020](#)) and developmental disorders ([Pieters et al., 2012](#)).

The current project assessed sensorimotor function by recording end-point kinematic data on participants' movements as they performed the Clinical Kinematic Assessment Tool (CKAT) ([Culmer et al., 2009](#)). This standardised computerised battery has participants performing a series of visuo-manual tasks that require them to use a handheld stylus to interact with 2D visual stimuli presented on a tablet computer. CKAT has previously been used to study sensorimotor function in both typically ([Flatters et al., 2014](#)) and atypically ([Cunningham et al., 2019](#)) developing populations and was previously used to measure sensorimotor function at 5 years old in a subset of the BiB

cohort (Shire *et al.*, 2020). Performance on tasks within the CKAT battery have also been shown to be correlate with performance on other sensorimotor tasks, such as: steering in a virtual reality driving simulator (Raw *et al.*, 2012) and maintaining postural stability (Flatters *et al.*, 2014).

Cognitive function

Cognitive skills are equally essential for academic success (Ahmed *et al.*, 2019; Alloway *et al.*, 2009; Blakey *et al.*, 2020; Blair & Razza, 2007; Lee *et al.*, 2011) and are linked to outcomes such as social functioning (McQuade *et al.*, 2013) and long term health (Marteau & Hall, 2013; Stautz *et al.*, 2016). In the current study we assessed three core components of cognition: working memory, inhibitory control, and processing speed. The rationale for focussing on each of these areas is discussed in the following sections.

Working memory. Working memory is a limited capacity system that is used to store and process information for immediate use in ongoing cognitive activity (Baddeley *et al.*, 2021; Cowan, 1999). Working memory ability increases throughout childhood and adolescence, reaching adult-like levels at approximately 15 years of age (Gathercole *et al.*, 2004). Working memory is essential for learning and predicts educational achievement including attainment in reading, mathematics and science (Alloway *et al.*, 2014; Cragg *et al.*, 2017; Gathercole *et al.*, 2004; Holmes & Adams, 2006; Monette *et al.*, 2011; Swanson *et al.*, 2006). Impairments to working memory also co-occur with several developmental disorders, for example, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), developmental coordination disorder (DCD), and dyslexia (Alloway & Archibald, 2008; Beneventi *et al.*, 2010; Martinussen *et al.*, 2005; Smith-Spark & Fisk, 2007). We measured working memory using three separate tasks: forward digit recall (FDR), the Corsi task, and backward digit recall (BDR). FDR measures the ability to retain verbal information, Corsi measures the ability to retain visuospatial information, and BDR taps into the ability to engage in executive control of information. Each of these tasks is used extensively in the working memory literature (Alloway *et al.*, 2006; Berry *et al.*, 2018; Berry *et al.*, 2019; Gathercole *et al.*, 2004; Waterman *et al.*, 2017).

Inhibitory control. Inhibitory control refers to the ability to suppress prepotent responses and ignore irrelevant or distracting information. It is one of the central constructs of executive function (Diamond, 2013). Indeed, some researchers have argued that working memory and inhibition are the two key factors underlying executive function (Roberts & Pennington, 1996; Senn *et al.*, 2004). The ability to inhibit irrelevant information and actions increases over childhood (Diamond & Taylor, 1996; Durston *et al.*, 2002; Williams *et al.*, 1999). Improved inhibitory control is linked to academic attainment (Blair & Razza, 2007; Kieffer *et al.*, 2013; Szucs *et al.*, 2013) and to broader long-term health outcomes such as body mass index (BMI) and alcohol use (Marteau & Hall, 2013; Moffit *et al.*, 2011; Stautz *et al.*, 2016). The inhibition task we used was based on a classic Flanker design (Blakey & Carroll, 2015; Eriksen & Schulz, 1979; Rueda *et al.*, 2005). This involves inhibition of irrelevant stimuli whilst attending to the relevant stimulus (attentional inhibition) and is sometimes referred to as a selective attention task (Diamond, 2013).

Processing speed. Processing speed is a fundamental part of cognition (Kail & Salthouse, 1994), enabling increased efficiency and improved performance on other cognitive tasks. Speed of processing increases considerably during early and middle childhood, with rate of increase slowing during late childhood, and then stabilising by late adolescence (Kail, 1991; Kail & Ferrer, 2007). Improved processing speed is linked to broader academic attainment (Gordon *et al.*, 2018; Mulder *et al.*, 2010; Rohde & Thompson, 2007), as well as to reading (Kail & Hall, 1994; Lobier *et al.*, 2013) and mathematics (Geary, 2011; Geary & Brown, 1991). Poor processing speed also co-occurs with many learning difficulties such as ADHD and Autism (Dickerson Mayes & Calhoun, 2007). The measure used in the current study was based on a speeded counting task methodology that has been used previously (Fry & Hale, 1996; Weiler *et al.*, 2003).

General aims and hypotheses

The current project aimed to collect data on sensorimotor and cognitive function, using objective computerised measures, on approximately 6,000 BiB children attending Bradford Primary Schools (covering ages 7–11 years) as well as their classmates (N ~ 9,000). Cross-sectional data on this scale on children's sensorimotor and cognitive functions is, in and of itself, valuable to researchers interested in exploring the relationships between these domains. Moreover, for BiB children involved in this study their data can also be linked to the further genetic, environmental, demographic, socioemotional, health, and educational data collected as part of the broader cohort study. Thus, providing opportunities to improve our understanding of the complex interplay of factors affecting child development.

The current paper describes the data collection process for the school-based assessment of sensorimotor and cognitive function in detail and presents an initial analysis of the data. The key research questions studied in relation to each task are:

1. How does performance change with age?
2. How does performance change with increasing difficulty within each task?
3. What are the associations between performance across the different tasks, within each of the two key domains (I.e. cognition and sensorimotor ability)?

Methods

Setting

Dates. Data collection for the study took place across four academic years (May – July 2016 and September – July 2016/17, 2017/18, and 2018/2019).

Location. Over the period of data collection, the Bradford District (West Yorkshire) was the fifth-largest metropolitan district in the UK (over half a million people), with nearly a quarter (23.7%) of residents aged under 16 years old (Office for National Statistics, 2019). Over the years, between 22 and 29% of the district's children were classified as living in Poverty (Office for National Statistics, 2019; The English Indices of Deprivation, 2019). During this time, around 64% of the Bradford District's population self-identified as being

of White British ethnic origin, with a further 20% identifying instead as Pakistani.

Participants

Schools. Eligibility: Schools in the Bradford district were initially invited to participate based on whether they had participated in a previous study called ‘Starting School’ that was carried out when the BiB children were in Reception year of school (ages 4–5) (Shire *et al.*, 2020). Additional schools were invited based on the team’s capacity, starting with those schools that had the highest numbers of children attending who were already part of the BiB study.

Method of recruitment: BiB researchers sent out individual emails addressed to Head teachers (or a key member of staff identified during previous years’ recruitment), with an information sheet attached. If no response was received, telephone calls were made and, if desired and feasible, a member of the research team would organise to meet a member of staff to explain the project. Recruitment of schools recurred annually over the 4 years of the study and if schools did not respond one academic year they were still contacted again in subsequent years, unless they requested otherwise. Head teachers had to provide written, opt-in consent on behalf of their school in order to participate.

Children. Eligibility: the intention was to assess children as close as possible to when they were 8 years old. There were three stages to recruitment. During a pilot phase between May 2016 and July 2016, only children in Year 4 (ages 8–9 years old) were invited to take part. In the main phase of recruitment, between September 2016 and July 2018, children in Years 3 (ages 7–8 years old) and 4 were eligible. If we had visited a school in the previous year, we would only capture data from the new Year 3 children the next academic year. In the final phase of recruitment (September 2018 – July 2019) children in Years 3, 4 and 5 were eligible in newly recruited schools for that year.

Method of recruitment: Recruited schools were given information sheets and opt-out consent forms to distribute to parents of children in the eligible year groups, which went out one to two weeks ahead of the school visit. The opt-out consent approach had been successfully used in the previous BiB Starting School study (Shire *et al.*, 2020), where it was chosen due to the low-risk nature of participation, the high numbers of children targeted, and the risks of excluding groups of children from homes where school forms are frequently not returned. One school asked for opt-in consent forms to be used and these were provided.

Parents were asked to return the opt-out consent forms to the school, and these were collected by researchers at the start of a visit. Only a small minority of parents withdrew their child from the study. For example, in the final phase of recruitment (Sept 18 – July 19), out of 5570 parents of children approached, 252 opted-out of the study (4%). Two further pathways by which a child could be withdrawn from the study also existed. Firstly, on a few occasions, parents would verbally inform their child’s teacher that they did not wish their child to take part. In these circumstances the teacher’s verbal account of

opt-out for that child was recorded, and the child was not assessed. Secondly, Teachers would also occasionally inform the researchers that they felt that a child’s special education needs (SEN) would prevent them from participating; we took the teachers decision on whether the child should participate or not. Assent from the children was also obtained before every assessment to ensure the child was happy to take part. Again, refusal at this stage was also rare. In the final phase of recruitment mentioned previously, only six children refused to take part in the assessments.

Design and general procedure

Ethical approval. Ethical approval for this study was obtained from the NHS Health Research Authority’s Yorkshire and the Humber - Bradford Leeds Research Ethics Committee (reference: 16/YH/0062) on the 24th March 2016.

Design and measurements. For both the sensorimotor and cognitive measures, data collection for this cross-sectional study took place during school time. All the assessments were presented on a tablet computer (Lenovo ThinkPad Helix type 20CG or 20CH) that used a digital stylus and finger touch for input. The children were presented with the sensorimotor tasks first (Tracking, Aiming and Steering) followed by the cognitive tasks (Forwards Digit Recall, Backwards Digit Recall, Corsi Block test, Flanker Task, and Processing Speed). The procedure was identical to the one used for the same tablet-based sensorimotor assessments during the Starting Schools study (methods described in Shire *et al.*, 2020). The only difference being an additional 20–25 minutes of cognitive tasks on the same tablet computers. The children interacted with the visual stimuli on the touch screen tablet using a digital stylus for the sensorimotor tasks and finger touch for the cognitive tasks. Tasks were presented in the same order to all children, following standardised instructions and a practice trial.

We offered schools the opportunity for both BiB children and their classmates (non-BiB children) to take part in the study. It was up to the school’s discretion whether they preferred just BiB children to take part, to minimise the impact on the school day. In the majority of cases, schools opted for both BiB children and non-BiB children to be tested.

Procedure. Once the school consented to participate, they were asked to provide class lists ahead of the school visit that included: children’s name; date of birth; Unique Pupil Number (UPN)¹; home post code; gender and ethnicity. This information was used to allow us to identify children eligible for assessment within their classes and to link the data collected back to the wider BiB cohort database, for those children who were part of the cohort. It also provided a means to resolving data entry errors (e.g. if the UPN was missing then linkage could be made using other identifiable information, reducing loss of data). Data was collected and stored securely following the Bradford Teaching Hospitals Foundation Trust

¹The UPN is a 13-character code allocated on entry into formal education (typically primary school) that identifies a child at a national level within education databases

procedures, which helps to protect all the BiB studies and is in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998. Transfer of data onto the secure central archive at the BiB research office was via encrypted devices (e.g. tablets, memory sticks) or encrypted emails.

Schools were asked to allocate a quiet room or area within their premises for the research team to use to conduct their assessments (e.g. an empty classroom). Typically, a team of five researchers took 10 children out of class at a time, with a ratio of no more than two children to one assessor. The assessor would administer the sensorimotor and cognitive assessments to the children, explaining what was required of each task at the beginning of each assessment and ensuring the child understood. Assessments took approximately 40–45 minutes per child.

Senior staff within the BiB cohort study trained the assessment team. Refresher training was provided at the start of each academic year and when required throughout the year to ensure high compliance with procedural protocols.

Feedback to schools. The results of the sensorimotor and cognitive assessments were compiled into individual reports for each child, and delivered back to class teachers, along with a document explaining why these skills were developmentally important, how the children were assessed, what was measured, what the scores meant and how they should be interpreted. These feedback documents were used at the discretion of the school, typically in conjunction with their own data on each child, to consider possible further assessment and evaluation for some children.

Sensorimotor methods

Materials and procedure. The Clinical-Kinematic Assessment Tool (CKAT), an objective computerised assessment implemented using the software development environment LabVIEW (Version 8.2.1, NationalInstruments™), was used to record sensorimotor function (see [Culmer et al., 2009](#) for full technical

details). This battery contains three tasks (tracking, aiming and steering), and takes approximately 12–15 minutes in total to administer. In all tasks, the children used a pen-shaped stylus to interact with the touchscreen tablet and movement of the stylus is recorded at 120 Hz, allowing task-relevant kinematic features of these movements to then be calculated. For example, temporal indices can measure the elapsed time between presentation of on-screen stimuli and consequent actions being initiated (Reaction Time; RT); and then the time between initiation and the end of the subsequent action (movement time; MT). Combining RT and MT then gives a measure of Total Response Time (TRT). Efficiency and accuracy of movements are described using spatial indices. These include Path Accuracy, which compares the recorded trajectory produced by participant to a model trajectory. Finally, dynamic indices summarise speed/accuracy trade-offs in sensorimotor control. For example, root-mean-square error (RMSE) measures average spatial error whilst tracking a target over time, and penalised Path Accuracy (pPA) records path accuracy after adjusting for length of movement time. Consistent with procedures in [Flatters et al. \(2014\)](#), one kinematic metric per CKAT task was selected, to be used as an index of task performance (RMSE for Tracking, Total Response Time for Aiming and Penalised Path Accuracy for Steering). A brief description of each task follows here, along with illustration of these tasks in [Figure 1–Figure 3](#). For a fuller description see [Flatters et al., 2014](#):

Tracking

A moving green circle is presented on the screen and participants are required to track the circle around the screen, keeping the tip of the stylus within the circle (which moved in a ‘figure-of-eight’ pattern for nine revolutions). The speed of the moving circle increases every three revolutions, producing Slow, Medium, and Fast conditions (42, 84, and 168 mm/s, respectively). This task comprises of two consecutive conditions; an unguided condition (Without Guide) where the path could not be seen and a guided trial (With Guide); where the ‘figure-of-eight’ is displayed on the screen). Each trial lasts approximately 84 s. See [Figure 1](#) for illustration.




Figure 1. Sensorimotor battery: Tracking task. ‘Without Guide’ sequence demonstrates the without-guide tracking trial (the dotted line indicates the trajectory the target is moving but these prompts are not visible to participants). ‘With Guide’ sequence shows the tracking trial with the visible guide added.

Aiming

A series of circles are presented on the screen and the child is required to move the stylus as quickly as possible (without disconnecting the stylus from the screen) from one green circle to the next, as they appear. Each time the tip of the stylus reaches a circle, that circle disappears, and a new target circle appears in a new location. A total of 75 discrete aiming movements are made taking approximately 2–4 minutes. In six of the final 25 movements the target shifted position (referred to as Jump trials) after the participant initiated movement and got within 4 cm of the initially aimed at target, forcing the participant to make an online correction to ‘jump’ to the new target location. All targets appeared at a fixed distance from each other. See [Figure 2](#) for illustration.

Steering

The steering task comprised of two trials, Path A and Path B (Path B was the reverse order of path A) and each took approximately 40 s to complete. This task was shortened to two trials instead of six, compared to the version used in [Flatters et al., 2014](#), due to time constraints. In this earlier study this task is also referred to as Tracing rather than Steering. A 5-mm-wide pathway consisting of two parallel lines was presented on the screen, running from a ‘start’ to a ‘finish’ position on the other side of the screen. Children are instructed to keep the tip of the stylus inside the pathway whilst also keeping their stylus within a ‘pacing box’ (sequentially moved along the path in 5-s intervals). This pacing box attempts to standardise the pace of movement and encourage a greater focus on accuracy during this set time period. See [Figure 3](#) for illustration.

Domain-specific hypotheses. Consistent with response patterns reported previously in a much smaller sample of 7–11-year-olds (see [Flatters et al., 2014](#)), it was predicted that with increasing age, performance across all tasks would significantly

improve. For Tracking specifically, improved RMSE was also predicted within the guided condition and at slower target speeds. These effects were also expected to interact with each other, whereby the positive effect of including the visual guide would be larger at slower speeds and this advantage would be more evident in older age groups. Within the Aiming task specifically, slower total response time was expected within Jump trials compared to ‘baseline’ trials, where no online correction was required. However, no interaction of this effect with age was predicted. Lastly, in the Steering task only an effect of age was predicted, with no difference in Penalised Path Accuracy as a function of condition expected (Path A versus Path B). Lastly, it was expected that there would be a significant correlation between performance on each of the three sensorimotor tasks.

Cognitive methods

Materials and procedure. Working memory, inhibition and processing speed were assessed through five cognitive tasks, which took approximately 20–25 minutes to complete. Working memory was assessed using three different tasks: Forward Digit Recall (FDR), Backwards Digit Recall (BDR) and the Corsi task (Corsi). Inhibition was assessed using a Flanker task. The order of presentation of these tasks were as follows: FDR, BDR, Corsi, Flanker task, and Processing Speed (PS). All cognitive tasks were programmed using PsychoPy ([Peirce, 2007](#)).

FDR

Children were presented with a sequence of numbers through headphones and subsequently asked to recall these numbers in the order they were audibly presented, by touching the appropriate boxes on the screen in order (see [Figure 4](#)). Nine boxes were ordered sequentially from 1 to 9 on the screen. The tasks progressed from sequence length three to six, with four trials for each sequence length, with a total of 16 trials. Response accuracy (correct or incorrect) and reaction time (s) was recorded




Figure 2. Sensorimotor battery: Aiming task. Arrows are indicative of the direction of movement the participant should make; these arrows would not be visible to the participants. The position of the five targets is shown in grayscale but again these would not be visible to participants. Figure displays first two aiming trials only.




Figure 3. Sensorimotor battery: Steering task. Shows path **A** and path **B** sequences. The thick grey line shows the path participants were expected to trace. The thick black lines demonstrate the actual tracing path participants made. The square box represents the “pacing box” which participants were expected to stay within.




Figure 4. Schematic illustration of the forwards digit recall working memory task.

for each trial. For each sequence length, the primary outcome variable was mean proportion correct. Reaction time per response was also recorded but is not reported here.

BDR

This task was similar to FDR but this time children were asked to recall the numbers in reverse order. As this task is more difficult than FDR, sequence length started at two digits and increased to sequence length five, with four trials at each length. The same outcome variables were recorded for this task as for FDR.

Corsi block tapping

Children were presented with nine randomly arranged blue squares, in which a random and unique sequence of boxes flashed yellow. The task was for the child to remember the order and once the sequence was finished, to tap the blue boxes

in the order in which the yellow boxes flashed (see [Figure 5](#)). Sequence length increased as the task progressed, from three squares to six squares, with four standardised sequences presented for each sequence length, equalling a total of 16 trials. Both response accuracy (correct and incorrect) and reaction time (s) were recorded for each item. Mean proportion correct was the primary outcome. As with the digit recall tasks, reaction time per response was also recorded but is not reported here.

Inhibition (Flanker task)

A line of five arrows was presented to the children in the centre of the screen. Children were required to identify the direction of the middle arrow, whilst the surrounding four arrows were either pointing in the same (congruous) or an opposite (incongruous) direction to the middle arrow (see [Figure 6](#)). There was a total of four practice trials and 40 test trials. In each




Figure 5. Schematic illustration of the Corsi spatial working memory task.




Figure 6. Schematic illustration of the inhibition (Flanker) task, showing an incongruent trial.

case, these were equally balanced between congruous and incongruous trials, with an equal number to the left and right. The children were asked to answer as quickly and accurately as possible. Accuracy and RT were captured, with the primary outcome variable being: Mean (RT to congruous trials – RT to incongruous trials).

Processing speed

Children were asked to identify how many red circles were present on the screen, amongst a random number of red triangles and blue circles, and to respond by tapping the box located at the bottom of the screen containing the correct number (see Figure 7). The boxes at the bottom of the screen included number options 1–9. There was a total of 18 trials and the children were asked to carry out each trial at quickly and as accurately as possible. Response accuracy (correct and incorrect) was recorded for each trial as well as RT (s). The primary outcome variable was mean RT for correct trials.




Figure 7. Schematic illustration of the processing speed task.

Domain-specific hypotheses. For the three working memory tasks, accuracy was expected to improve with age (e.g. Gathercole, 1999; Gathercole *et al.*, 2004). Due to the increased processing demands involved in reversing the digit sequence for recall (e.g. Alloway *et al.*, 2006), BDR was expected to be more difficult than FDR or Corsi and result in lower accuracy overall (Anders & Lillyquist, 1971). For each of these three tasks, performance was predicted to decline as sequence length increased, in line with the view of working memory as a limited capacity system (e.g. Cowan, 2001).

For the inhibition and processing speed tasks, children were expected to show faster reaction times with increasing age. Accuracy was a secondary dependent variable in these tasks and was expected to be high, but with similar age-related improvements apparent. For the inhibition task, responses were predicted to be faster (and more accurate) for congruent trials, relative to incongruent trials (Blakey & Carroll, 2015; Eriksen & Eriksen, 1974; Mullane *et al.*, 2009). This was expected to be more apparent for the younger age groups, indicating developmental changes in executive control and inhibition with age (Diamond, 2013).

Finally, the interrelationships between the different tasks at an individual differences level was explored. We expected positive correlations between each of the working memory measures, particularly for FDR and BDR, in line with the concept of shared processing components alongside domain-specific storage (Alloway *et al.*, 2006). We also predicted positive correlations between a working memory composite score, reaction time on the inhibition and processing speed tasks, and the magnitude of the congruency advantage within the inhibition task.

Data analysis

Data cleaning and preparation. Prior to analyses, the sensorimotor and cognitive data collected was reviewed for quality

control purposes. Sessions of recorded data were omitted for one of three primary reasons: duplication; incompleteness or issues raised in an accompanying field-note².

Duplicated sessions were cases in which the identifying information for the participant was the same across multiple sessions, this sometimes also included the recorded cognitive and/or sensorimotor data also being identical. In cases of complete duplications (i.e. identifying information and recorded data were identical), one session was retained, and the other(s) omitted. In cases where only the identifying information but not the data were identical this likely occurred as a result of human error in data entry and so both/all occurrences were omitted. An exception to this was where a child began but did not complete data collection within one session but continued it in a second session. In these cases, if there was also a field note confirming this was the case, then these two sessions were combined.

Incomplete cases arose where data was missing for some tasks or some trials within tasks. Participants had to have complete data for a task for it to be included in analysis. For example, if trials were incomplete or missing entirely for a participant's Tracking task but were complete for their Aiming, Steering, and Cognitive Tasks then only their Tracking data would be omitted. For this reason, the sample sizes for each task varies somewhat, presented in Table 1.

²At the end of each session conducted in a school the observing researcher had the option to add a free text Field Note to the data collected, to be saved alongside it. Normally this was used to note any unusual circumstances that had arisen during that session.

Table 1. Number of participants with data for each of the Sensorimotor and Cognitive tasks, respectively stratified by age group.

	Total sample	7 Years	8 Years	9 Years	10 Years
Sensorimotor					
Tracking	15701	5217	6985	3203	296
Aiming	15727	5230	6995	3206	296
Steering	15720	5217	6998	3208	297
Cognitive					
FDR	15473	5154	6870	3152	297
BDR	15146	5000	6725	3126	295
Corsi	15366	5095	6826	3146	299
Inhibition	14051	4634	6199	2927	291
Processing Speed	14933	4915	6633	3086	299

FDR=forward digit recall; BDR=backwards digit recall

Lastly, field notes were inspected and judged on a case by case basis by two researchers, with data from these sessions excluded if either researcher they felt the nature of the note warranted exclusion. Examples of notes which led to exclusion include technical difficulties (i.e. tablet crashes) or indications that participants were non-compliant with instructions.

Each dataset was analysed using mixed methods ANOVAs with Bonferroni-corrected planned comparisons examining differences between age groups. This was then supplemented by correlational analyses between separate sub-tests within both of the two key domains (sensorimotor and cognitive).

Results

School recruitment

Over the four testing periods, 86 schools in Bradford participated (see Figure 8 for breakdown of number of schools per year). Where schools were approached, but did not actively respond, we were unable to capture reasons for non-recruitment and were not counted as 'declining'. In the school year 2016/2017, two schools consented and visits arranged but these were subsequently cancelled by the schools (due to other demands). These were unable to be re-booked that year due to capacity of the research team, but all three schools were all visited the following year. A total of 12 schools took part in all four testing periods, 35 in three of the periods, 23 in two, and 16 in only one testing period.

Child recruitment

Over all three phases of testing, 17,774 children were recruited to take part (i.e. were in an eligible year group in a consenting school, and whose parents had not opted them out of the study), see Table 2 for a breakdown of children consented each year.




Figure 8. Flowchart illustrating school participation from recruitment through to being visited by the research team.

Table 2. Numbers of children recruited and subsequently assessed, by year.

School year	Sample	Children recruited	Children assessed	% of total assessed
2015–2016	BiB	832	717	86.18
	Non-BiB	110	102	92.73
	Total	942	819	86.94
2016–2017	BiB	3189	2821	88.46
	Non-BiB	2773	2490	89.79
	Total	5962	5311	89.08
2017–2018	BiB	3015	2671	88.59
	Non-BiB	2537	2285	90.07
	Total	5552	4956	89.27
2018–2019	BiB	3856	3395	88.04
	Non-BiB	1462	1339	91.59
	Total	5318	4734	89.02
Total	BiB	10892	9604	88.17
	Non-BiB	6882	6216	90.32
	Total	17774	15820	89.01

BiB=Born in Bradford cohort

Not all of these children completed the testing, however, due to either being absent on the day, refusing to take part, or through there being not enough time during the visit to complete testing with all the children. A breakdown of number of children falling into each of these groups was only captured during the final phase of testing (school year 2018–2019). In this year, 242 children were absent (62 BiB), 6 children refused to take part (3 BiB), and 69 (12 BiB) were not tested due to running out of time during the school visit.

Sensorimotor measures

See the data availability statement for the link to the script used to derive the three variables used within this paper (RMSE, TRT and pPA) from the raw output produced by CKAT. Additional processing of these variables was then conducted (negative reciprocal transformation) to normalise the distribution.

Tracking. A 2x3x4 mixed ANOVA was conducted with condition (With Guide versus Without Guide) and speed (Slow, Medium, and Fast) as within-groups factors and age-group (7-, 8-, 9- and 10-year olds) as the between-subjects factor. Significant main effects (all $p < .001$) of age-group ($\eta_p^2 = .063$), condition ($\eta_p^2 = .004$), and speed ($\eta_p^2 = .642$) on negative reciprocal RMSE were noted, as was a significant three-way interaction ($\eta_p^2 = .001$), illustrated in [Figure 9](#).

Age group comparisons (Bonferroni-corrected) indicated significant differences between all age groups, with greater performance for 10-year-olds ($M = .112$, $SE = .001$), compared to 9-year-olds ($M = .101$, $SE < .001$), 8-year-olds ($M = .091$, $SE < .001$), and 7-year-olds ($M = -.084$, $SE < .001$). Speed related effects were attenuated in younger age groups and for 7-year-olds and in younger age groups there was little effect of condition in any of the three speeds. However, with increasing age, there were larger effects of condition, supporting the significant 3-way interaction that was found.

Aiming. A 2x4 mixed ANOVA was carried out with condition as the within-groups factor (Baseline versus Jump) and age group as the between-subjects factor. This revealed significant main effects (at $p < .001$) of age group ($\eta_p^2 = .078$) and condition ($\eta_p^2 = .910$) and the age group x condition interaction ($\eta_p^2 = .048$).

Comparisons (Bonferroni-corrected) revealed that performance between all age groups significantly differed from each other with 10-year-old children performing the best. Age group effects observed were larger within the Baseline condition compared to the Jump condition, explaining the significant age-group x condition interaction found, illustrated in [Figure 10](#). In addition, greater differences were found between the Baseline and Jump conditions with increasing age.

Steering. A similar 2x4 mixed ANOVA was conducted for the Steering task with condition as the within-groups factor (Path A versus Path B) and age group as the between-subjects factor. Significant main effects (at $p < .001$) were found for age group ($\eta_p^2 = .032$) and condition ($\eta_p^2 = .003$) However, a significant interaction was not found ($p = .269$).

Further comparisons (Bonferroni-corrected) showed performance across groups significantly differed from each other (all $p < .001$ except between 9-year-olds and 10-year-olds, $p < .01$). Whilst children were found to perform significantly better on Path A compared to Path B ($p < .001$) ([Figure 11](#)), the effect size was comparatively small, indicating minimal impact in comparison to the effect of age on performance.

Relationships across sensorimotor tasks. Correlational analyses were conducted to observe how performance is related across the three CKAT tasks. [Figure 12](#) show the interrelationships between Tracking, Aiming, and Steering. Positive correlations (significant at $p < .001$) are apparent between all three sensorimotor tasks.

Cognitive measures

Working memory. Performance on each of the working memory tasks was scored as the mean proportion of correct responses across all trials in the task. This is presented in [Figure 13](#) for each task and age group. Age differences are formally analysed as part of the subsequent section examining sequence length, but it is clear that performance improves with age in each task. There is also substantial variation in performance




Figure 9. Bar chart of negative-reciprocal Root Mean Squared Error (RMSE) by age-group, condition and speed for Tracking task. Error bars denote SD. Note: Higher score = increased accuracy.




Figure 10. Negative-reciprocal total response time (TRT) by age-group and condition for Aiming task. Error bars denote SD and grey points denote individual children. Note: Lower score = faster responses.




Figure 11. Negative-reciprocal penalised path accuracy (pPA) by age-group and condition for Steering task. Error bars denote SD and grey points denote individual children. Note: Lower score = increased accuracy.




Figure 12. Scatterplots and correlations (Pearson's correlation coefficients) illustrating the relationship between the three sensorimotor tasks (N=15,817).




Figure 13. Mean proportion correct (and SD) in each working memory task and age group. Grey points denote individual children.

within each age group, as indicated by the large SDs and spread of individual data points. Finally, the tasks themselves differ in performance levels, with FDR generally superior to Corsi. As befitting its status as a complex WM task, recall accuracy was lowest in BDR, even though this measure used a shorter range of sequence lengths.

Sequence length: Performance was then examined as a function of sequence length, with mean performance for each task and age group illustrated in Figure 14. A set of 4x4 mixed ANOVAs were carried out on each cognitive task, with sequence length as the within-subjects factor and age group as the between-subjects factor. For all three tasks, this revealed significant effects (at $p < .001$) of age group ($\eta_p^2 = \text{FDR } .03, \text{BDR } .05, \text{Corsi } .05$), sequence length ($\eta_p^2 = \text{FDR } .44, \text{BDR } .28, \text{Corsi } .27$) and the age group x sequence length interaction ($\eta_p^2 = .01$ for all tasks). Thus, recall performance improved with age, and declined with sequence length, for all measures. Comparisons (Bonferroni-corrected) revealed that all age groups differed from each other at all lengths, with the exception of the FDR task, where there were no significant age differences at length 3 after correction, or between age 9 and 10 at certain sequence lengths in each task ($p > .05$). In general, age group effects were somewhat attenuated at the shortest sequence length for each task, indicating the higher performance levels at the easiest level of each task, and manifesting in the age group x sequence length interactions that were observed.

Inhibition (Flanker). The inhibition task data were first trimmed by removing any reaction time that fell >3 SD above the mean across all participants and conditions. We also removed any

child who achieved less than .25 correct across all trials. This resulted in the exclusion of 110 children from the sample, leaving $N = 14,425$.

Mean proportion correct and reaction time for correct responses are illustrated in Figure 15a and 15b, respectively. As expected, accuracy was typically very high on this task. One-way ANOVAs on each of these outcomes indicated that accuracy and response speed improved with age ($p < .001$), with comparisons showing significant differences ($p < .05$) between all age groups (apart from age 9 and 10 in RT).

The primary outcome of interest on this task is the difference between RTs on congruent and incongruent trials (RT congruency effect), although we also investigated differences in accuracy between congruent and incongruent trials (accuracy congruency effect). Overall, responses were more accurate (proportion correct difference = .05, $SE = .001$) and faster (mean RT difference = 199ms, $SE = 2.81$) for congruent trials. This is plotted, by age group, in Figure 15, for accuracy (c) and reaction time (d). One-way ANOVAs showed that the congruency effect on each of these outcome measures decreased with age ($p < .001$); further comparisons showed significant differences ($p < .05$) for both measures between all age groups apart from age 9 and 10.

Processing speed. The processing speed task data was trimmed by removing any reaction time that fell >3 SD above the mean across all participants. Mean proportion correct, and reaction time for correct responses are illustrated in Figure 16. The primary outcome variable of interest on this measure




Figure 14. Mean proportion correct (and SD) in each working memory task and age group, separated by sequence length. Grey points denote individual children.




Figure 15. Mean proportion correct (A) and reaction time (B) in the Inhibition task (with SD). (C) (accuracy) and (D) (reaction time) display the mean difference between congruent and incongruent trial types.

is reaction time to correct trials, although we also measured accuracy which was, as expected, typically very high. A one-way ANOVA on each outcome variable indicated significant age group effects in each case ($p < .001$); comparisons indicated all age groups significantly differed from each other ($p < .05$), with only two exceptions (on proportion correct, 7–8 years, and 9–10 years).

Relationships across cognitive tasks. Correlational analysis was carried out to examine the relationship between performance on different tasks. These were not corrected for age, though partial correlations controlling for age showed the same pattern of outcomes. Figure 17 shows the interrelationships between FDR, BDR, and Corsi. Positive correlations (significant at $p < .001$) are apparent between all measures.

A composite working memory score was then developed (using the multicon package in R) to examine the relationship with the reaction time outcomes from the inhibition and processing speed tasks. Figure 18 indicates a significant negative relationship ($p < .001$ for all outcomes) between working memory and inhibition RT, the inhibition congruent-incongruent RT difference, and processing speed RT.

Discussion

In collecting data on the sensorimotor and cognitive performance from over 6,200 children participating in the Born in Bradford cohort, and a further 9,500 of their classmates, the Growing Up in Bradford project has succeeded in obtaining objective measures of these important aspects of cognitive and motoric functioning at a critical stage in children’s




Figure 16. Mean proportion correct and reaction time in the processed speed task (with SD).




Figure 17. Scatterplots and correlations (Pearson’s R) illustrating the relationship between the three working memory measures (N=14,962).




Figure 18. Scatterplots and correlations (Pearson's R) illustrating the relationship between the working memory composite score, and reaction time outcomes for the inhibition and processing speed tasks (N=13,522).

development. This initial paper established the methodological details of this data collection and illustrated that performance on all the assessments showed the changes one would expect in response to age and task difficulty. The predicted associations between tests of related sensorimotor functions, or cognitive abilities, were also observed. Furthermore, while these cross-sectional comparisons fit with the established literature on age-relevant cognitive and sensorimotor development, they also demonstrated heterogeneity within age groups. Indeed, it was apparent that within age-group variation was much larger than between age-group variation, particularly for certain tasks (e.g., working memory). This highlights the need to consider the profile of individual children in studying cognitive and sensorimotor development. It also demonstrates the challenges faced by teachers who may have children within a class that have, for example, a WM ability equivalent to a child several years younger through to several years older than the average age of the class.

Sensorimotor tasks

The present analyses report findings that are consistent with our initial hypotheses and previous work conducted by [Flatters et al. \(2014\)](#), who also found that with increasing age performance across all three tasks *increased*, whilst increasing task difficulty *decreased* performance across all three tasks.

Specifically, previous work has demonstrated a significant three-way interaction between age, speed and condition for tracking ([Flatters et al., 2014](#)). Similar to our own findings, they also found that the benefit of slower target speed was greater with increasing age. When the target was moving at the fastest speed, age-related differences were still found but to a lesser extent than at the slower target speeds. This concurs with the view that increasing target speed is believed to influence shift away from feed *back* to feed *forward* control mechanisms for guiding action, which places increased reliance on predicting future target trajectory rather than using available online visual feedback; a more complex skill ([Ao et al., 2015](#); [van Roon et al., 2008](#); [Wolpert & Kawato, 1998](#)). In this

context, the benefits to be gained from providing additional visual feedback in the guide condition might be somewhat undermined by the need to process this additional information in a timely manner, leading to more reliance on feedforward responses.

Findings from the Aiming task were generally consistent with [Flatters et al. \(2014\)](#), who also found reduced age-related effects within the Jump trials. However, they did not find a significant interaction. Speculating on why such an interaction may have arisen in this dataset, it is instructive to note that whilst children possess the ability to produce on-line corrective movements from around eight years this is not believed to be fully automated until late childhood ([Mackrous & Proteau, 2016](#); [Wilson & Hyde, 2013](#)). Therefore, our data is likely reflective of both typical corrective aiming movement showing improvement across this specific age range, but at a slower rate for, more challenging, corrective movements. It would certainly be of interest in future research to see if these rates of improvement reversed, with further increases in typical aiming movement plateauing, whilst the capacity to make corrective movement continued to mature later into adolescence.

The Steering task (previously referred to as “Tracing” in [Flatters et al., 2014](#)), showed a significant main effect of condition which had not been found in previous study. However, a potential explanation for this difference is the slight adaptation of the task for use in the Primary School Years data collection. In previous use, six trials were included within this task, alternating between Path A and Path B. However, the current version of the task was truncated to include only one trial for each task to reduce administration time, which could explain this discrepancy. Path A performance was significantly greater than Path B however the effect size was minimal which should also be considered. Additionally, Path B is identical to Path A in its proportions, with the only difference being that the path is flipped along its horizontal plane. Therefore, in Path B but not A it is partially occluded from view by the participants’ own hand for right-handed participants. The lack of this additional visual information could explain significantly

poorer performance in this condition, albeit a difference of negligible magnitude. Further support of this hypothesis comes from findings from the Tracking task, where task performance is compromised when the visual guide is not provided.

Lastly, it was found that performance across all three CKAT tasks were significantly related. These relationships were found to be largest between the Tracking and Steering tasks. Whilst each CKAT task measures a distinct sensorimotor skill, this corroborates previous research that has found a reasonable degree of correlation between sub-tests on other standardised assessments of sensorimotor skill, such as the MABC-2 and the DCD-Q'07 (Ellinoudis *et al.*, 2011; Parmar *et al.*, 2014).

Cognitive tasks

Across all measures, the cognitive battery produced outcomes that were in line with the starting hypotheses. Firstly, age differences were apparent throughout, with children improving with age on accuracy and (where relevant) response speed on all tasks. These results were in line with established developmental changes in working memory and executive function (Diamond, 2013; Gathercole, 1999). The data also revealed that within-group variation was much larger than between-group variation, particularly for the working memory tasks. Subsequent papers will analyse these patterns in more detail. Indeed, this large within-group variation is still seen when the data are grouped by age in months. This suggests that individual differences need to be considered within the context of age-related improvements.

Sequence length effects were observed within each working memory task, and these were consistent across the different age groups, indicating that these measures were effective in capturing the limited capacity of working memory. Recall accuracy was also somewhat lower in BDR, relative to FDR or Corsi (even though BDR used a shorter set of lengths), reflecting the more difficult and processing-intensive nature of this task. Finally, for the inhibition (Flanker) task, significant congruency effects were observed in both reaction time and accuracy, indicating that the task was effective in indexing the greater executive cost of responding to a visual stimulus in the presence of incongruent flanker items. Furthermore, this cost decreased from the younger to older children, in line with age-related development in executive function.

The predicted positive interrelationships were observed between the three working memory measures, which remained after controlling for age, with some indication of a closer positive relationship between FDR and BDR. These patterns are likely to reflect a combination of shared and separable components operating within and across domains in working memory. Working memory performance was also related to inhibition and processing speed, including a moderate but still highly significant correlation between the working memory composite score and the magnitude of the inhibition congruency effect.

Applications, strengths and limitations

In the context of the Growing up in Bradford study, these measures are particularly valuable because, for BiB participants, they can be linked with contemporaneous data that has also

been collected regarding their social and emotional wellbeing, growth, adiposity, and cardiometabolic health (Bird *et al.*, 2019). Longitudinally, there is also the capacity to link these cross-sectional data with data at earlier time points from BiB participants. This includes biological samples and maternal and paternal questionnaire responses collected at baseline (Wright *et al.*, 2013), routine health (Bishop *et al.*, 2018) and educational data (Pettinger *et al.*, 2020) that the cohort has permission to access, and further data collected from sub-samples of the cohort as part of nested research projects (e.g. the BiB-1000 sub-cohort, see Bryant *et al.*, 2013). Repeated measurement of cognition and sensorimotor ability in adolescence is also being planned as part of the next phase of data collection within the cohort. Further, the sensorimotor data reported here can be linked with the sensorimotor data collected when the children were 4–5 years old, within the Starting Schools project (see Shire *et al.*, 2020). Altogether this represents a rich set of data on children's health, wellbeing and development that is an invaluable resource for future research. It will allow closer consideration of how participating children's sensorimotor control and cognitive abilities integrate, influence, and are influenced by other factors in the course of their development.

The scale and objectivity of these assessments represent a strength of this work. In particular, the use of precise, computerised assessments methods to measure children's sensorimotor control at different time points are unique to the BiB cohort. Whilst other birth cohorts have attempted to assess their participant's motor function, this is typically only captured via more subjective parental reports, collected at a much earlier age, reporting on when children accomplish specific gross motor milestones, such as in the Millenium Cohort Study (see Kelly *et al.*, 2006). The Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC) is the only other birth cohort study we are aware of to attempt a brief standardised assessment of motor function, even then only doing so at single time point in development, 7–8 years of age (Lingam *et al.*, 2010).

In demonstrating the capacity to undertake relatively brief, laboratory quality, objective measures of cognition and sensorimotor control within a community setting (i.e. over eighty schools across four years), and feedback the results of these assessments to teachers in a timely and informative fashion, this project also demonstrates the potential applied value of using such assessments at scale within health and education services. For example, the data collected here on cognitive and sensorimotor functioning will be important for identifying children who show deficits in these core developmental constructs, and who will therefore be at risk for educational underachievement and poorer longer-term outcomes. Fine motor skills can be improved by training (Sugden *et al.*, 2013), and poor cognitive ability can be mitigated by appropriate classroom support (Gathercole & Alloway, 2008). Thus, these data, and the assessment tools developed for use within this cohort to collect them, can help to inform subsequent interventions that aim to improve the long-term physical and mental health outcomes for children.

However, it should also be acknowledged that neither the specific cognitive nor sensorimotor assessments used here constitute a comprehensive of either of these broad constructs.

Collecting large-scale data via school-based assessment meant we were operating under tight time constraints. As such, we selected tasks that represent fundamental sensorimotor and cognitive constructs with a strong body of evidence linking them to key outcomes. Additional nested projects are planned within the BiB cohort to supplement the data presented here. Further, via Connected Bradford, we can link data to school records, including measures of language, literacy and physical literacy (e.g., phonics, EAL status, reading attainment, gross motor skills).

In summary, the collection of objective computerised measures of a range of cognitive and sensorimotor functions at 7–10 years of age in over 15,500 children has created a comprehensive dataset that can be used to answer more specific questions about the development of these constructs, and can facilitate future studies of the relationship between cognition and motor function. These data also have real world applications, such as identifying children within the education system in need of additional support, and providing teachers with feedback on individual children to enable schools to make informed decisions about how to best tailor their approach to supporting individual learners. In particular, in collecting these measures on over 6,200 participants in the Born in Bradford study, the project also greatly enriches the longitudinal dataset available on the participants involved in this birth cohort study. This will help build a deeper understanding of the complex relationships between cognition, sensorimotor ability and other key aspects of childhood development.

Data availability

Underlying data

Scientists are encouraged to make use of the BiB data, which are available through a system of managed open access.

Before you contact BiB, please make sure you have read our [Guidance for Collaborators](#). Our BiB executive review proposals

on a monthly basis and we will endeavour to respond to your request as soon as possible. You can find out about all of the different datasets which are available [here](#). If you are unsure if we have the data that you need please contact a member of the BiB team (borninbradford@bthft.nhs.uk).

Once you have formulated your request please complete the ‘Expression of Interest’ form available [here](#) and email the BiB research team (borninbradford@bthft.nhs.uk).

If your request is approved, we will ask you to sign a [collaboration agreement](#); if your request involves biological samples, we will ask you to complete a [material transfer agreement](#).

Extended data

Open Science Framework: Markdown report containing explanation of how to derive the sensorimotor variables from the raw CKAT output. <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/TSVX6> (Shire, 2020).

Extended data are available under the terms of the [Creative Commons Zero “No rights reserved” data waiver](#) (CC0 1.0 Public domain dedication).

Acknowledgements

Born in Bradford is only possible because of the enthusiasm and commitment of the Children and Parents in BiB. We are grateful to all the participants, teachers, school staff, health professionals and researchers who have made Born in Bradford happen. Thanks to Liz Andrews for all her help in coordinating the research, and to Sameera Ali and the BiB Research Assistants for their help with data collection. We would also like to acknowledge the work of Amber Seddon in helping to format and prepare the final manuscript for submission.

References

Ahmed SF, Tang S, Waters NE, *et al.*: **Executive function and academic achievement: Longitudinal relations from early childhood to adolescence.** *J Educ Psychol.* 2019; **111**(3): 446–458.

[Publisher Full Text](#)

Alloway TP, Alloway RG, Wootan S: **Home sweet home: Does where you live matter to working memory and other cognitive skills?** *J Exp Child Psychol.* 2014; **124**: 124–131.

[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)

Alloway TP, Archibald L: **Working Memory and Learning in Children With Developmental Coordination Disorder and Specific Language Impairment.** *J Learn Disabil.* 2008; **41**(3): 251–262.

[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)

Alloway TP, Gathercole SE, Kirkwood H, *et al.*: **The Cognitive and Behavioral Characteristics of Children with Low Working Memory.** *Child Dev.* 2009; **80**(2): 606–621.

[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)

Alloway TP, Gathercole SE, Pickering SJ: **Verbal and visuospatial short-term and working memory in children: Are they separable?** *Child Dev.* 2006; **77**(6): 1698–716.

[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)

Anders TR, Lillyquist TD: **Retrieval time in forward and backward recall.** *Psychon Sci.* 1971; **22**: 205–206.

[Publisher Full Text](#)

Ao D, Song R, Tong KY: **Sensorimotor Control of Tracking Movements at Various Speeds for Stroke Patients as Well as Age-Matched and Young Healthy Subjects.** *PLoS One.* 2015; **10**(6): e0128328.

[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)

Augustijn MJCM, Deconinck FJA, D’Hondt E, *et al.*: **Reduced motor competence in children with obesity is associated with structural differences in the cerebellar peduncles.** *Brain Imaging Behav.* 2018; **12**(4): 1000–1010.

[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)

Baddeley AD, Hitch GJ, Allen RJ, *et al.*: **A multicomponent model of working memory.** In R.H. Logie, V. Camos, & N. Cowan (Eds). *Working memory: State-of-the-science.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2021.

[Publisher Full Text](#)

Beneventi H, Tønnessen FE, Erslund L, *et al.*: **Working Memory Deficit in Dyslexia: Behavioral and fMRI Evidence.** *Int J Neurosci.* 2010; **120**(1): 51–59.

[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)

Berry ED, Allen RJ, Mon-Williams M, *et al.*: **Cognitive offloading: structuring the environment to improve children’s working memory task**

- performance. *Cogn sci.* 2019; **43**(8): e12770.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Berry EDJ, Waterman AH, Baddeley AD, et al.: **The limits of visual working memory in children: Exploring prioritization and recency effects with sequential presentation.** *Dev Psychol.* 2018; **54**(2): 240–253.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Bird PK, McEachan RRC, Mon-Williams M, et al.: **Growing up in Bradford: protocol for the age 7-11 follow up of the Born in Bradford birth cohort.** *BMC Public Health.* 2019; **19**(1): 939.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Bishop CF, Small N, Parslow R, et al.: **Healthcare use for children with complex needs: using routine health data linked to a multiethnic, ongoing birth cohort.** *BMJ Open.* 2018; **8**(3): e018419.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Blair C, Razza RP: **Relating effortful control, executive function, and false belief understanding to emerging math and literacy ability in kindergarten.** *Child Dev.* 2007; **78**(2): 647–663.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Blakey E, Carroll DJ: **A Short Executive Function Training Program Improves Preschoolers' Working Memory.** *Front Psychol.* 2015; **6**: 1827.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Blakey E, Matthews D, Cragg L, et al.: **The Role of Executive Functions in Socioeconomic Attainment Gaps: Results From a Randomized Controlled Trial.** *Child Dev.* 2020; **91**(5): 1594–1614.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Bryant M, Santorelli G, Fairley L, et al.: **Design and characteristics of a new birth cohort, to study the early origins and ethnic variation of childhood obesity: the BiB1000 study.** *Longit Life Course Stud.* 2013; **4**(2): 119–135.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Cameron CE, Brock LL, Murrah WM, et al.: **Fine Motor Skills and Executive Function Both Contribute to Kindergarten Achievement.** *Child Dev.* 2012; **83**(4): 1229–1244.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Cowan N: **An Embedded-Processes Model of working memory.** In: A. Miyake & P. Shah (Eds.), *Models of working memory: Mechanisms of active maintenance and executive control.* Cambridge University Press. 1999; 62–101.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Cowan N: **The magical number 4 in short-term memory: A reconsideration of mental storage capacity.** *Behav Brain Sci.* 2001; **24**(1): 87–114.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Cragg L, Richardson S, Hubber PJ, et al.: **When is working memory important for arithmetic? The impact of strategy and age.** *PLoS One.* 2017; **12**(12): e0188693.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Culmer PR, Levesley MC, Mon-Williams M, et al.: **A new tool for assessing human movement: The Kinematic Assessment Tool.** *J Neurosci Methods.* 2009; **184**(1): 184–192.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Cunningham AC, Fung W, Massey TH, et al.: **Movement Disorder Phenotypes in Children With 22q11.2 Deletion Syndrome.** *Mov Disord.* 2020; **35**(7): 1272–1274.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Cunningham AC, Hill L, Mon-Williams M, et al.: **Using kinematic analyses to explore sensorimotor control impairments in children with 22q11.2 deletion syndrome.** *J Neurodev Disord.* 2019; **11**(1): 8.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Diamond A: **Executive Functions.** *Annu Rev Psychol.* 2013; **64**: 135–168.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Diamond A, Taylor C: **Development of an aspect of executive control: Development of the abilities to remember what I said and to "Do as I say, not as I do".** *Dev Psychobiol.* 1996; **29**(4): 315–334.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Dickerson Mayes S, Calhoun SL: **Learning, Attention, Writing, and Processing Speed in Typical Children and Children with ADHD, Autism, Anxiety, Depression, and Oppositional-Defiant Disorder.** *Child Neuropsychol.* 2007; **13**(6): 469–493.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Durston S, Thomas KM, Yang Y, et al.: **A neural basis for the development of inhibitory control.** *Developmental Science.* 2002; **5**(4): F9–F16.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- D'Souza H, Cowie D, Karmiloff-Smith A, et al.: **Specialization of the motor system in infancy: from broad tuning to selectively specialized purposeful actions.** *Dev Sci.* 2017; **20**(4): e12409.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Ellinoudis T, Evaggelidou C, Kourtessis T, et al.: **Reliability and validity of age band 1 of the Movement Assessment Battery for Children—Second Edition.** *Res Dev Disabil.* 2011; **32**(3): 1046–1051.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Eriksen BA, Eriksen CW: **Effects of noise letters upon the identification of a target letter in a nonsearch task.** *Perception & Psychophysics.* 1974; **1**(1): 143–149.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Eriksen CW, Schultz DW: **Information processing in visual search: A continuous flow conception and experimental results.** *Percept Psychophys.* 1979; **25**(4): 249–263.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Flatters I, Hill LJ, Williams JH, et al.: **Manual control age and sex differences in 4 to 11 year old children.** *PLoS One.* 2014; **9**(2): e88692.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Fry A, Hale S: **Processing Speed, Working Memory, and Fluid Intelligence: Evidence for a Developmental Cascade.** *Psychological Science.* 1996; **7**(4): 237–241.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Gathercole SE: **Cognitive approaches to the development of short-term memory.** *Trends Cogn Sci.* 1999; **3**(11): 410–419.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Gathercole S, Alloway TP: **Working memory and learning: A practical guide for teachers.** Sage. 2008.
[Reference Source](#)
- Gathercole SE, Durling E, Evans M, et al.: **Working memory abilities and children's performance in laboratory analogues of classroom activities.** *Applied Cognitive Psychology: The Official Journal of the Society for Applied Research in Memory and Cognition.* 2008; **22**(8): 1019–1037.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Gathercole SE, Pickering SJ, Ambridge B, et al.: **The Structure of Working Memory From 4 to 15 Years of Age.** *Dev Psychol.* 2004; **40**(2): 177–190.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Geary DC: **Cognitive predictors of achievement growth in mathematics: A 5-year longitudinal study.** *Dev Psychol.* 2011; **47**(6): 1539–1552.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Geary DC, Brown SC: **Cognitive addition: Strategy choice and speed-of-processing differences in gifted, normal, and mathematically disabled children.** *Developmental Psychology.* 1991; **27**(3): 787–797.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Giles OT, Shire KA, Hill LJB, et al.: **Hitting the Target: Mathematical Attainment in Children Is Related to Interceptive-Timing Ability.** *Psychol Sci.* 2018; **29**(8): 1334–1345.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Gordon R, Smith-Spark JH, Newton EJ, et al.: **Executive Function and Academic Achievement in Primary School Children: The Use of Task-Related Processing Speed.** *Front Psychol.* 2018; **9**: 582.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Gottwald JM, Achermann S, Marciszko C, et al.: **An Embodied Account of Early Executive-Function Development.** *Psychol Sci.* 2016; **27**(12): 1600–1610.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Goyen TA, Lui K, Hummell J: **Sensorimotor skills associated with motor dysfunction in children born extremely preterm.** *Early Hum Dev.* 2011; **87**(7): 489–493.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Harrowell I, Hollén L, Lingam R, et al.: **Mental health outcomes of developmental coordination disorder in late adolescence.** *Dev Med Child Neurol.* 2017; **59**(9): 973–979.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Hill LJB, Mushtaq F, O'Neill L, et al.: **The relationship between manual coordination and mental health.** *Eur Child Adolesc Psychiatry.* 2016; **25**(3): 283–295.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Holmes J, Adams JW: **Working Memory and Children's Mathematical Skills: Implications for mathematical development and mathematics curricula.** *Educational Psychology.* 2006; **26**(3): 339–366.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- James KH: **The Importance of Handwriting Experience on the Development of the Literate Brain.** *Current Directions in Psychological Science.* 2017; **26**(6): 502–508.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Kail R: **Developmental change in speed of processing during childhood and adolescence.** *Psychol Bull.* 1991; **109**(3): 490–501.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Kail RV, Ferrer E: **Processing Speed in Childhood and Adolescence: Longitudinal Models for Examining Developmental Change.** *Child Dev.* 2007; **78**(6): 1760–1770.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Kail R, Hall LK: **Processing speed, naming speed, and reading.** *Developmental Psychology.* 1994; **30**(6): 949–954.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Kail R, Salthouse TA: **Processing Speed as a mental capacity.** *Acta Psychol (Amst).* 1994; **86**(2–3): 199–225.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Kelly Y, Sacker A, Schoon I, et al.: **Ethnic differences in achievement of developmental milestones by 9 months of age: The Millennium Cohort Study.** *Dev Med Child Neurol.* 2006; **48**(10): 825–30.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Kieffer MJ, Vukovic RK, Berry D: **Roles of Attention Shifting and Inhibitory Control in Fourth-Grade Reading Comprehension.** *Read Res Q.* 2013; **48**(4): 333–348.
[Publisher Full Text](#)

- Krakauer JW, Mazzoni P: **Human sensorimotor learning: adaptation, skill, and beyond.** *Curr Opin Neurobiol.* 2011; **21**(4): 636–644.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Kwan MYW, King-Dowling S, Hay JA, *et al.*: **Longitudinal examination of objectively-measured physical activity and sedentary time among children with and without significant movement impairments.** *Hum Mov Sci.* 2016; **47**: 159–165.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Latash M: **Fundamentals of Motor Control.** Academic Press; Illustrated edition. 2012.
[Reference Source](#)
- LeBarton ES, Goldin-Meadow S, Raudenbush S: **Experimentally-Induced Increases in Early Gesture Lead to Increases in Spoken Vocabulary.** *J Cogn Dev.* 2015; **16**(2): 199–220.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Lee K, Ng SF, Bull R, *et al.*: **Are patterns important? An investigation of the relationships between proficiencies in patterns, computation, executive functioning, and algebraic word problems.** *J Educ Psychol.* 2011; **103**(2): 269–281.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Leonard HC: **The Impact of Poor Motor Skills on Perceptual, Social and Cognitive Development: The Case of Developmental Coordination Disorder.** *Front Psychol.* 2016; **7**: 311.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Lingam R, Golding J, Jongmans MJ, *et al.*: **The Association Between Developmental Coordination Disorder and Other Developmental Traits.** *Pediatrics.* 2010; **126**(5): e1109–e1118.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Lingam R, Jongmans MJ, Ellis M, *et al.*: **Mental Health Difficulties in Children With Developmental Coordination Disorder.** *Pediatrics.* 2012; **129**(4): e882–e891.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Lobier M, Dubois M, Valdois S: **The Role of Visual Processing Speed in Reading Speed Development.** *PLoS One.* 2013; **8**(4): e58097.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Mackrout I, Proteau L: **Visual online control of goal-directed aiming movements in children.** *Front Psychol.* 2016; **7**: 989.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Marmot M, Bell R: **Fair society, healthy lives.** *Public Health.* 2012; **126**(Suppl 1): S4–S10.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Marteau TM, Hall PA: **Breadlines, Brains, and Behaviour.** *BMJ.* 2013; **347**: f6750.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Martinussen R, Hayden J, Hogg-Johnson S, *et al.*: **A Meta-Analysis of Working Memory Impairments in Children with Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder.** *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry.* 2005; **44**(4): 377–384.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- McQuade JD, Murray-Close D, Shoulberg EK, *et al.*: **Working memory and social functioning in children.** *J Exp Child Psychol.* 2013; **115**(3): 422–435.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Miller LT, Missiuna CA, MacNab JJ, *et al.*: **Clinical description of children with developmental coordination disorder.** *Can J Occup Ther.* 2001; **68**(1): 5–15.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Moffitt TE, Arseneault L, Belsky D, *et al.*: **A gradient of childhood self-control predicts health, wealth, and public safety.** *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2011; **108**(7): 2693–2698.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Monette S, Bigras M, Guay MC: **The role of the executive functions in school achievement at the end of Grade 1.** *J Exp Child Psychol.* 2011; **109**(2): 158–173.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Mulder H, Pitchford NJ, Marlow N: **Processing speed and working memory underlie academic attainment in very preterm children.** *Arch Dis Child Fetal Neonatal Ed.* 2010; **95**(4): F267–F272.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Mullane JC, Corkum PV, Klein RM, *et al.*: **Interference Control in Children with and without ADHD: A Systematic Review of Flanker and Simon Task Performance.** *Child Neuropsychol.* 2009; **15**(4): 321–342.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Office of National Statistics: **Estimates of the population for the UK England and Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland [dataset].** 2019.
[Reference Source](#)
- Parmar A, Kwan M, Rodriguez C, *et al.*: **Psychometric properties of the CCD-Q-07 in children ages to 4–6.** *Res Dev Disabil.* 2014; **35**(2): 330–339.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Peirce JW: **PsychoPy—psychophysics software in Python.** *J Neurosci Methods.* 2007; **162**(1–2): 8–13.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Pettinger KJ, Kelly B, Sheldon TA, *et al.*: **Starting school: educational development as a function of age of entry and prematurity.** *Arch Dis Child.* 2020; **105**(2): 160–165.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Piaget J: **The origins of intelligence in children.** New York: International Universities Press. 1952.
[Reference Source](#)
- Pieters S, De Block K, Scheiris J, *et al.*: **How common are motor problems in children with a developmental disorder: rule or exception?** *Child Care Health Dev.* 2012; **38**(1): 139–145.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Prunty MM, Barnett AL, Wilmut K, *et al.*: **Handwriting speed in children with Developmental Coordination Disorder: Are they really slower?** *Res Dev Disabil.* 2013; **34**(9): 2927–2936.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Raw RK, Kountouriotis GK, Mon-Williams M, *et al.*: **Movement control in older adults: does old age mean middle of the road?** *J Exp Psychol Hum Percept Perform.* 2012; **38**(3): 735–745.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Roberts RJ, Pennington BF: **An interactive framework for examining prefrontal cognitive processes.** *Developmental Neuropsychology.* 1996; **12**(1): 105–126.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Rohde TE, Thompson LA: **Predicting academic achievement with cognitive ability.** *Intelligence.* 2007; **35**(1): 83–92.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Rueda MR, Posner MI, Rothbart MK: **The development of executive attention: contributions to the emergence of self-regulation.** *Dev Neuropsychol.* 2005; **28**(2): 573–594.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Senn TE, Espy KA, Kaufmann PM: **Using Path Analysis to Understand Executive Function Organization in Preschool Children.** *Dev Neuropsychol.* 2004; **26**(1): 445–464.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Shire K: **Markdown report containing explanation of how to derive the sensorimotor variables from the raw CKAT output.** 2020.
<http://www.doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/TSVX6>
- Shire K, Andrews E, Barber S, *et al.*: **Starting School: a large-scale start of school assessment within the 'Born in Bradford' longitudinal cohort [version 1; peer review: 1 approved, 1 approved with reservations].** *Wellcome Open Res.* 2020; **5**: 47.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Smith-Spark JH, Fisk E: **Working memory functioning in developmental dyslexia.** *Memory.* 2007; **15**(1): 34–56.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Snapp-Childs W, Casserly E, Mon-Williams M, *et al.*: **Active Prospective Control Is Required for Effective Sensorimotor Learning.** *PLoS One.* 2013; **8**(10): e77609.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Stautz K, Pechey R, Couturier DL, *et al.*: **Do Executive Function and Impulsivity Predict Adolescent Health Behaviour after Accounting for Intelligence? Findings from the ALSPAC Cohort.** *PLoS One.* 2016; **11**(8): e0160512.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Sugden D, Wade MG, Hart H: **Typical and atypical motor development.** London: Mac Keith Press. 2013.
[Reference Source](#)
- Swanson HL, Howard CB, Saez L: **Do Different Components of Working Memory Underlie Different Subgroups of Reading Disabilities?** *J Learn Disabil.* 2006; **39**(3): 252–269.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Szucs D, Devine A, Soltesz F, *et al.*: **Developmental dyscalculia is related to visuo-spatial memory and inhibition impairment.** *Cortex.* 2013; **49**(10): 2674–2688.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- The English Indices of Deprivation: Statistical release – main findings.** 2019.
[Reference Source](#)
- Tresilian J: **Sensorimotor control and learning: An introduction to the behavioral neuroscience of action.** Palgrave Macmillan. 2012.
[Reference Source](#)
- Van Roon D, Caeyenberghs K, Swinnen SP, *et al.*: **Development of Feedforward Control in a Dynamic Manual Tracking Task.** *Child Dev.* 2008; **79**(4): 852–865.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- von Hofsten C: **An action perspective on motor development.** *Trends Cogn Sci.* 2004; **8**(6): 266–272.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Wang TN, Tseng MH, Wilson BN, *et al.*: **Functional performance of children with developmental coordination disorder at home and at school.** *Dev Med Child Neurol.* 2009; **51**(10): 817–825.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Waterman AH, Atkinson AL, Aslam SS, *et al.*: **Do actions speak louder than words? Examining children's ability to follow instructions.** *Mem Cognit.* 2017; **45**(6): 877–890.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Weiler MD, Forbes P, Kirkwood M, *et al.*: **The developmental course of processing speed in children with and without learning disabilities.** *J Exp Child Psychol.* 2003; **85**(2): 178–194.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)

Williams BR, Ponesse JS, Schachar RJ, *et al.*: **Development of inhibitory control across the life span.** *Dev Psychol.* 1999; **35**(1): 205–213.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)

Wilson PH, Hyde C: **The development of rapid online control in children aged 6–12 years: Reaching performance.** *Hum Mov Sci.* 2013; **32**(5): 1138–1150.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)

Wolpert DM, Kawato M: **Multiple paired forward and inverse models for motor control.** *Neural Netw.* 1998; **11**(7–8): 1317–1329.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)

Wright J, Small N, Raynor P, *et al.*: **Cohort Profile: the Born in Bradford multi-ethnic family cohort study.** *Int J Epidemiol.* 2013; **42**(4): 978–991.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)

Yang TX, Allen RJ, Holmes J, *et al.*: **Impaired memory for instructions in**

children with attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder is improved by action at presentation and recall. *Front Psychol.* 2017; **8**: 39.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)

Yuan L, Xu TL, Yu C, *et al.*: **Sustained visual attention is more than seeing.** *J Exp Child Psychol.* 2019; **179**: 324–336.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)

Yu C, Smith LB: **Hand-Eye Coordination Predicts Joint Attention.** *Child Dev.* 2017; **88**(6): 2060–2078.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)

Zwicker JG, Harris SR, Klassen AF: **Quality of life domains affected in children with developmental coordination disorder: a systematic review.** *Child: Care, Health and Development.* 2013; **39**(4): 562–580.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)

Open Peer Review

Current Peer Review Status: ? ✓ ✓ ✓

Version 2

Reviewer Report 20 September 2023

<https://doi.org/10.21956/wellcomeopenres.19546.r58758>

© 2023 Rhodes S. This is an open access peer review report distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.



Sinead Rhodes

The University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK

This study reports on an important area of focus namely cognitive development during childhood. The findings build on previous reports from other studies that highlight the issue of within age variability in cognitive development especially working memory.

The large sample size and opt-out recruitment approach is a clear strength of the study. It would be good to hear of further information about the recruitment in relation to SEND characteristics. It is estimated that 15-20% of children are neurodivergent. Did the researchers include any assessment of this? Is their sample a mixed typical and SEND sample? It seems that some neurodivergent children may be excluded due to teacher report but it is not clear as to how systematic this was.

The interpretation of findings is very clear and has important implications for understanding and supporting children with age-inappropriate cognitive development.

Is the work clearly and accurately presented and does it cite the current literature?

Yes

Is the study design appropriate and is the work technically sound?

Yes

Are sufficient details of methods and analysis provided to allow replication by others?

Yes

If applicable, is the statistical analysis and its interpretation appropriate?

Yes

Are all the source data underlying the results available to ensure full reproducibility?

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the results?

Yes

Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.**Reviewer Expertise:** Cognitive development**I confirm that I have read this submission and believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to confirm that it is of an acceptable scientific standard.**

Reviewer Report 20 September 2023

<https://doi.org/10.21956/wellcomeopenres.19546.r57687>

© 2023 **Kampouri M.** This is an open access peer review report distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

**Mariza Kampouri** 

Karolinska Institutet, Solna, Sweden

The aim of the study was to report on results of neuropsychological assessment (cognitive and sensorimotor function) at 7–11-year-olds in the BiB longitudinal birth cohort study.

This article comprehensively presents data on the sensory-motor and cognitive skills of a large cohort of children as part of an ongoing longitudinal study. The study involved over 15,000 children who underwent testing for sensory-motor skills, specifically tracking, aiming, and steering, as well as cognitive functions, including working memory, inhibition, and processing speed, through various tasks. The results indicate an age-related increase in all the assessed skills and support positive correlations between sensory-motor and cognitive measures. These findings are in line with established theories and consensus on neuropsychological development.

The article is well-written and engaging, providing valuable insights into neuropsychological development within a large population-based cohort study. Although it doesn't address a specific research gap, it serves as a detailed and informative reference for readers seeking to understand the neurodevelopmental data of the cohort.

The manuscript is comprehensive and detailed on the procedures that were followed. The analyses are straightforward and presented clearly. I have no further comments.

Is the work clearly and accurately presented and does it cite the current literature?

Yes

Is the study design appropriate and is the work technically sound?

Yes

Are sufficient details of methods and analysis provided to allow replication by others?

Yes

If applicable, is the statistical analysis and its interpretation appropriate?

Yes

Are all the source data underlying the results available to ensure full reproducibility?

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the results?

Yes

Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

Reviewer Expertise: Epidemiology; Psychology; Child health and development

I confirm that I have read this submission and believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to confirm that it is of an acceptable scientific standard.

Version 1

Reviewer Report 22 April 2021

<https://doi.org/10.21956/wellcomeopenres.18078.r43008>

© 2021 Tresilian J. This is an open access peer review report distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.



James Tresilian

Department of Psychology, University of Warwick, Coventry, UK

The manuscript reports on the methods and results of a cross-sectional study of sensorimotor and cognitive performance in over 15,000 primary school age children – a significant feat of data collection. The data are reported by age in years. The vast majority of the children were aged 7, 8 or 9 years, there were a relatively small number of 10 year olds (Table 1). All children were tested on the same battery of sensorimotor and cognitive tests and so the study provides a substantial data set concerning childrens' performance on these tests across the age range tested.

The sensorimotor data are a particularly important component of the data set. The computerized test battery that was used involved the collection of movement end-point position data at a suitably high sampling rate (I assume that these data will be available from the repository), allowing subsequent computation of movement speed, acceleration and other kinematic variables. This permits the fine grained analysis of the actual movement performance itself, rather than simply the outcome of the movement. The possibility of such fine grained analysis in such a large group is something few other studies can offer and so these data represent a significant resource in and of themselves. The additional cognitive performance data available for the whole

group and the genetic, social and geographical data for the Born in Bradford cohort group, makes this a truly unique resource with great potential, especially if followed through into adolescence as indicated in the manuscript.

The manuscript provides details concerning the data acquisition/testing procedures, the groups of children studied and the recruitment process together with a preliminary analysis of some main features of the data. As such it provides a useful and important starting point for future secondary data analysis work. Obviously, one could ask why some analyses were conducted and others not or why some analyses were more detailed and others less so. Given the aims of the study and the preliminary or indicative nature of the analysis, I think the choice of analyses is a reasonable one and this is not the time/place to quibble about perceived omissions. The authors appropriately comment on this in the discussion section (pages 18-19), though this comment would arguably be better placed in the introduction.

I have no doubt that this is a valuable report, I have a few specific and relatively minor comments that might help the authors improve the clarity of their exposition. I list these in order of occurrence below.

1. At the bottom of page 3 the authors make the claim that the sensorimotor tasks used are “representative of fundamental coordinative abilities”, these being tracking, aiming and steering. I was not sure about the validity of this claim. It seems that the claim amounts to saying that tracking, aiming and steering are fundamental coordinative abilities. On the face of it, this seems plausible mainly because aiming underlies many different kinds of activities from reaching to pick something up to playing sports and steering is fundamental to getting around in the world. However, the kind of steering assessed in the test task is not that kind of steering – the task was actually a kind of computer version of the pass a loop along a twisted piece of wire game, where a bell rings if you touch the wire with the loop. It doesn't have a lot to do with steering your way around the environment: indeed, the task was called ‘tracing’ in an earlier study, which is arguably a more accurate description of what it is. In addition, use of the term ‘coordination’ is unclear given that coordination per se doesn't seem to have been measured/assessed. I wouldn't want to argue that the skills underlying performance in these tasks aren't important ones – I'm sure they are – it's just that the task names ‘tracking’ and ‘steering’ don't accurately describe what went on. The tracking task involved following the path of a moving target and the steering task involved tracing a path. I think it would be helpful to the reader to make this clear.
2. In the same paragraph (p. 3) that aiming movements rely on “fast implementation of online corrections” in the production of “ballistic” responses. The term ‘ballistic’ refers to movements produced without any on-line corrections, so some kind of adjustment to the text is warranted here. The final sentence of the paragraph is also rather confusing, I wasn't sure what the authors were saying here and what the ‘timing constraints’ are. Some revision of this paragraph is, I think, needed.
3. On page 4 there is a short paragraph describing the ‘inhibitory control’ task. It is true that inhibitory control refers to situations of response suppression (including impulse suppression) and to the inhibition of irrelevant stimuli. However, the term is more commonly used for the first of these and the term ‘selective attention’ is used for the latter. The task used (flanker task) involves inhibition of irrelevant stimuli and so is typically described as a selective attention task. It might help the reader to make this explicit.

4. In the introduction, the BiB cohort is stated to comprise 13,776 children. Only about 6200 of these participated in the testing reported in the manuscript. It is not clear why – perhaps some of the children were too old or too young? Perhaps some weren't in the schools recruited? A bit of information about why less than half the BiB cohort participated would be useful, especially for a reader like me who doesn't know much about the cohort. On a related matter, it is interested to note from Table 2 that in all school years the proportion of recruited BiB children who were assessed is lower than the proportion of recruited non-BiB children who were assessed (about 2% lower on average). On the face of it, this seems odd, given that the BiB children had been previously recruited into the cohort and were presumably expecting to be tested. Is there any known reason for the discrepancy?
5. On page 5 where the design and measurements are described, it is stated that the procedure was “very similar” to that previously used for the ‘Starting Schools’ study. It seems that this means only that more time was allowed for the cognitive tasks in the present study. Is this the case? If it is, then the procedure was identical (rather than very similar) for the sensorimotor tasks. I think it would be clearer if it were stated that procedures were identical except for the added time. Was there any reason for the added time?
6. On page 10 it is stated that task data were analyzed with ANOVAs with “follow-up comparisons”. Were these post hoc comparisons? If they were, were they only conducted when the relevant main effects or interactions were significant? Given that these comparisons were often between different age groups, it would be reasonable to assume that they could have been pre-planned, in which case they are arguably not ‘follow-up’ comparisons at all. In fact, the main effects of age group that would be predicted are actually trends for improvement over years. This would imply that ANOVA trend analysis and pre-planned comparisons would be the appropriate statistical approach.
7. It is stated on the top of page 16 that a “composite working memory score” was developed. I may have missed something, but I couldn't see how the score was developed or what exactly it involved.
8. Early in the discussion section (page 17), the authors comment on the large within age group variability. The data presentation used in the graphs nicely shows this variability, which stands out as a significant feature of the data. What isn't obvious is the extent to which a significant proportion of the variability is simply a result of the variability in age within each group. Dividing into groups based on age in years is a coarse grained means of division – a 7 year old child could be any age from exactly 7 years old to 7 years 11 months and 29/30 days old. Thus the difference in age between 7 two 7 year olds could be nearly a year, whereas the difference in age between a 7 year old and an 8 year old could be as little as one day. This large variability in age (as a proportion of the entire age range) could well be the main contributory factor to the within group variability in performance. A finer grained analysis of age-groups would, of course, be possible given that the exact age data are available. The authors should comment further on these matters.

Is the work clearly and accurately presented and does it cite the current literature?

Yes

Is the study design appropriate and is the work technically sound?

Yes

Are sufficient details of methods and analysis provided to allow replication by others?

Yes

If applicable, is the statistical analysis and its interpretation appropriate?

Partly

Are all the source data underlying the results available to ensure full reproducibility?

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the results?

Yes

Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

Reviewer Expertise: Human sensorimotor control

I confirm that I have read this submission and believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to confirm that it is of an acceptable scientific standard.

Author Response 26 Jan 2022

Katy Shire

Comment:

At the bottom of page 3 the authors make the claim that the sensorimotor tasks used are “representative of fundamental coordinative abilities”, these being tracking, aiming and steering. I was not sure about the validity of this claim. It seems that the claim amounts to saying that tracking, aiming and steering are fundamental coordinative abilities. On the face of it, this seems plausible mainly because aiming underlies many different kinds of activities from reaching to pick something up to playing sports and steering is fundamental to getting around in the world. However, the kind of steering assessed in the test task is not that kind of steering – the task was actually a kind of computer version of the pass a loop along a twisted piece of wire game, where a bell rings if you touch the wire with the loop. It doesn't have a lot to do with steering your way around the environment: indeed, the task was called ‘tracing’ in an earlier study, which is arguably a more accurate description of what it is. In addition, use of the term ‘coordination’ is unclear given that coordination per se doesn't seem to have been measured/assessed. I wouldn't want to argue that the skills underlying performance in these tasks aren't important ones – I'm sure they are – it's just that the task names ‘tracking’ and ‘steering’ don't accurately describe what went on. The tracking task involved following the path of a moving target and the steering task involved tracing a path. I think it would be helpful to the reader to make this clear. In the same paragraph (p. 3) that aiming movements rely on “fast implementation of online corrections” in the production of “ballistic” responses. The term ‘ballistic’ refers to movements produced

without any on-line corrections, so some kind of adjustment to the text is warranted here. The final sentence of the paragraph is also rather confusing, I wasn't sure what the authors were saying here and what the 'timing constraints' are. Some revision of this paragraph is, I think, needed.

Response:

We've reflected on the reviewers comments here and extensively redrafted this paragraph, which is meant to serve as a brief justification of our selection of CKAT as the specific tool we chose to use as a measure sensorimotor function. We have removed the more speculative claims they commented on. Instead, we now justify our selection of CKAT based on prior precedents, and other relevant findings from the research literature.

Later, in the Methods, we've also clarified that in earlier versions of CKAT the 'Steering' subtask was known as 'Tracing'. It was first renamed Steering in Giles et al. (2018) and has since been referred to by this name in all subsequent publications. One of the co-creators of CKAT explained to us that they proposed this renaming after observing that performance on this task was predictive of participants steering performance in a driving simulator (Raw et al., 2012).

Here, we have simply chosen to refer to these tasks by the names given to them by their creators and that are in current usage (i.e. Tracking, Aiming and Steering).

Comment:

On page 4 there is a short paragraph describing the 'inhibitory control' task. It is true that inhibitory control refers to situations of response suppression (including impulse suppression) and to the inhibition of irrelevant stimuli. However, the term is more commonly used for the first of these and the term 'selective attention' is used for the latter. The task used (flanker task) involves inhibition of irrelevant stimuli and so is typically described as a selective attention task. It might help the reader to make this explicit.

Response:

We thank the reviewer for pointing out the inconsistencies with labelling that exist for these types of task. We have added some text to the paper to acknowledge this.

Comment:

In the introduction, the BiB cohort is stated to comprise 13,776 children. Only about 6200 of these participated in the testing reported in the manuscript. It is not clear why - perhaps some of the children were too old or too young? Perhaps some weren't in the schools recruited? A bit of information about why less than half the BiB cohort participated would be useful, especially for a reader like me who doesn't know much about the cohort. On a related matter, it is interesting to note from Table 2 that in all school years the proportion of recruited BiB children who were assessed is lower than the proportion of recruited non-BiB children who were assessed (about 2% lower on average). On the face of it, this seems odd, given that the BiB children had been previously recruited into the cohort and were presumably expecting to be tested. Is there any known reason for the discrepancy?

Response:

We recruited on a school-by-school basis, targeting those schools with the highest proportion of BiB children initially. This necessarily meant we could not aim to recruit all BiB children.

There is no known reason for this difference. Table 2 relates only to children who had been 'recruited' i.e. not withdrawn by their parents. BiB and non-BiB children were subject to exactly the same procedure and given the same information in school.

Comment:

On page 5 where the design and measurements are described, it is stated that the procedure was "very similar" to that previously used for the 'Starting Schools' study. It seems that this means only that more time was allowed for the cognitive tasks in the present study. Is this the case? If it is, then the procedure was identical (rather than very similar) for the sensorimotor tasks. I think it would be clearer if it were stated that procedures were identical except for the added time. Was there any reason for the added time?

This has been adjusted in the manuscript. The procedure was identical for the sensorimotor tasks, the additional time was only for the cognitive tasks (which were not done as part of the Starting School study)

On page 10 it is stated that task data were analyzed with ANOVAs with "follow-up comparisons". Were these post hoc comparisons? If they were, were they only conducted when the relevant main effects or interactions were significant? Given that these comparisons were often between different age groups, it would be reasonable to assume that they could have been pre-planned, in which case they are arguably not 'follow-up' comparisons at all. In fact, the main effects of age group that would be predicted are actually trends for improvement over years. This would imply that ANOVA trend analysis and pre-planned comparisons would be the appropriate statistical approach.

Response:

This has now been adjusted in the manuscript, to indicate that the age group comparisons were planned rather than post hoc.

Regarding the final point, we would acknowledge that other forms of analytic approach are available, but would reiterate that this manuscript aimed to provide a first description of methods and basic outcomes.

Comment:

It is stated on the top of page 16 that a "composite working memory score" was developed. I may have missed something, but I couldn't see how the score was developed or what exactly it involved.

Response:

This detail has now been added.

Comment:

Early in the discussion section (page 17), the authors comment on the large within age

group variability. The data presentation used in the graphs nicely shows this variability, which stands out as a significant feature of the data. What isn't obvious is the extent to which a significant proportion of the variability is simply a result of the variability in age within each group. Dividing into groups based on age in years is a coarse grained means of division – a 7 year old child could be any age from exactly 7 years old to 7 years 11 months and 29/30 days old. Thus the difference in age between two 7 year olds could be nearly a year, whereas the difference in age between a 7 year old and an 8 year old could be as little as one day. This large variability in age (as a proportion of the entire age range) could well be the main contributory factor to the within group variability in performance. A finer grained analysis of age-groups would, of course, be possible given that the exact age data are available. The authors should comment further on these matters.

Response:

We completely agree with the reviewer's comments. This type of detailed analysis will be included in subsequent papers, where we do more fine-grained analyses of all the data. The aim of the current manuscript is to present the details of the methodology, and to present some initial, high-level analysis of the data.

When we look at age by months, we still see very high levels of individual variability within each of the groups (i.e., each separate month), similar to that when looking at it by age in years. We have added a comment in the manuscript signposting the reader to the fact that additional papers will be published looking at more detailed analyses.

Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

Reviewer Report 22 April 2021

<https://doi.org/10.21956/wellcomeopenres.18078.r43009>

© 2021 Vergauwe E et al. This is an open access peer review report distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.



Beatrice Valentini 

Department of Psychology and Educational Sciences, University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland

Evie Vergauwe

Department of Psychology and Educational Sciences, University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland

This article reports the observations regarding sensory-motor and cognitive skills of a large group of children that were tested as part of a large-scale longitudinal study. The current observations are based on >15'000 children who were tested at one time point using tasks to assess three sensory-motor skills (tracking, aiming and steering) and three cognitive capacities (working memory, inhibition and processing speed). Overall, the results show that there is an age-related increase in all of these skills, in line with most theories and studies that are currently available. Furthermore, as expected, all sensory-motor measures were positively correlated and all cognitive

measures were positively correlated.

Overall, this article is interesting and well written. The article is not really addressing a novel question, nor is it addressing debated issues in the field. Indeed, to our knowledge, not many researchers would have predicted a different outcome. However, there is value in this type of large-scale studies providing us with a huge amount of interesting data for the research community. Moreover, as the authors explain in the introduction, there are also other types of data available for a subsample of the current sample of primary school children (e.g., social and emotional wellbeing, growth, adiposity, and cardiometabolic health). In that regard, we find it unfortunate that the data do not seem to be as openly accessible as we expected. Firstly, the hyperlink in page 19 (i.e., "You can find out about all of the different datasets which are available here") is a dead link. Secondly, it appears that, to have access to the data reported in the current article, one needs to go through to a procedure to be granted access, which involves the completion of an "expression of interest" form and then signing a collaboration agreement (which seems to come with specific, rather strict, rules about authorship and publication).

Some further, more minor points that deserve attention are listed below (in no particular order) :

- The reported observations are in essence based on one time point of a longitudinal study and are thus the result of a cross-sectional portion of a longitudinal study. We feel that this should be more explicitly stated in the manuscript, as there are currently several points at which the reader may be confused. Moreover, given that the current report is not presenting any longitudinal data, we think the introduction and general discussion should mainly focus on that, rather than describing the benefits and potential impact of the longitudinal study that also includes other measures. The current report is not presenting longitudinal data, nor is it presenting any additional measure beyond sensory-motor and cognitive performance.
- It would be useful to know what software was used to program the different tasks.
- For the Aiming task : the text describes a task involving green circles, but Figure 2 shows red circles.
- Figure 8 is not entirely clear to us. Perhaps more explanation is needed here. For example, for Year 16/17, 95 schools seemed to have been approached, 2 declined, and this resulted in 51 schools being recruited. It is unclear what happened to the remaining 42 schools who did not decline.
- For the working memory tasks, the method section mentioned « the primary outcome variable was mean proportion correct and the secondary outcome variable was mean reaction time (RT). », but we could not find any information or analysis on the secondary variable, i.e., on RT.
- It is unclear to us why Age was analyzed as a categorical variable in this study.

Is the work clearly and accurately presented and does it cite the current literature?

Yes

Is the study design appropriate and is the work technically sound?

Yes

Are sufficient details of methods and analysis provided to allow replication by others?

Yes

If applicable, is the statistical analysis and its interpretation appropriate?

Yes

Are all the source data underlying the results available to ensure full reproducibility?

Partly

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the results?

Yes

Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

Reviewer Expertise: Cognition, Working memory, cognitive development

We confirm that we have read this submission and believe that we have an appropriate level of expertise to confirm that it is of an acceptable scientific standard, however we have significant reservations, as outlined above.

Author Response 26 Jan 2022

Katy Shire

Comment:

Overall, this article is interesting and well written. The article is not really addressing a novel question, nor is it addressing debated issues in the field. Indeed, to our knowledge, not many researchers would have predicted a different outcome. However, there is value in this type of large-scale studies providing us with a huge amount of interesting data for the research community. Moreover, as the authors explain in the introduction, there are also other types of data available for a subsample of the current sample of primary school children (e.g., social and emotional wellbeing, growth, adiposity, and cardiometabolic health). In that regard, we find it unfortunate that the data do not seem to be as openly accessible as we expected. Firstly, the hyperlink in page 19 (i.e., "You can find out about all of the different datasets which are available here") is a dead link. Secondly, it appears that, to have access to the data reported in the current article, one needs to go through to a procedure to be granted access, which involves the completion of an "expression of interest" form and then signing a collaboration agreement (which seems to come with specific, rather strict, rules about authorship and publication).

Response:

All data relating to the Born in Bradford cohort is subject to the same restrictions and the authors do not have the ability to alter these. The BiB executive welcome collaborators to apply to use all the data collected and can provide support in navigating the process. The hyperlink has been updated to link directly to the data dictionary page, rather than the top level page for the research data section on the BiB website.

Comment:

The reported observations are in essence based on one time point of a longitudinal study and are thus the result of a cross-sectional portion of a longitudinal study. We feel that this should be more explicitly stated in the manuscript, as there are currently several points at which the reader may be confused. Moreover, given that the current report is not presenting any longitudinal data, we think the introduction and general discussion should mainly focus on that, rather than describing the benefits and potential impact of the longitudinal study that also includes other measures. The current report is not presenting longitudinal data, nor is it presenting any additional measure beyond sensory-motor and cognitive performance.

Response:

We have updated the abstract and the introduction to help make this distinction more explicit.

Comment:

It would be useful to know what software was used to program the different tasks.

Response:

This detail has been added for both the motor and cognitive tasks in the manuscript.

Comment:

For the Aiming task : the text describes a task involving green circles, but Figure 2 shows red circles.

Response:

The dots would initially be presented as red, and turn green as they were successfully reached by the participant. We agree this was confusing in the manuscript, and the text has been updated to avoid this confusion.

Comment:

Figure 8 is not entirely clear to us. Perhaps more explanation is needed here. For example, for Year 16/17, 95 schools seemed to have been approached, 2 declined, and this resulted in 51 schools being recruited. It is unclear what happened to the remaining 42 schools who did not decline.

Response:

We agree this is unclear from the figure, and have added some in-text description to address this. Schools that were approached, but did not respond, were not counted as actively 'declining'.

Comment:

For the working memory tasks, the method section mentioned « the primary outcome variable was mean proportion correct and the secondary outcome variable was mean reaction time (RT). », but we could not find any information or analysis on the secondary variable, i.e., on RT.

Response:

RT is not reported in the manuscript. We have now noted this in the method section.

Comment:

It is unclear to us why Age was analyzed as a categorical variable in this study.

Response:

The current paper's aim is to present a detailed description of the methodology, and some initial, high-level analyses by key variables. More detailed analyses will be presented in future papers, including detailed analyses using age in months as a continuous variable. We have added some text on p.25 relating to this issue.

Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.
