Time trends and area-level socioeconomic inequalities in early childhood development at 2 to 2.5 years old in England between 2019 and 2024

Yu Wei Chua[1], Caitlin Murray[1], Luke Munford[2], Davara Bennett[1], Dougal Hargreaves[3], David Taylor-Robinson[1]

[1] Department of Public Health, Systems and Policy, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK

[2] School of Health Sciences, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK

[3] Mohn Centre for Children's Health and Wellbeing, School of Public Health, Imperial College London, London, UK.

Corresponding author: Yu Wei Chua (yu.wei.chua@liverpool.ac.uk)

Acknowledgements: YWC is part-funded by an NIHR Research Professorship (NIHR302438) awarded to DTR. CM was funded by an NIHR Undergraduate Internship Programme (NIHR304390), awarded to YWC. DTR and DB are funded by the NIHR School for Public Health Research (grant reference number NIHR204000). DTR is also funded on an NIHR Research Professorship (NIHR302438). LM is part funded by the NIHR Applied Research Collaboration Greater Manchester (NIHR200174). The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care.

Conflicts of interests: The authors declare no conflict of interests.

Author Contributions: Dr Chua had full access to all of the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis. Dr Munford take responsibility for the accuracy of the cost analysis.

Concept and design: Chua, Bennett, Taylor-Robinson
Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data: Chua, Murray, Munford, Bennett, Hargreaves, Taylor-Robinson
Drafting of the manuscript: Chua, Munford, Murray
Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: Chua, Bennett, Hargreaves, Taylor-Robinson
Statistical analysis: Chua, Murray, Munford
Obtained funding: Chua, Taylor-Robinson
Supervision: Chua

Key points

Question: What are the time trends and area-level socioeconomic inequalities in early childhood development at 2 to 2.5 years in England around the time of the COVID-19 pandemic?

Findings: Early childhood development at 2 to 2.5 years in England worsened in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic. Stark socioeconomic inequalities were observed throughout the period of 2019 to 2024.

Meaning: Policy makers need to prioritise early years and children services in pandemic recovery efforts to improve early developmental outcomes, especially for children from socioeconomically deprived backgrounds.

Abstract

Importance: Internationally, there are gaps in data to monitor both early childhood development (ECD) and progress in closing the inequality gap. The unequal impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, and any differential impact on ECD domains is also not poorly understood.

Objective: To examine time trends and area-level socioeconomic inequalities in ECD at 2 2.5 years in England between 2019 and 2024

Design: Cross-sectional and longitudinal ecological analysis

Setting: 149 local authorities in England

Participants: 143 local authorities (662 annual observations, publishable quality data and at least 75% coverage of eligible children)

Exposure: Year of assessment, area-level socioeconomic conditions (Index of Multiple Deprivation 2019, Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI)) assessed as the Slope Index of Inequality (SII) and Relative Index of Inequality (RII))

Main outcomes: Ages and Stages Questionnaire 3, rate per 100 not developmentally on track (Five domains of development: Communication, Gross Motor, Fine Motor, Personal Social, or Problem Solving; and any domain)

Results: Rate per 100 children not developmentally on track in any domain increased progressively from 2019 (16[95%CI: 14.2; 16.9]), and was highest in 2023 (20.6[18.9; 22.4]) and 2024 (19.8[18.2; 21.4]). Compared to 2019 rates, the largest absolute increase was in 2023 (4.9[3.6; 6.3]), largest for Communication (4.3[3.5; 5.2], followed by similar increases for Personal Social (3.3[2.5; 4]) and Problem Solving (2.9[2.2; 3.5]), and smaller increases for Fine Motor (1.4[0.6; 2]) and Gross Motor (0.9[0.2; 1.6]). All rates except Gross Motor remained elevated in 2024. On average, 21.3[19.5; 23.0] per 100 children were not on track in any domain for the most income-deprived quintile compared to 16.2[14.7;17.8] for the least income-deprived (SII: 2.9[1.8; 3.9]; RII: 23%[14%; 32%]). Inequalities were largest in Communication (SII: 2.8[2.0; 3.6]; RII: 36%[25%; 49%]). Year by area-level socioeconomic conditions interaction effects were not statistically significant.

Conclusions and Relevance: In England, ECD worsened during the pandemic, more so for children exposed for longer, or from a younger age. Children born after the pandemic continue to be affected. Area-level inequalities were striking but did not worsen during this period. Pandemic-recovery efforts need to consider the potentially enormous economic and societal cost of disruption to ECD.

Keywords: *early childhood development; socioeconomic inequalities; COVID-19 pandemic*

Time trends and area-level socioeconomic inequalities in early childhood development at 2 to 2.5 years old in England between 2019 and 2024

Introduction

Every child has a right to develop to their full potential, but socioeconomic inequalities in health and development have been evidenced from conception to adulthood.[1] Globally, poverty, stunting and malnutrition disrupt children's development.[2] In high income countries, rising child poverty and its impact on children's development is a growing concern.[3] In the UK, inequalities in poverty, school readiness, and other health and educational outcomes across childhood were widening before the pandemic. Promoting early childhood development (ECD) is a foundation for all children to reach their full potential and a priority for sustainable development.[2,4–7] In particular, the first 1000 days (period of conception to two to three years of life), can be seen as a window of opportunity to improve lifelong outcomes due to the rapid rate of neural development during this time.[2,6,8]

There are gaps in national and cross-national data and measurement tools to track ECD.[9] Monitoring progress in ECD outcomes at a population-level helps support financial and political commitments to improve ECD, and monitor the impact of policies, programmes and investment in early childhood.[10] Despite extensive evidence from birth cohort studies showing the detrimental impact of socioeconomic deprivation on ECD,[9] up-to-date, population-level data is needed to track progress in closing inequalities, and provide intelligence for policymakers on the children most in need of early support.

To inform recovery efforts after the COVID-19 pandemic, it is imperative that we understand the extent to which the pandemic impacted children's development, including any worsening inequalities in ECD. Experts had warned during the COVID-19 pandemic that household economic shocks, impact on caregiver stress and ability to provide nurturing care, and disruption of services, can disrupt ECD.[11] Evidence now shows that preschool children and infants born during, or exposed to the COVID-19 pandemic were delayed in their development, compared to children not exposed to the pandemic.[12–14] However, some studies have suggested that certain domains may be unaffected, and that communication development may be most affected.[15–17] Evidence of whether preexisting socioeconomic inequalities in ECD were exacerbated by the pandemic is limited and mixed.[18–21]

In the UK, population-level indicators of ECD have previously relied on indicators of school readiness at school entry. Recently available data on ECD assessed at 2 to 2.5 years old now enables monitoring of outcomes nationally, just after the critical first 1000 days. Child-level data is submitted by health visitors to the Community Services Dataset, but most of the data is not yet research ready.[22] No study has examined the area-level aggregated data available in the interim.[23] Using area-level estimates, this study assesses national time trends and socioeconomic inequalities in the rates of children not developmentally on track at 2 to 2.5 years in five domains of development, and in any domain, in England around the time of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Methods

We report an ecological area-level analysis assessing longitudinal trends in children not developmentally on track at 2 to 2.5 years between 2018/19 to 2023/24 (hereafter 2019 to

2024) in England, the extent of socioeconomic inequalities and whether inequalities changed during this period.

Data sources and measures

Outcome data from 149 local authorities (LA), after accounting for LA boundaries and boundary changes, were obtained from the Health Visiting Service Delivery Metrics (HVSDM), published by the Office of Health Improvement and Disparities (Appendix S1).[24]

ECD at 2 to 2.5 years was measured using the Ages and Stages Questionnaire 3 (ASQ-3),[25] as part of universal mandatory developmental reviews in England carried out by Health Visitors.[26] The ASQ-3 screens for children requiring further developmental evaluation, based on cut-off scores of expected development in five domains: Communication, Gross Motor, Fine Motor, Problem Solving and Personal Social Skills. We obtained to the rate of children *not* developmentally on track, per 100 children assessed on the ASQ. Data on the number of children developmentally on track submitted to the HVSDM has been validated to locally held data.[20] Data from seven assessment years (2018 to 2024) were available at the time of analysis.

The percentage of children receiving developmental reviews was over 90% in all years, but lower for children receiving an ASQ-3 review.[27] As the ECD metric was classed as experimental statistics up to 2021 due to data quality and coverage of the ASQ review,[24] we obtained data on the quality (number of LAs submitting publishable quality data) and coverage of ASQ-3 review (percentage of eligible children receiving an ASQ-3 review).

Our exposures were assessment year and childhood socioeconomic conditions (SECs). SECs was measured using the Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index (IDACI) Average Score from the 2019 Indices of Multiple Deprivation.[28] This score measures the proportion of children experiencing income deprivation in the LA, averaged across deprived and non-deprived areas. A higher score indicates greater income deprivation. We ranked LAs and created quintiles where a fifth of the 2019 child population fell into each income deprivation quintile. A higher quintile indicates lower income deprivation. We converted the ranks into a continuous score ranging from 0 (most advantaged) to 1 (least advantaged) to investigate the Slope and Relative Index of Inequality (SII and RII), such that model parameters capture the absolute and relative difference in children not developmentally on track in the least compared to the most advantaged.

We identified covariates using Directed Acyclic Graphs (DAGs) to isolate the relationship of interest and address potential selection bias (Appendix S2). Children of non-White ethnicity were previously found to be less likely and children from the most deprived decile more likely to receive an ASQ review, in 2019 and 2020 data.[20] Selection bias can occur if these factors, and any unobserved factors affecting review, are also associated with the outcome (Appendix S3). The adverse effects of COVID-19 lockdown may be biased by the background trend of generally improving employment rates in households with children.[29] As our focus was on time trends related to COVID-19 impact, we controlled for ethnic composition (Percentage of 0 to 15-year-old children of White British/Irish ethnicity from the 2021 UK Census)[30], income deprivation (IDACI), ASQ coverage to proxy for other unobserved factors affecting review, and employment rates at birth (Annual Population Survey/Labour Force Survey, households with children 0 to 15 years, by combined economic

activity status[31]). In analyses of childhood SECs, we controlled for Year, ASQ coverage and ethnicity.

Statistical analyses

Analyses were carried out in R (V4.3.2). We preliminarily described data quality and coverage over time to inform main analyses (Appendix S3, Figure S1-S2). Due to high positive skewness and kurtosis of the outcome (Table S1), we trimmed the dataset, log-transformed the outcome and checked regression assumptions (Appendix S1, Figures S3-S7).

In main analyses, we first obtained means and 95% confidence intervals of each outcome over time, and visualised time trends by income deprivation quintile.

Second, using linear mixed-effect models (Appendix S3), we estimated associations of Year and SECs on rates of children not on track in (1) any domain and (2) in each of the five domains. Analyses of Year controlled for ASQ coverage, ethnic composition, IDACI, and employment rates at birth as fixed effects. We entered Year as a categorical variable, to model a complex exposure capturing annual trends, and exposure to COVID-19 shocks (e.g. lockdowns, impact on the economy). Analyses of SECs used continuous IDACI rank as the exposure, controlling for Year, ASQ coverage and ethnic composition in linear mixed-effect models. Interaction effects of SECs by Year were examined using Likelihood Ratio tests. All Models included random effects term to represent normally distributed means of each LA.

Third, we exponentiated model coefficients for the RII. For the SII, we obtained the difference in predicted values between the least advantaged versus most advantaged, for each year. 95% confidence intervals were generated using 1000 nonparametric bootstrap samples of the original data.

Service-use and economic costs

Referring to population estimates and cost estimates in the published literature, we estimate potential contemporaneous and long-term implications of the increase in children not on track in ECD, on service use and economic losses (Appendix S1 and Table S2). We focus on key domains of speech and language therapy, special educational needs, parental employment losses, and projected implications on workforce participation and labour productivity.[32–34]

Results

Sample characteristics

Availability of publishable quality data was poor in 2018, relative to latter years, which had comparable levels of data: 74 (49.0%) LAs submitted publishable ASQ data in 2018, 113 (74.8%) in 2019 and rising to 138 (91.4%) in 2024 (Table S3). IDACI average score was correlated with ASQ coverage only in 2019 (τ=-0.12, p=0.032), indicating that coverage was better in areas with lower levels of income deprivation, but not in other years (Table S4). Most LAs achieved over 90% ASQ coverage, but there was variability in coverage with very low coverage in some LAs or year (Table S5). We proceeded with analysing data from 2019 onwards, with at least 75% ASQ coverage (n=143 (96.0%) LAs) (Table S6 and Figure S8).

Time trends in early childhood development

Rates per 100 children not on track in any domain increased over time (Figure 1), from 15.6[95%CI: 14.2; 16.9] in 2019, peaking in 2023 at 20.6[18.9; 22.4] and decreasing slightly to 19.8[18.2; 21.4] in 2024 (Table S7). Rates were highest for Communication across time.



Figure 1. Mean and confidence intervals of children not developmentally on track in any domain and each domain over 2019 to 2024.

There were no differences in rates of children not on track in any domain or in individual domains in 2020 compared to 2019, but rates were higher in all subsequent years (

Table 1).

For Any Domain, there were progressively larger differences compared to pre-pandemic in cohorts experiencing a longer or earlier age of exposure to the pandemic (2021: 1.4[0.2; 2.6]; 2022: 3.7[2.5; 4.8], 2023: 4.9[3.6; 6.3]). Rates remained higher in 2024 (4.2[2.9; 5.5]) who did not experience the pandemic. The largest absolute increase, in 2023, was equivalent to a 35%[24%; 46%] relative increase.

For Communication, Problem Solving and Personal Social Skills, absolute (Range: 0.7 to 1.6) and relative (Range: 15% to 18%) increases compared to 2019 were small in 2021. Increases were similar in 2022 and 2023, when the largest absolute increase was observed (Communication: 4.3[3.4; 5.2]; Problem solving: 2.9[2.2; 3.5]; Personal Social Skills (3.3[2.5; 4]), equivalent to a 48% to 63% relative increase. The size of increase fell slightly in 2024. For Fine Motor, there were no differences in 2020 and 2021 compared to 2019. Absolute increases were observed in 2022 (0.9[0.1; 1.6]) and 2023 (1.4[0.6; 2]), equivalent to a 21% to 32% relative increase. For Gross Motor, there was a 0.9[0.2; 1.6] absolute increase in 2023, and no differences in other years.

Table 1. Mean and 95% confidence intervals of absolute and relative differences in later years compared to 2019, obtained from 1000 bootstrap simulations.

	Any domain	Communication	Gross Motor	Fine Motor	Problem Solving	Personal Social Skills
Intercept	**17.8** ***	**10.7** ***	**4.1** **	**3.4** *	**3.1** **	**5.7** ***
	(10.4 – 30.7)	**(5.7 – 20.1)**	**(1.6 – 10.5)**	**(1.1 – 10.2)**	**(1.4 – 7.0)**	**(2.7 – 12.2)**
Effect of Year (Absolute differences) [Ref: 2019]						
2020	0.7 (-0.3 to 1.9)	0.7 (-0.2 to 1.7)	-0.3 (-0.9 to 0.4)	-0.2 (-0.8 to 0.5)	0.4 (-0.3 to 0.9)	0.2 (-0.5 to 0.9)
2021	**1.4** * **(0.2 to 2.6)**	**1.6** *** **(0.5 to 2.7)**	0 (-0.7 to 0.7)	0.1 (-0.7 to 0.8)	**0.7** * **(0.0 to 1.3)**	**0.8** ** **(0.1 to 1.5)**
2022	**3.7** *** **(2.5 to 4.8)**	**4.1** *** **(3.1 to 5.1)**	0.4 (-0.3 to 1)	**0.9** * **(0.1 to 1.6)**	**2.1** *** **(1.4 to 2.7)**	**2.6** *** **(1.8 to 3.3)**
2023	**4.9** *** **(3.6 to 6.3)**	**4.3** *** **(3.4 to 5.2)**	**0.9** ** **(0.2 to 1.6)**	**1.4** *** **(0.6 to 2)**	**2.9** *** **(2.2 to 3.5)**	**3.3** *** **(2.5 to 4)**
2024	**4.2** *** **(2.9 to 5.5)**	**3.6** *** **(2.5 to 4.6)**	0.5 (-0.2 to 1.2)	**1.0** *** **(0.2 to 1.7)**	**2.4** *** **(1.7 to 3.1)**	**2.5** *** **(1.8 to 3.3)**
Effect of Year (Relative differences) [Ref: 2019]						
2020	1.05 (0.98 to 1.14)	1.08 (0.98 to 1.2)	0.94 (0.84 to 1.08)	0.95 (0.82 to 1.12)	1.08 (0.95 to 1.22)	1.03 (0.92 to 1.17)
2021	**1.1** * **(1.01 to 1.19)**	**1.18** *** **(1.06 to 1.33)**	1 (0.86 to 1.15)	1.01 (0.85 to 1.22)	**1.15** * **(0.99 to 1.31)**	**1.15** ** **(1.01 to 1.3)**
2022	**1.26** *** **(1.16 to 1.35)**	**1.46** *** **(1.33 to 1.6)**	1.08 (0.94 to 1.24)	**1.21** * **(1.03 to 1.41)**	**1.46** *** **(1.29 to 1.64)**	**1.47** *** **(1.31 to 1.65)**
2023	**1.35** *** **(1.24 to 1.46)**	**1.48** *** **(1.35 to 1.61)**	**1.19** ** **(1.04 to 1.35)**	**1.32** *** **(1.12 to 1.53)**	**1.63** *** **(1.44 to 1.81)**	**1.6** *** **(1.43 to 1.78)**
2024	**1.3** *** **(1.19 to 1.4)**	**1.39** *** **(1.26 to 1.53)**	1.1 (0.95 to 1.27)	**1.23** ** **(1.04 to 1.45)**	**1.53** *** **(1.35 to 1.72)**	**1.46** *** **(1.3 to 1.64)**

95% confidence intervals from 1000 bootstrapped simulations presented
$^{*}p<0.05$, $^{**}p<0.01$, $^{***}p<0.001$, p values based on Satterthwaite approximation for the number of degrees of freedom of parameter estimates

Socioeconomic inequalities in early childhood development

On average between 2019 and 2024, the rate of children not on track in any domain was higher in LAs in the least advantaged quintile (Rate per 100: 21.3[19.5; 23.0]) compared to most advantaged quintile (16.2[14.7; 17.8]) (Figure 2 and Table S8). The difference was largest in 2022 (6.4[2.9; 9.9]) (Table S9). There was a high level of overlap in the confidence intervals for outcomes within each quintile (Figure S9).



Figure 2. Time trends in the means with 95% confidence intervals for local authorities in the most deprived 20% of Index of Multiple Deprivation Quintile in England, and local authorities in the least deprived quintile.

We did not find evidence of interaction effects of year by area-level socioeconomic conditions (Table S10 and S11). We found evidence for absolute and relative inequalities in rates of children not on track for all outcomes, except Gross Motor, based on Bootstrapped confidence intervals (Table 2, Table S12). For the rate per 100 children not on track in any domain, the Slope Index of Inequality (SII) indicated that the most deprived areas had a 2.9[1.8; 3.9] higher rate, compared to the least deprived areas. The SII was largest for Communication (2.8[1.8; 3.9]). The RII for Any domain was 23%[14%; 32%], and largest for Communication (36%[25%; 49%]) and Fine motor (40%[19%; 62%]), although confidence intervals were wider for Fine Motor.

Table 2. Estimates (Mean(95%CI)) of the Slope and Relative Index of Inequality using 1000 bootstrapped samples

Index	Any domain	Communication	Gross Motor	Fine Motor	Problem Solving	Personal Social Skills
SII	2.9 (1.8 to 3.9)	2.8 (2 to 3.6)	0.2 (-0.5 to 0.7)	1.5 (0.7 to 2.1)	1.1 (0.5 to 1.6)	1 (0.4 to 1.5)
RII	1.23 (1.14 to 1.32)	1.36 (1.25 to 1.49)	1.03 (0.9 to 1.16)	1.40 (1.19 to 1.62)	1.27 (1.12 to 1.42)	1.19 (1.07 to 1.32)

Model adjusted for Year, ASQ coverage and ethnic composition

Sensitivity analyses

We re-ran models using linear and quadratic year, capturing only the continuous effect of year (instead of year-specific COVID-19 effects), to increase power in assessing Year x SECs interactions. We also did not find evidence of interaction effects in these models (Table S13 and S14). To test if findings were robust to data quality, we re-ran models excluding outcome outliers (Appendix S1, Table S15) and found little change in the parameter estimates (Table S16).

Service-use and economic costs

In 2023, a 5 per 100 increase in the rate of children not on track in any domain could mean 32,000 more children require child health services nationally, using a population estimate of 640,000 2-year-olds.[35] Worse ECD outcomes in 2023 could incur an additional £60 million annually in early intervention and educational costs, and parental employment losses, and potentially enormous costs due to reduced workforce participation or economic productivity in adulthood (Table 3)

Table 3. Summary of cost estimates based on the 2023 increase in children not on track in development, compared to pre-pandemic.

Cost Category	**Cost assumptions (Source)**	**Cost incurred***
Contemporary costs		
Increased early intervention (speech and language therapy)	£2,000 per affected child annually (NHS England, 2023)[36]	£6.4 million annually
Increased demand for Special Education Needs support	£10,000 per affected child annually (Education Policy Institute, 2020)[37]	£32 million annually
Parental employment losses	Average employment loss of £7,500 per affected child annually (OECD, 2021)[38]	£24 million annually
Predicted future costs		
Lower workforce participation resulting from lower educational attainment	£100,000 reduction in lifetime earnings per child who have lower educational attainment (UK Department for Education, 2021)[39]	£320 million in lifetime earnings loss
Reduced economic productivity	10% reduction in productivity amongst children affected (Penn Wharton Budget Model, 2021)[40]	£1 billion fall in UK GDP^

**Costs incurred are calculated based on published costs, the 2023 estimate that 5 per 100 more children fail the ASQ-3 developmental screen at 2-2.5 years, and that 10% of children failing the early developmental screen require additional services/greater parental support, and experience lower educational attainment/workforce participation and reduced economic productivity in adulthood (ie., 90% of children affected by COVID-19 catch up in their development over time).*[41,42]
^UK GDP was USD3.38 trillion (approximately £2.6 trillion) in 2023.[43]

Discussion

Drawing on English national surveillance data, our study provides timely public health intelligence on recent trends and socioeconomic inequalities in ECD, as early as 2 to 2.5 years. Cohorts assessed during or after the pandemic had greater rates of children not developmentally on track at 2 to 2.5 years, compared to 2019, the unexposed cohort. The greatest increases were amongst children exposed to the pandemic from birth (approximately 5 per 100 increase in 2023, similar increase in 2022), with smaller increases amongst children exposed from 1 year of age (2021) and no differences in children who experienced the shortest exposure (2020). Notably, children born after the pandemic (2024) continued to experience worse outcomes in almost all domains. Stark area-level socioeconomic inequalities, which did not change during this period, were observed in all developmental

domains except Gross Motor. The Communication domain had the largest socioeconomic inequalities and greatest pandemic-related increases.

While acknowledging some data quality limitations, we demonstrate the usefulness of a novel dataset in England to monitor the impact of national shocks on ECD. An important limitation is the underestimation of inequalities when data is aggregated over the population in an area.[44] Studies using individual-level data have found a stronger adverse impact of the pandemic on various domains of development amongst children from low versus high socioeconomic status.[16,19,21,45] Individual-level data will be best placed to investigate whether the impact of early years exposure to the COVID-19 pandemic may be sustained longitudinally into school age. In the UK, on the ground efforts are needed, including training and increasing staff capacity to contribute to data reporting, to improve data completeness of individual-level data on ASQ-3 in the Community Services Dataset.

Our findings, showing that cohorts exposed to COVID-19 experienced worse ECD outcomes in almost all domains, are consistent with large national studies assessing ECD at around 2 years of age.[46,47] Our findings support previous work showing that children born during the pandemic, who experienced a longer exposure to the pandemic experienced the worst outcomes.[47] Previous work has also found socioeconomic inequalities in ECD in all domains before and during the pandemic.[18,19,47]

Differences in methodology and sample may explain differences between our findings and the wider literature. A relatively small study comparing COVID-19 exposed cohort of 2-year-olds to a historical cohort only found differences in the communication domain.[15] In studies examining ECD in children younger than 1.5 years, or in children of various ages over 0 to 5, experience of COVID-19 on worse development has been inconsistently reported.[12,13,15,17,47–50] Age of assessment may be important because some developmental delays may only be identified later.[51] Domain-level effects may differ by age of exposure to the COVID-19 pandemic. Similar to us, another study reported gross motor delays in younger children exposed to the pandemic, but not in older children,[47] and exposure to COVID-19 around 2-years-old affected only the communication and social interaction domain at 3-years-old.[16] Communication may be the most susceptible, as its development relies on the social environment which was severely restricted by the pandemic. This likely explains why communication delays were the most consistently observed across studies, despite methodological differences.

The cost of COVID-19 on and inequalities in children's early development is likely to be enormous and far-reaching. Implications on the economy, society and health services require immediate attention in pandemic recovery efforts. In 2023 alone, 32,000 more children required further paediatric assessment, adding to already alarming waitlists.[52,53] The extent of national inequality (3 per 100 absolute difference between the worst and least deprived areas) appears comparable to around two-thirds the adverse developmental impact over the period of the pandemic. An unequal start in life could hinder children from reaching their developmental potential. Spending on late intervention services has risen significantly in the UK post-pandemic, but only small rises seen in early intervention spending, after a decade of cuts to early intervention spending.[54] Our findings emphasise the need for immediate investment in early intervention, which could include an additional £6.4m annually in speech and language therapy services, and an additional £32m annually in the education sector to support the increase in children with special educational needs. Preventative early intervention can support children to reach their full potential, reduce more costly late

intervention services and yield long-term economic benefits through improved workforce participation, higher tax revenues, as well as reduced public expenditure on welfare and criminal justice services.

The wide pre-existing socioeconomic inequalities in ECD prior to the pandemic, alongside worse ECD outcomes since the pandemic, does not bode well for the UK government's school readiness targets. Children from socioeconomically disadvantaged backgrounds are the most at risk falling behind their peers at school entry. Meeting school readiness targets will require a strong policy focus on inequality reduction, including addressing child poverty, inequalities in the home learning environment, and access to early childhood education. The early childhood education and care sector is a key sector to alleviate inequalities in ECD.[55] Efforts to tackle the post-pandemic challenges faced by the sector, such as reduced attendance and workforce issues, are urgently needed.[56]

To conclude, we report worsening ECD outcomes at 2 to 2.5 years in England, alongside stark socioeconomic inequalities, during and after the pandemic. All domains were affected, with the most pronounced impact on communicative development. The cost of the pandemic's impact on ECD is likely to be enormous. Ensuring children have a fair start in life requires investment in the early years. National ECD data can enable monitoring outcomes post-pandemic and progress in closing inequality gaps.

References

1. Houweling TAJ, Grünberger I. Intergenerational transmission of health inequalities: towards a life course approach to socioeconomic inequalities in health – a review. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2024;78(10):641-649. doi:10.1136/jech-2022-220162

2. Black MM, Walker SP, Fernald LCH, et al. Early childhood development coming of age: science through the life course. *The Lancet*. 2017;389(10064):77-90. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(16)31389-7

3. Rees G, Timar E, Dedewanou FA, Otchere F, Carraro A, Cunsolo S. *Child Poverty in the Midst of Wealth*. Innocenti Global Office of Research and Foresight; 2023. Accessed November 20, 2024. https://www.unicef.org/innocenti/reports/child-poverty-midst-wealth

4. Ozawa S, Laing SK, Higgins CR, et al. Educational and economic returns to cognitive ability in low- and middle-income countries: A systematic review. *World Development*. 2022;149:105668. doi:10.1016/j.worlddev.2021.105668

5. Cattaneo A, Cogoy L, Macaluso A, Tamburlini G. *Child Health in the European Union*. European Commission; 2012. doi:10.13140/2.1.2186.5924

6. European Observatory on Health Systems andPolicies, Tamburlini G, Blair M, Wolfe I. *Child Public Health in Europe*. World Health Organization. Regional Office for Europe; 2014:12-15. Accessed November 20, 2024. https://iris.who.int/handle/10665/332845

7. Shonkoff JP, Richter L, van der Gaag J, Bhutta ZA. An Integrated Scientific Framework for Child Survival and Early Childhood Development. *Pediatrics*. 2012;129(2):e460-e472. doi:10.1542/peds.2011-0366

8. Darling JC, Bamidis PD, Burberry J, Rudolf MCJ. The First Thousand Days: early, integrated and evidence-based approaches to improving child health: coming to a population near you? *Archives of Disease in Childhood*. 2020;105(9):837-841. doi:10.1136/archdischild-2019-316929

9. Gove A, Black MM. Measurement of Early Childhood Development and Learning under the Sustainable Development Goals. *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities*. 2016;17(4):599-605. doi:10.1080/19452829.2016.1243520

10. Richter L, Black M, Britto P, et al. Early childhood development: an imperative for action and measurement at scale. *BMJ Global Health*. 2019;4(Suppl 4):e001302. doi:10.1136/bmjgh-2018-001302

11. Yoshikawa H, Wuermli AJ, Britto PR, et al. Effects of the Global Coronavirus Disease-2019 Pandemic on Early Childhood Development: Short- and Long-Term Risks and Mitigating Program and Policy Actions. *The Journal of Pediatrics*. 2020;223:188-193. doi:10.1016/j.jpeds.2020.05.020

12. Sato K, Fukai T, Fujisawa KK, Nakamuro M. Association Between the COVID-19 Pandemic and Early Childhood Development. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2023;177(9):930-938. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2023.2096

13. Giesbrecht GF, Lebel C, Dennis CL, et al. Risk for Developmental Delay Among Infants Born During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *J Dev Behav Pediatr*. 2023;44(6):e412-e420. doi:10.1097/DBP.0000000000001197

14. Johnson SB, Kuehn M, Lambert JO, et al. Developmental Milestone Attainment in US Children Before and During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2024;178(6):586-594. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2024.0683

15. Byrne S, Sledge H, Hurley S, et al. Developmental and behavioural outcomes at 2 years in babies born during the COVID-19 pandemic: communication concerns in a pandemic birth cohort. *Arch Dis Child*. 2023;108(10):846-851. doi:10.1136/archdischild-2022-325271

16. Lee KS, Choi YY, Kim YS, Kim Y, Kim MH, Lee N. Association between the COVID-19 pandemic and childhood development aged 30 to 36 months in South Korea, based on the National health screening program for infants and children database. *BMC Public Health*. 2024;24(1):989. doi:10.1186/s12889-024-18361-9

17. Hessami K, Norooznezhad AH, Monteiro S, et al. COVID-19 Pandemic and Infant Neurodevelopmental Impairment: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2022;5(10):e2238941. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.38941

18. Weyers S, Rigó M. Child health and development in the course of the COVID-19 pandemic: are there social inequalities? *Eur J Pediatr*. 2023;182(3):1173-1181. doi:10.1007/s00431-022-04799-9

19. Hoffmann S, Tschorn M, Spallek J. Did social inequalities in child development change during the COVID-19 pandemic in Germany? *The European Journal of Public Health*. 2024;34(Suppl 3):ckae144.079. doi:10.1093/eurpub/ckae144.079

20. Jung J, Cattan S, Powell C, et al. Early child development in England: cross-sectional analysis of ASQ®-3 records from the 2-2½-year universal health visiting review using national administrative data (Community Service Dataset, CSDS). Published online September 30, 2024:2024.09.28.24314205. doi:10.1101/2024.09.28.24314205

21. Nozadi SS, Li X, Kong X, et al. Effects of COVID-19 Financial and Social Hardships on Infants' and Toddlers' Development in the ECHO Program. *IJERPH*. 2023;20(2):1013. doi:10.3390/ijerph20021013

22. Fraser C, Harron K, Barlow J, et al. Variation in health visiting contacts for children in England: cross-sectional analysis of the 2–2½ year review using administrative data (Community Services Dataset, CSDS). *BMJ Open*. 2022;12(2):e053884. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2021-053884

23. Office for Health Improvement and Disparities. Child development: percentage of children achieving a good level of development at 2 to 2½ years. Accessed August 8, 2023. https://fingertips.phe.org.uk/profile/child-health-profiles/data#page/7/gid/1938133402/pat/159/par/K02000001/ati/15/are/E92000001/iid/93436/age/241/sex/4/cat/-1/ctp/-1/yrr/1/cid/4/tbm/1/page-options/ine-vo-1_ine-yo-1:2020:-1:-1_ine-pt-0_ine-ct-113

24. Office for Health Improvement and Disparities. Child development outcomes at 2 to 2 and a half years: quarterly data for 2021 to 2022. Published online August 2, 2022. Accessed November 14, 2024. https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/child-development-outcomes-at-2-to-2-and-a-half-years-quarterly-data-for-2021-to-2022

25. Squires J, Bricker D. *Ages & Stages Questionnaires®: A Parent-Completed Child Monitoring System*. Brookes Publishing Co.; 2009.

26. Office for Health Improvement and Disparities. *Healthy Child Programme: Health Visitor and School Nurse Commissioning*.; 2016. Accessed November 14, 2024. https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/healthy-child-programme

27. Liu M, Woodman J, Grath-Lone LM, et al. Local area variation in health visiting contacts across England for children under age 5: a cross-sectional analysis of administrative data in England 2018-2020. *International Journal of Population Data Science*. 2024;9(2). doi:10.23889/ijpds.v9i2.2382

28. Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities. English Indices of Deprivation 2019 - Summaries at Local Authority Level. Published online 2019. Accessed November 14, 2024. https://opendatacommunities.org/resource?uri=http%3A%2F%2Fopendatacommunities.org%2Fdata%2Fsocietal-wellbeing%2Fimd2019%2Findicesbyla

29. Office for National Statistics. *Families and the Labour Market, UK - 2021*.; 2022. Accessed November 14, 2024. https://www.ons.gov.uk/employmentandlabourmarket/peopleinwork/employmentandemployeetypes/articles/familiesandthelabourmarketengland/2021

30. Office for National Statistics. *Ethnic Group, England and Wales: Census 2021*.; 2021. Accessed November 27, 2024.

https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/culturalidentity/ethnicity/bulletins/ethnicgroupenglandandwales/census2021

31. Office for National Statistics. Annual population survey - households by combined economic activity status. Published online October 28, 2024. Accessed November 14, 2024. https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/query/construct/summary.asp?mode=construct&version=0&dataset=136

32. Heckman JJ. Skill Formation and the Economics of Investing in Disadvantaged Children. *Science*. 2006;312(5782):1900-1902. doi:10.1126/science.1128898

33. Heckman JJ, Masterov DV. The Productivity Argument for Investing in Young Children. *Rev Agricultural Economics*. 2007;29(3):446-493. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9353.2007.00359.x

34. Cunha F, Heckman J. The Technology of Skill Formation. *American Economic Review*. 2007;97(2):31-47. doi:10.1257/aer.97.2.31

35. Office for National Statistics. Population estimates - local authority based by single year of age - Nomis - Official Census and Labour Market Statistics. Published online 2023. Accessed November 14, 2024. https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/datasets/pestsyoala

36. NHS England. *2021/22 National Cost Collection Data Publication.*; 2023. https://www.england.nhs.uk/publication/2021-22-national-cost-collection-data-publication/

37. Hutchinson J. *Identifying Pupils with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities*. Education Policy Institute; 2021. https://epi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/SEND-Indentification_2021-EPI.pdf

38. OECD. *The Labour Market Position of Families (LMF)*.; 2021. https://www.oecd.org/en/data/datasets/oecd-family-database.html#12345.

39. Hodge L, Little A, Weldon M. *GCSE Attainment and Lifetime Earnings*. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/60c36f0cd3bf7f4bd11a2326/GCSE_Attainment_and_Lifetime_Earnings_PDF3A.pdf

40. Penn Wharton. *Economic Effects of Preschool and Childcare Programs*. University of Pennsylvania; 2021. https://budgetmodel.wharton.upenn.edu/issues/2021/8/23/economic-effects-preschool-and-childcare-programs

41. Dale PS, McMillan AJ, Hayiou-Thomas ME, Plomin R. Illusory Recovery: Are Recovered Children With Early Language Delay at Continuing Elevated Risk? *Am J Speech Lang Pathol*. 2014;23(3):437-447. doi:10.1044/2014_AJSLP-13-0116

42. Cleveland Clinic. *Developmental Delay in Children.*; 2023. Accessed March 14, 2025. https://my.clevelandclinic.org/health/diseases/14814-developmental-delay-in-children.

43. World Bank Open Data. World Bank Open Data. Accessed March 14, 2025. https://data.worldbank.org

44. Brown D, Dundas R, Allik M, Leyland A. OP79 Impact of choice of geographical unit of analysis on inequalities in premature mortality: a population-based study. In: *SSM Annual Scientific Meeting*. BMJ Publishing Group Ltd; 2024:A29.1-A29. doi:10.1136/jech-2024-SSMabstracts.60

45. Scott RM, Nguyentran G, Sullivan JZ. The COVID-19 pandemic and social cognitive outcomes in early childhood. *Sci Rep*. 2024;14(1):28939. doi:10.1038/s41598-024-80532-w

46. Eisen L, Vinograd A, Sheffer R, et al. The Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Children's Development from Birth to the Age of Two Years. Published online January 8, 2025. doi:10.2139/ssrn.5083851

47. Choi YY, Lee KS, Park SG, et al. COVID-19 and Neurodevelopmental Delays in Early Childhood: A Longitudinal Analysis of Developmental Outcomes in Korean Children. *J Korean Med Sci*. 2024;39(31). doi:10.3346/jkms.2024.39.e243

48. Huang P, Zhou F, Guo Y, et al. Association Between the COVID-19 Pandemic and Infant Neurodevelopment: A Comparison Before and During COVID-19. *Front Pediatr*. 2021;9. doi:10.3389/fped.2021.662165

49. Kuehn LM, Jones A, Helmkamp L, Knudtson M, Domek GJ, Allison MA. Socioemotional Development of Infants and Toddlers During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2024;178(2):151-159. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2023.5684

50. Shuffrey LC, Firestein MR, Kyle MH, et al. Association of Birth During the COVID-19 Pandemic With Neurodevelopmental Status at 6 Months in Infants With and Without In Utero Exposure to Maternal SARS-CoV-2 Infection. *JAMA Pediatrics*. 2022;176(6):e215563. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2021.5563

51. Lavallée A, Dumitriu D. Low Risk of Neurodevelopmental Impairment in the COVID-19 Generation Should Not Make Researchers Complacent. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2022;5(10):e2238958. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.38958

52. Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health (RCPCH). 50% of children waiting over 18 weeks for community health services compared to just 15% of adults. *RCPCH*. https://www.rcpch.ac.uk/news-events/news/50-children-waiting-over-18-weeks-community-health-services-compared-just-15. 2024. Accessed January 22, 2025.

53. NHS England. Community Health Services Waiting Lists. Published online October 2024. Accessed January 22, 2025. https://www.england.nhs.uk/statistics/statistical-work-areas/community-health-services-waiting-lists/

54. Larkham J. *Struggling against the Tide: Children's Services Spending, 2011-2023*. Children's Charities Coalition; 2024.

55. Davies C, Kong SP, Hendry A, Archer N, McGillion M, Gonzalez-Gomez N. Sustained benefits of early childhood education and care (ECEC) for young children's development during COVID-19. *Journal of Early Childhood Research*. 2024;22(2):238-257. doi:10.1177/1476718X231213488

56. Hobbs A, Bernard R. Impact of COVID-19 on Early Childhood Education & Care. Published online October 27, 2021. Accessed January 22, 2025. https://post.parliament.uk/impact-of-covid-19-on-early-childhood-education-care/