


Smart Proof System Instructions

It is recommended that you read all instructions below; even if you are familiar with online review practices.

Using the Smart Proof system, proof reviewers can easily review the PDF proof, annotate corrections, respond to queries directly from the locally saved PDF proof, all of which are automatically submitted directly to **our database** without having to upload the annotated PDF.

- ✓ **Login into Smart Proof** anywhere you are connected to the internet.
- ✓ **Review the proof** on the following pages and mark corrections, changes, and query responses using the **Annotation Tools**.

Note: Editing done by replacing the text on this PDF is not permitted with this application.



- ✓ **Save your proof corrections** by clicking the "Publish Comments" button.
Corrections don't have to be marked in one sitting. You can publish comments and log back in at a later time to add and publish more comments before you click the "Complete Proof Review" button below.
- ✓ **Complete your review** after all corrections have been published to the server by clicking the "Complete Proof Review" button below.

Before completing your review.....

Did you reply to all author queries found in your proof?






Did you click the "Publish Comments" button to save all your corrections?
Any unpublished comments will be lost.

Note: Once you click "Complete Proof Review" you will not be able to add or publish additional corrections.

Adding Comments and Notes to Your PDF

To facilitate electronic transmittal of corrections, we encourage authors to utilize the comment/annotations features in Adobe Acrobat. The PDF provided has been *comment enabled*, which allows you to utilize the comment and annotation features even if using only the free Adobe Acrobat reader (see note below regarding acceptable versions). Adobe Acrobat's Help menu provides additional details on the tools. When you open your PDF, the annotation tools are clearly shown on the tool bar (although icons may differ slightly among versions from what is shown below).

For purposes of correcting the PDF proof of your journal article, the important features to know are the following:

- To **insert text**, place your cursor at a point in text and select the Insert Text tool () from the menu bar. Type your additional text in the pop-up box.
- To **replace text**, highlight the text to be changed, select the Replace Text tool () from the menu bar, and type the new text in the pop-up box. Do this instead of deleting and then reinserting.
- To **delete text**, highlight the text to be deleted and press the Delete button on the keyboard.
- Use the **Sticky Note tool** () to describe changes that need to be made (e.g., changes in bold, italics, or capitalization use; altering or replacing a figure) or to answer a question or approve a change from the editor. To use this feature, click on the Sticky Note tool in the menu bar and then click on a point in the PDF where you would like to make a comment. Then type your comment in the pop-up box.
- Use the **Callout tool** () to point directly to changes that need to be made. Try to put the callout box in an area of white space so that you do not obscure the text.
- Use the **Highlight and Add Note to Text tool** () to indicate font problems, bad breaks, and other textual inconsistencies. Select text to be changed, choose this tool, and type your comment in the pop-up box. One note can describe many changes.
- To view a list of changes to the proof or to see a more comprehensive set of annotation tools, select **Comment** from the menu bar.

As with hand-annotated proof corrections, the important points are to communicate changes clearly and thoroughly, to answer all queries and questions, and to provide complete information to allow us to make the necessary changes to your article so it is ready for publication. Do not use tools that incorporate changes to the text in such a way that no indication of a change is visible. Such changes will not be incorporated into the final proof.

To utilize the comments features on this PDF you will need Adobe Reader version 7 or higher. This program is freely available and can be downloaded from <http://get.adobe.com/reader/>

Subscriptions and Special Offers

In addition to purchasing reprints of their articles, authors may purchase an annual subscription, purchase an individual issue of the journal (at a reduced rate), or request an individual issue at no cost under special "hardship" circumstances.

To place your order online, visit <http://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/subscriptions.aspx>; or you may fill out the order form below (including the mailing label) and send the completed form and your check or credit card information to the address listed on the order form.

For information about becoming a member of the American Psychological Association, visit <http://www.apa.org/membership/index.aspx>; or call the Membership Office at 1-800-374-2721.

2019 EPF Journal Subscription Rates

Journal*	Individual Rate	APA Member Rate	Journal*	Individual Rate	APA Member Rate
American Jnl of Orthopsychiatry	\$ 151	\$ 101	Peace & Conflict: Jnl of Peace Psychology	\$ 151	\$ 82
Asian American Jnl of Psychology	\$ 151	\$ 82	Personality Disorders: TRT	\$ 187	\$ 91
Behavioral Analysis: Research and Practice (online only)	\$ 151	\$ 82	Practice Innovations	\$ 99	\$ 70
Behavioral Development (online only)	\$ 89	\$ 43	Psychiatric Rehabilitation Jnl	\$ 197	\$ 96
Canadian Jnl of Behavioural Science	\$ 151	\$ 102	Psychoanalytic Psychology	\$ 151	\$ 82
Canadian Jnl of Experimental Psych	\$ 151	\$ 102	Psychological Services	\$ 151	\$ 82
Canadian Psychology	\$ 151	\$ 102	Psychological Trauma: TRPP	\$ 263	\$ 119
Clin Pract in Pediatric Psychology	\$ 151	\$ 82	Psychology & Neuroscience (online only)	\$ 151	\$ 82
Consulting Psychology Journal	\$ 151	\$ 82	Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, & Arts	\$ 151	\$ 82
Couple & Family Psychology: Res & Prac	\$ 151	\$ 82	Psychology of Consciousness	\$ 151	\$ 82
Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psych	\$ 151	\$ 82	Psychology of Men & Masculinities	\$ 151	\$ 82
Decision	\$ 151	\$ 82	Psychology of Popular Media Culture	\$ 151	\$ 82
Dreaming	\$ 158	\$ 82	Psychology of Religion & Spirituality	\$ 151	\$ 82
Evolutionary Behavioral Science	\$ 151	\$ 82	Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity	\$ 151	\$ 82
Families, Systems, & Health	\$ 210	\$ 121	Psychology of Violence	\$ 187	\$ 91
Group Dynamics: Theory, Res, and Practice	\$ 151	\$ 82	Psychomusicology: Music, Mind, & Brain	\$ 151	\$ 82
Health Psychology	\$ 328	\$ 146	Psychotherapy	\$ 179	\$ 87
International Jnl of Play Therapy	\$ 151	\$ 82	Qualitative Psychology	\$ 119	\$ 70
International Jnl of Stress Management	\$ 151	\$ 82	Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Psychology	\$ 151	\$ 82
International Perspectives in Psychology: RPC	\$ 151	\$ 82	School Psychology	\$ 151	\$ 92
Jnl of Diversity in Higher Education	\$ 151	\$ 82	Spirituality in Clinical Practice	\$ 151	\$ 82
Jnl of Latinx Psychology	\$ 151	\$ 82	Sport, Exercise, & Performance Psychology	\$ 151	\$ 82
Jnl of Neuroscience, Psychology & Econ	\$ 151	\$ 82	Stigma and Health	\$ 99	\$ 70
Jnl of Occupational Health Psychology	\$ 151	\$ 92	The Humanistic Psychologist	\$ 70	\$ 66
Jnl of Psychotherapy Integration	\$ 151	\$ 96	The Psychologist-Manager Jnl	\$ 151	\$ 82
Jnl of Rural Mental Health	\$ 151	\$ 82	Training & Education in Prof. Psych.	\$ 151	\$ 82
Jnl of Theoretical & Philosophical Psych	\$ 151	\$ 82	Translational Issues in Psychological Science	\$ 151	\$ 82
Jnl of Threat Assessment & Management	\$ 151	\$ 82	Traumatology (online only)	\$ 151	\$ 82
Law and Human Behavior	\$ 158	\$ 96			
Motivation Science	\$ 151	\$ 82			

*For journal descriptions, see APA's website: <http://www.apa.org/pubs/journals>

Instructions: Check the appropriate box, enter journal title and price information, and complete the mailing label in the right column. Enclose a check made out to the **American Psychological Association**, and mail it with the form to the APA Order Department or complete the credit card information below. Orders can also be placed online at <http://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/subscriptions.aspx>.

Annual Subscription (available on January-December basis only). Refer to the Subscription Rates shown above.

Journal: _____

Price: _____

Special Offers! If you are a journal article author, you may take advantage of two Special Offers.

Individual Copy. You may order individual copies of the entire issue in which your article appears. Does not apply to online-only journals. As an author, you receive a special reduced rate of \$5 per copy for up to a maximum of 25 copies. No phone requests accepted.

Journal: _____

Vol. no.: _____ Issue no.: _____ Issue month: _____

_____ copies @ \$5 a copy = \$ _____ (order amount)
 + _____ (handling; see below)
 TOTAL enclosed: \$ _____

Shipping & Handling Fees			
Order amount:	U.S. & Puerto Rico	Guaranteed Non-U.S.*	Economy Non-U.S.**
Up to \$14.99	\$5.00	\$50.00	\$15.00
\$15 to \$59.99	\$6.00	\$75.00	\$16.00
\$60.00+	10% Order Total	\$125.00	\$20.00

*International rates for guaranteed service are estimates.

**I agree that international economy service is non-guaranteed and does not provide tracking or date/time specific delivery. Delivery time for this level of service can take up to 8 weeks. If this level of service is selected, APA will not be held liable and will not honor any claims for undelivered, delayed, or lost shipments.

Hardship Request. If you do not have a personal subscription to the journal and you do not have access to an institutional or departmental subscription copy, you may obtain a single copy of the issue in which your article appears at no cost by filing out the information below.

Journal: _____

Vol. no. : _____ Issue no.: _____

Issue month: _____

CREDIT CARD PAYMENT

___ VISA ___ MASTERCARD ___ AMERICAN EXPRESS

CARD NUMBER _____

Expire Date _____ Signature _____

PRINT CLEARLY – THIS IS YOUR MAILING LABEL

SHIP TO:	Phone No. _____
Name _____	
Address _____	

City _____ State _____ Zip _____	
Expedited Service (enter service required): _____	

Send the completed form and your check, made out to the **American Psychological Association**, or your credit card information to:

**APA Order Department
 750 First Street, NE
 Washington, DC 20002-4242**

All orders must be prepaid. Allow 4-6 weeks after the journal is published for delivery of a single copy or the first copy of a subscription.



Policy on Unreliable Game Addiction Diagnoses Puts the Cart Before the Horse

AQ: au
AQ: 1

Christophe Ferguson
Stetson University

Anthony M. Bean
Framingham State University

AQ: 2

Rune K. L. Nielsen
IT University Copenhagen

Mark P. Smyth
Chartered Clinical Psychologist

Internationally, several policies have been designed to prevent pathological or “problematic” gaming issues in youth, commonly referred to simply as “game addiction.” Particularly following the release of the World Health Organization’s “gaming disorder” diagnosis, policymakers may be inclined to enact further policies on this matter. With new data reflecting lack of success for South Korea’s shutdown policy, the efficacy of current policy efforts remains in doubt. Given continued controversies regarding whether pathological gaming or gaming disorder is best conceptualized as a unique disorder rather than symptomatic of other, underlying mental illnesses, little data has emerged to encourage policy interventions. By contrast, policy interventions at this juncture may risk doing considerable harm and wag the dog in the sense of reifying a pathological gaming disorder construct that remains problematic and under contentious debate in the field. We advise caution, ethnographic and qualitative research approaches, open science, etiological comprehension, and more time to fully understand whether pathological gaming is the best target for policy interventions and informing clinicians.

Public Policy Relevance Statement

Despite ongoing controversies regarding the validity of pathological gaming as a diagnosis, some efforts have been made to implement policies based on this construct. The current review finds that empirical evidence to support such policies remains lacking and many policies may inadvertently do more harm than good.

Keywords: video games, addiction, public policy, pathological gaming

In 2018, the World Health Organization (WHO) announced the release of their “gaming disorder” diagnosis, marking the first time that video gaming could be labeled as an addiction and a clinical disorder. Gaming disorder (GD) was defined by the WHO as gaming to an extent that it interferes with other life activities. The

WHO did not provide further specific symptoms or clinical information, aside from classifying it as an addictive behavior, leaving much interpretation in the hands of clinicians. As clinicians rely heavily on clearly defined criteria, this may be considered an unorthodox approach not just to psychological research but also to clinical research and utility that impacts millions of people every day who seek out psychological services. By contrast, the American Psychiatric Association has proposed a category for further study, “internet gaming disorder” (IGD), which provides specific symptoms that are very similar to substance abuse and gambling disorder symptoms.¹ Research into this area has been convoluted at best, suggesting the proposed criteria may not be measuring any meaningful construct, which should be of concern to policymakers (Przybylski, Weinstein, & Murayama, 2017). However, as research on gaming overuse has been conducted for years prior without consistent results, the lack of solid conclusions should not be surprising. Even with the controversies surrounding problem-

Christopher J. Ferguson, Department of Psychology, Stetson University; Anthony M. Bean, Department of ●●●, Framingham State University; Rune K. L. Nielsen, Department of ●●●, IT University Copenhagen; and Mark P. Smyth, Chartered Clinical Psychologist.

Dr. Nielsen has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s H2020 ERC-ADG program (grant agreement No 695528). All authors contributed to the conceptualization and writing of the article and approved of the submitted draft. The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare. Human participant research was not conducted as part of this article.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Christopher J. Ferguson, Department of Psychology, Stetson University, 421 North, Woodland Boulevard, DeLand, FL 32729. E-mail: CJFerguson1111@aol.com

¹ For a discussion of the problematic origin of internet gaming disorder symptoms, see Nielsen & Grabarczyk (2018) and Nielsen & Karhulahti (2017).

atic video gaming, clinics have been developed across the world to treat pathological gaming (PG) and GD, even before the WHO's official diagnosis. Although some countries had already enacted policies designed to curb gaming overuse, potentially using poorly informed methods ultimately causing more harm than good, it appears probable that more countries may follow suit with policy efforts to curb gaming overuse. But are such policies effective, and is gaming overuse a conceptually valid target for such policies? This article focuses on evidence regarding the efficacy of public policies targeting gaming overuse and provides suggestions for future policies.

A Brief Overview of Gaming Overuse Research

AQ: 5 Scholarship on gaming overuse began as early as 1983 when perhaps the first article on the topic referred to “junk-time junkies” (Soper & Miller, 1983). In the intervening 36 years, a subject search on PsycINFO for [“pathological gaming” OR “video game addiction”] returned 101 articles. So, this is definitely a topic of great interest. Several excellent reviews of this topic have been written from varying perspectives (Hellman, Schoenmakers, Nordstrom, & van Holst, 2013; Pontes, 2018). A full summary of this nearly 4-decades-old research field is beyond the scope of this article. Thus, our review here is summative.

Much of the research has focused on the parameters of PG. These include issues such as its conceptual utility, means of diagnosis, biological or neurological markers (if any), distinguishing pathological from engaged gaming (Charlton & Danforth, 2007), co-occurrence with other mental disorders, and cultural reactions to new technology including technophobia and moral panic (Bowman, 2016). Despite several decades of research, opinions among scholars on these issues remain significantly divided. This is not to say that one view is correct and the other wrong, merely to note that a wide-ranging literature has not always provided either consensus or clarity on these fundamental issues.

Perhaps the one issue most scholars might agree upon is that some individuals play games instead of engaging in other life responsibilities. Yet, whether the games themselves are responsible for this or whether gaming is a fun activity some people do to distract themselves from other mental health issues remains less clear. Nonetheless, several efforts have moved forward with implementing policies designed to target PG in hopes of reducing such behaviors. We now turn to a discussion of these policies.

Currently Existing Policies Regarding Gaming Overuse

Kiraly and colleagues (2018) presented an important review of current policies targeted at the controversial PG concept. Policy approaches include those directed at limiting access to potentially overused technology and those which are directed at providing warnings of some sort to users themselves. We briefly review each of these in turn.

Policies Geared Toward Limiting Access

One way to reduce individuals' risk of developing overuse of technology is to limit their access to that technology. Perhaps the most well-known example of a policy based on this premise is

South Korea's “shutdown” policy, which attempts to limit minors' access to the Internet between the hours of midnight and 6 a.m. by requiring age verification for online use. This policy was implemented due to the perception that Internet overuse had become prevalent among Korean youth and was impacting their health and grades. Thus, by carving out a particular *no use* time zone, the shutdown law is intended to free youth for adequate sleep and preparation for school and limit other mental health problems of overuse. The law was initiated in 2011 and has survived constitutional challenge in Korea but remains controversial.

Regarding, the effectiveness of the shutdown law, evidence has generally not suggested the shutdown law is effective in improving youth mental health. Early work suggested that the law had little actual impact on youth Internet use (Sung, 2014). More recently, the efficacy of the South Korean shutdown policy has been empirically evaluated (Lee, Kim, & Hong, 2017). This evaluation found that the policy increased youths' nightly sleep totals by approximately 1.5 min and reduced the probability of developing gaming addiction by 0.7%, but only among female users. The authors concluded that the potential human rights costs of the policy and inappropriate regulation of speech were far greater than the modest gains in adolescent health.

A more recent preregistered study, Przybylski (2018) found that digital screen time had a small and nonpractical effect (1.9% of the observed variability) on pediatric sleep. Przybylski additionally concluded that other contextual factors such as family life, school endeavors, and relationships were more culpable for a decline in sleep than screen time was. This finding further questions whether there is evidence for any form of regulation or shutdown policy of the use of technology for children or adolescents.

Other countries have also attempted shutdown laws of various sorts. Thailand enacted a shutdown law in the early 2000s, although later repealed it. Vietnam and China have also implemented or considered shutdown laws. In June 2018, French politicians voted to ban the use of mobile phones in primary and middle schools from September 2018. The reported aim of the legislation banning phones in schools is designed to improve students' concentration and preventing cyberbullying and the watching of pornography. Criticisms of the ban have focused on the practicalities of teachers implementing and policing such a ban for all pupils.

Fatigue Systems/Warning Messages

Fatigue systems are systems that disincentivized ongoing game play. These could take several forms, such as allotting fewer experience points, achievements, and so forth, to game play that occurs after a set time limit, or providing warnings to players once they have exceeded a certain time playing. At present, regulations regarding such systems appear limited to China (Kiraly et al., 2018), although they could be voluntarily included in platforms by designers themselves.

Fatigue systems have received some critiques regarding potential privacy issues and stopping points for game play that may cut-off play half-way through meaningful experiences. Empirical analyses of fatigue systems are few, although one analysis by Davies and Blake (2016) suggested that a system of soft warnings and gradually reduced incentives cause fewer disruptions that automatic shutdowns. However, incentives such as experience

points only relate to a small part of gamer motivations, and fatigue systems may have fewer impacts on intrinsic motivations such as those noted by self-determination theory (Przybylski, Rigby, & Ryan, 2010). In other words, if player motivations to play are intrinsic, manipulating extrinsic influences may produce few results.

Ratings for Addictiveness

One other possibility would be to include potential ratings for a gamer's addictiveness as part of ratings systems such as the Entertainment Software Ratings Board or Pan European Game Information systems. Likely, such ratings may be for specific mechanisms such as loot boxes (Drummond & Sauer, 2018) or other mechanisms that may resemble gambling rather than "addictiveness" per se, which is a subjective qualifier. Particularly, if voluntarily implemented by industry and focused on specific mechanisms such as loot boxes, such an approach has a potential appeal of being specific, free of value-laden "addiction" language and avoids limits on government regulation in some countries such as the United States (van Rooij, Meerkerk, Schoenmakers, Grifiths, & van de Mheen, 2010). There is a movement in some countries toward regulatory enforcement of ratings, with Belgium being a notable leader, given its declaration of loot boxes being akin to gambling and therefore illegal. However, this invites the question of whether other *hidden-prize* mechanisms such as those in popular trading cards, or even Lego toys should be similarly considered akin to gambling.²

Fn2

One problem associated with classifying video games according to "addictiveness" is that research to date has not been able to identify a clear addictive component in video games. One cannot make the digital equivalent to the nonalcoholic beer. A recent study indicates that "addiction" in video game addiction derives from the games' abilities to fulfill our needs for autonomy, relatedness, and competence (Weinstein, Przybylski, & Murayama, 2017). Because it is difficult to imagine a game that does not allow for these experiences, it is difficult to imagine a game that is not "addictive" if one argues that fun and engaging elements are, in and of themselves, inherently addictive. It is possible that some mechanisms such as loot boxes may ultimately be more clearly linked to addictiveness, or increased risk of harm, but further research is required.

Taxation

Whether video games could be taxed due to their perceived harms is likely to vary according to the jurisdiction and specific national laws. For instance, in the United States, selective taxation of "naughty" speech or art is considered unconstitutional as reaffirmed by the *Brown v EMA* (2011) decision. Such approaches would ostensibly aim to reducing incentives to purchase games by increasing price. Analogies to cigarettes and other controlled substances are obvious, although it is less clear that making public health analogies between games and controlled substances are warranted, given significant differences in magnitudes of effect and quality of existing data (Block & Crain, 2007).

At present, limited empirical evidence exists to suggest that policy efforts geared toward reducing game time are effective in increasing youth well-being. This raises the possibility that such

policies may be misdirected, failing in large part due to mis-specifying the problem. In particular, although the WHO's GD represents the first time a hobby has been classified as a mental illness due to its potential overuse, this move by the WHO has been met by expressions of skepticism and concern from numerous scholars and scholarly groups. For example, a large group of scholars wrote an open letter to the WHO, expressing concern that *GD* was not based on sound science and could do more harm than good (Aarseth et al., 2017). Similarly, the American Psychological Association and Psychological Society of Ireland's respective divisions and special interest groups for technology-, media-, and art-related issues cosponsored a statement opposing the WHO's decision (Society for Media Psychology & Technology & Special Interest Group for Media, Art, & Cyberpsychology, 2018). In the following text, we briefly highlight some of the concerns with the pathologizing of gaming.

Does "Pathological Gaming" Exist as an Independent Disorder?

Is Pathological Gaming the Right Target for Policy?

For policy targeted toward PG to succeed; PG must uniquely explain some variance in mental or physical health. Whether this is true remains an open question. We are more inclined to believe, as some other scholars and researchers do (Przybylski et al., 2017; Quandt, 2017), that PG is best conceptualized as symptomatic of other underlying disorders rather than a unique disorder in its own right. Our perspective is based both on data to suggest that underlying mental disorders precede PG symptoms (Ferguson & Cera-noglu, 2014) and also that PG symptoms tend to be poor predictors of other mental and physical health problems (Przybylski et al., 2017). Lack of mental and physical health stability as a construct (Rothmund, Klimmt, & Gollwitzer, 2018; Scharnow, Festl & Quandt, 2014). Furthermore, our clinical experience of working therapeutically with video gamers is consistent with raising concerns about underlying mental health disorders (e.g., anxiety and depression) and the need to cautiously differentiate between highly engaged/immersed individuals and potential PG (Bean, 2018; Nielsen, 2017). Many individuals likely use video gaming as a coping mechanism for other underlying mental health conditions (Kardefelt-Winther, 2017). We express the concern that taking games away abruptly without contextual factors in mind, the act likely does more harm than good and could cause further stigmatization now related to gaming in a clinical field already having difficulties with mental health stigmatization being a barrier to treatment.

AQ: 6

The advent of the PG diagnosis in any form has been controversial, with ongoing uncertainty about which or what symptoms indicate the disorder, how prevalent it is, and indeed whether it is an independent diagnosis at all. We find these ongoing concerns to be critical, for policy based upon a clinical *house of cards* may be expected to be of limited value. If policies target the wrong issue, they are doomed to failure. For example, if it is true that PG is

² For a classification of loot box mechanics that allow for a distinction between those that are equivalent to collectible cards, or Kinder surprises, from those that are more equivalent to scratch-off tickets, see Nielsen and Grabarczyk (2018).

merely symptomatic of underlying mental health problems, then targeting those symptoms will merely result in symptom shift rather than true improvement in quality of life. Another risk is that pathologizing gaming behavior as an illness could inadvertently increase the stigma associated with gaming behavior and demotivate individuals to seek help out of concern that nongaming therapists or psychiatrists may not understand their hobby or gaming culture. Stigma is well-associated with reduced help-seeking behavior for other mental health conditions (Klik, Williams, & Reynolds, 2019). Conceptualizing PG as an addiction also risks locating the problem inherently within the individual (or more likely “naughty” technology) as opposed to understanding the systemic difficulties that often co-occur, such as the need for parental psychoeducation with regard to appropriate boundaries in the home. The binary view of young people as “digital natives” and parents as “digital immigrants” does little to assist in bridging the gap between the technology knowledge base of young people and their parents. This perspective is especially important, given research that suggests that “video game addiction” is a symptom of conflict within the family rather than psychopathology (Brus, 2013).

Is There Consensus?

Although the inclusion of IGD in the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition (DSM-5*; in a preliminary section for categories requiring further research) and the WHO’s announcement regarding “GD” have sparked considerable debate, it is worth exploring further these scholarly disagreements (Aarseth et al., 2017; Bean, Nielsen, van Rooij, & Ferguson, 2017). Indeed, one issue which continues to be problematic is whether scholars and clinicians agree that PG is a primary disorder or a misdiagnosed and misunderstood pastime.

One previous study of clinicians (Ferguson, 2015) found that a majority of clinicians (61.5%) agreed that PG was a problem for society. This number, interestingly, was greater than for those who believe violent games cause youth violence (39.5%) although it is worth noting that nearly 30% of clinicians were more skeptical of the concept of PG. Further, a follow-up of behavioral scientists (Ferguson & Colwell, 2017) found that only 29.8% of scholars agreed that PG is a serious problem. Indeed, the difference in agreement between scholars and clinicians is statistically significant, $t(282) = 5.63, p < .001, r = .318$. For this article, we obtained both of these previous data sets (Ferguson, 2015; Ferguson & Colwell, 2017) to examine attitudes toward PG with a few simple analyses. Combining the samples and using age, gender, video game experience, and negative attitudes toward youth themselves, we find that concerns about PG are predicted by video game experience ($\beta = -.155, p = .007$) and negative attitudes toward youth ($\beta = .436, p < .001$).

Results from the analysis of data sets described earlier suggest that concerns about PG are not always objective in nature, even among clinicians or scholars. Clinicians are more inclined to worry about PG, whereas scholars are more skeptical. Further, individuals with less gaming experience and more hostile views of youth express greater concern about PG. It is possible that clinicians may be overly quick to “see” PG in patients, reflecting issues with prior controversial diagnoses such as multiple personality disorder (Lilienfeld & Lynn, 2003) and repressed memory syndrome (Lindsay

& Briere, 1997). Given these findings, we are less sanguine than Király et al. (2018) that experts in the field (particularly clinicians) are likely to bridge generational divides, critically consume or understand conflicting research, or refrain from misdiagnosing clients. This concern is exacerbated by the fact that clinicians have been offering treatment to all manner of behavioral addictions from sex, sports, work, and exercise to shopping for years despite the fact that these are not officially recognized (Addictions.com, 2019; Begin Again Institute, 2019). Before 2013, behavioral addictions were not recognized by either the *DSM* or the *International Classification of Diseases (ICD)*. Yet, problematic use of nondigital games, the Internet, smartphones, shopping, sex, and so forth consistently are exempt from diagnostic classification. The inclusion of digital games and not these other behaviors sends the message that digital games are uniquely harmful, for which there is little evidence.

Distancing Pathological Gaming From Substance Abuse and Gambling

Some experts in the field such as Kiraly and colleagues (2018) expressed the view that PG has “shared similarities” with substance abuse disorders and referred to substance abuse disorders several other times in their article. Though we understand the good intentions of the authors, we express concern that referencing or comparing with substance abuse (and even pathological gambling) has likely caused more damage than good to the conceptualization of PG. This can result in policies designed for PG that are imported from what works for substance abuse that will be unlikely to work for PG, even were PG to be understood as an independent disorder.

The assumption that PG could be diagnosed similarly to substance abuse has undoubtedly caused many problems for the IGD diagnosis in the *DSM-5* (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). It has been noted that many of the diagnostic criteria for IGD have been criticized for pathologizing normal behavior (Quandt, 2017), in large part because behaviors that are problematic for use of addictive substances (such as using them to improve mood, thinking about them during the day, giving up other activities for them, etc.) are normal when referencing hobby-like behaviors including gaming, model-building, sports, or even reading (Kardefelt-Winther, 2015; Kuss, Griffiths, & Pontes, 2017). Problematic diagnostic criteria cause problems down the line regarding prevalence estimates and the ability of the diagnosis to predict negative outcomes (Przybylski et al., 2017). Furthermore, many researchers have expressed considerable concern about whether utilizing the past criteria of substance abuse creates a top-down approach to the diagnostic criteria rather than a bottom-up approach, further creating confirmatory bias within current research projects (Aarseth et al., 2017; Bean et al., 2017; Przybylski et al., 2017).

This is not to say no similarities exist (after all, a fly and a tree are both forms of life), but that similarities are often exaggerated to make alarmist claims such as that gaming can be compared with substances such as heroin or methamphetamines. Such arguments may rest on claims that have a kernel of truth. Specifically, dopamine or particular brain regions are involved in both behaviors, albeit the mechanisms of action differ (Vousooghi, Zarei, Sadat-Shirazi, Eghbali, & Zarrindast, 2015). Yet, these narratives leave out many nuances that would render such a comparison to appear less meaningful (such as that dopamine release and those

AQ: 7

AQ: 8

AQ: 9

AQ: 10

brain regions are involved in a myriad of nonpathological behaviors, e.g., holding a newborn, greeting friends, attending a vacation, etc.). Comments made regarding similarities between gaming and substance use, though certainly made in good faith, are easy to be taken out of context by news reporters (Griffiths, 2014) and will likely cause similar misunderstanding among policymakers, clinicians, and the general public.

In this sense, the potential use of warning labels may be problematic. Király et al. (2018) argued that warning messages in digital games such as “Remember to take all things in moderation (even World of Warcraft!)” (n.p.) are analogous to the health warnings that appear on tobacco and alcohol packages. We find this line of argumentation to be unconvincing and an example of when the addiction metaphor is taken too far. We find such warning messages are more analogous to the nonexistent warning messages that appear on TV shows, in fitness centers, in shopping malls, on social media, on smartphones, or in the word processors of scholars who spend far too much time on academic writing. Claiming that the well-established and inevitable negative effects of sustained tobacco and alcohol use are similar to the potential negative effects of gaming is hyperbolic unless policymakers are willing to extend the same warnings regarding gardening, dancing, running, exercising, and every other hobby, which is too numerous to count—one could also say that writing academic articles can be addictive using the same language as these claims (Allegre, Souville, Therme, & Griffiths, 2006; Bamber, Cockerill, Rodgers, & Carroll, 2003; Berczik et al., 2012; Maraz, Urbán, Griffiths, & Demetrovics, 2015), further raising concern about bipolarity of the current diagnostic criteria of Frances (2013).
 AQ: 11 Allen Frances, Chair of the *DSM-IV* Task Force warned in the article Frances (2013) in a criticism of the development of *DSM-5* that “mislabeling everyday problems as mental illness has shocking implications for individuals and society: stigmatizing a healthy person as mentally ill leads to unnecessary, harmful medications, the narrowing of horizons, misallocation of medical resources.” It is arguable that the WHO inclusion of PG in *ICD-11* is a recent example of what Allen has called “Out of control Psychiatric Diagnosis.”

Thus, whether discussing diagnosis or policy, we believe it as fruitful if not more so to discuss the important differences between PG and substance abuse and even gambling as similarities. Few scholars, for instance, caution that we must distinguish engaged from addicted heroin users. Comments about dopamine or fMRI studies must be taken with considerable salt, and associations between brain regions and excessive gaming are nuanced (Kühn et al., 2011). The involvement of dopamine appears to differ in nontrivial ways between gaming and substance abuse (Vousooghi et al., 2015). Similarly, we urge caution in assuming that gaming works similarly to gambling. Gaming is, of course, a fairly heterogeneous experience, and commenting that all games work similarly is fraught, however one speaks of them. It is true some games deliberately include cynical gambling-like elements (e.g., loot boxes, which are worthy of criticism). But many do not, and we are less certain that reducing games to variable-reinforcement (particularly given many games are continuously reinforcing) operant structures is meaningful, given that motivations for gameplay often focus on less salient, more motivational issues (Przybylski et al., 2010). Further, we argue that it would be more productive to build data-based policies around the unique concerns of PG rather than

assuming approaches for substance abuse can be transported to PG (as occurred with the symptomatology of IGD).

Policy and Censorship

Although we do not doubt that many policies directed toward PG will be well-intentioned, we do express concern that PG can, at times, be used as a fig-leaf or cover for policies that are authoritarian and censorious in nature. This may be less of an issue in countries where free-speech protections are considerable, such as in the United States, where taxing or regulating access to games would likely be unconstitutional (forms of speech cannot be taxed or limited like cigarettes). But other governments may be more inherently interested in regulating the flow of information, and a public health crisis, whether it truly exists or not, can provide an excuse for the control of speech (Golub & Lingley, 2008). Thus, an analysis of policy should not assume all policies are equally well motivated.

Likewise, policy efforts can be the tail that wags the dog of science itself. The WHO acknowledged being under pressure, particularly from Asian governments, to provide a PG related diagnosis (Bean et al., 2017). But an atmosphere of moral panic with attendant news media attention, grant funding, professional prestige, and so forth can also create an atmosphere that does not encourage a rigorous testing of the PG concept. Distancing of science from policy may be essential to improve the objectivity of science. This may include suggestions such as distancing scholars from conflict-of-interest funding including clinical treatment centers, media watchdog advocacy groups, and perhaps even governments actively pursuing policies related to games. Using open science, particularly the preregistration of study hypotheses before data collection, may also help limit potential problematic influences on the scientific process.

Points That May Guide Further Policy

Time Spent Gaming Does Not Indicate Pathology

Current evidence suggests that time spent engaged with digital games is a poor measure of pathological behavior. Many engaged players can play fairly seriously without showing interference with other life responsibilities (Charlton & Danforth, 2007; Przybylski, Weinstein, Ryan, & Rigby, 2009). Approaches that focus too heavily on time are likely to overidentify nonaddicted players and may subsequently miss players with legitimate interference issues. This point is made especially salient, given the rise of esports as a viable profession for players, coaches, managers, commentators, and so forth and the dedication that pursuing an esports career demands (Nielsen & Karhulahti, 2017).

The Cure Is Not in Controlling the Game

Any treatment focused separately on removing the “addictive potential” of games is likely to have negligible effects. This of course is because PG may not be the root cause of problems but rather a symptom of or coping strategy to deal with underlying problems. Previous research on computer or programming addiction found that the behavior was in fact not an addiction but a well-adapted coping strategy (Shotton, 1989, 1991). We believe

more qualitative research is needed to determine if most cases of PG are not also forms of psychological coping. It seems to us that concerns about addiction are always tied to the qualities associated with the most recent and popular games, both of which are qualities that are difficult to remove from games. As an example, few would argue as Griffiths and Hunt (1998) did 20 years ago, that chasing one's high score is a symptom of addiction. If all it took to prevent problem gaming was to remove high score tables, that would indeed be a happy situation.

Might Well-Intentioned Interventions Cause Harm?

There is a real danger that it might cause more harm than benefit if we start labeling new technology-enabled behaviors as pathologies and inadvertently overpathologize nonpathological behaviors. Potential harms from ill-considered policies may include regulation and censorship of speech, stigmatizing games such that educational settings become afraid of complaints, promoting poorly verified treatments, focusing in treatment on symptoms rather than causes of problems, promoting moral panics about new technology, and fomenting discord between moral panicking parents and their children.

The Need for Preregistered Open Science

At present, most research in this field has not been preregistered and does not exist under conditions of open science (see Colder Carras & Kardefeldt-Winther, 2018; Przybylski et al. 2017 for exceptions). This raises a significant possibility of Type I error, researcher expectancy effects, and other sources of nontrivial bias in this field. Given the replication crisis that has spread across other areas of social science, including other video game-related fields (Tear & Nielsen, 2013), this issue bears serious consideration. We highly recommend that, in the future, scholars adopt preregistration and open science to critically evaluate, rather than merely confirm, theories related to PG.

Concluding Thoughts

With the advent of GD in the WHO's *ICD-11*, there is a distinct likelihood that policymakers will increasingly target gaming for policies geared toward limiting use. Our concerns mainly fall into two categories. First, the PG-related policies may cynically be used by some governments as part of larger, authoritarian efforts to control speech. Related to this, moral panics and policy over PG may have undue influence on PG research itself. Second, that the PG concept itself remains mired in significant controversies and without greater clarity, perhaps promoted by open science principles in this field, policy efforts are unlikely to see much success. Or, simply, policy directed at PG may unwittingly distract from better policies directed at mental health more broadly and at the cost of free speech rights and the potential of harm to minors. We urge all policymakers to take these important and cautious points into consideration if a policy is to be introduced and to focus on quality research studies that are not based in confirmatory biases. By using these key points, it will put forth better research and a greater breadth of understanding of video game culture, and help to delineate actual appropriate diagnostic criteria.

AQ: 14

References

- Aarseth, E., Bean, A. M., Boonen, H., Colder-Carras, M., Coulson, M., Das, D., . . . Van Rooij, A. J. (2017). Scholars' open debate paper on the World Health Organization ICD-11 gaming disorder proposal. *Journal of Behavioral Addictions, 6*, 267–270. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1556/2006.5.2016.088>
- Addictions.com. (2019). *Is shopping addiction real?* Retrieved from <https://www.addictions.com/shopping/is-shopping-addiction-real/>
- Allegre, B., Souville, M., Therme, P., & Griffiths, M. (2006). Definitions and measures of exercise dependence. *Addiction Research and Theory, 14*, 631–646. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/16066350600903302>
- American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders, 5th Edition: DSM-5*. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Publishing.
- Bamber, D. J., Cockerill, I. M., Rodgers, S., & Carroll, D. (2003). Diagnostic criteria for exercise dependence in women. *British Journal of Sports Medicine, 37*, 393–400. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bjbm.37.5.393>
- Bean, A. M. (2018). *Working with video gamers and games in therapy: A clinician's guide*. New York, NY: Routledge. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9781315173382>
- Bean, A. M., Nielsen, R. K. L., van Rooij, A. J., & Ferguson, C. J. (2017). Video game addiction: The push to pathologize video games. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 48*, 378–389. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pro0000150>
- Begin Again Institute. (2019). *Over 11 years specializing in sex and porn addiction*. Retrieved from https://www.beginagaininstitute.com/?utm_source=bing&utm_medium=cpc&utm_campaign=Sexual%20Addiction%20%3A%3A%20EM&utm_term=sex%20addiction%20treatment&utm_content=sex%20addiction%20treatment
- Berczik, K., Szabó, A., Griffiths, M. D., Kurimay, T., Kun, B., Urbán, R., & Demetrovics, Z. (2012). Exercise addiction: Symptoms, diagnosis, epidemiology, and etiology. *Substance Use and Misuse, 47*, 403–417. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3109/10826084.2011.639120>
- Block, J. J., & Crain, B. R. (2007). Omissions and errors in "media violence and the American public". *American Psychologist, 62*, 252–253. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.62.3.252>
- Bowman, N. D. (2016). The rise (and refinement) of moral panic. In R. Kowert & T. Quandt (Eds.), *The video game debate: Unravelling the physical, social, and psychological effects of digital games* (pp. 22–38). New York, NY: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- Brown v. Entertainment Merchants Assn. (2011). Retrieved from <https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/10pdf/08-1448.pdf>
- Brus, A. (2013). A young people's perspective on computer game addiction. *Addiction Research and Theory, 21*, 365–375. <http://dx.doi.org/10.13109/16066359.2012.733466>
- Charlton, J. P., & Danforth, I. D. W. (2007). Distinguishing addiction and high engagement in the context of online game playing. *Computers in Human Behavior, 23*, 1531–1548. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2005.07.002>
- Colder Carras, M., & Kardefelt-Winther, D. (2018). When addiction symptoms and life problems diverge: A latent class analysis of problematic gaming in a representative multinational sample of European adolescents. *European Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 27*, 513–525. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00787-018-1108-1>
- Davies, B., & Blake, E. (2016). Evaluating existing strategies to limit video game playing time. *IEEE Computer Graphics and Applications, 36*, 47–57. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/MCG.2016.25>
- Drummond, A., & Sauer, J. (2018). Video game loot boxes are psychological akin to gambling. *Nature Human Behaviour, 2*, 530–532. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41562-018-0360-1>
- Ferguson, C. J. (2015). Clinicians' attitudes toward video games vary as a function of age, gender and negative beliefs about youth: A sociology of media research approach. *Computers in Human Behavior, 52*, 379–386. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.06.016>

AQ: 15

- Ferguson, C. J., & Ceranoglu, T. A. (2014). Attention problems and pathological gaming: Resolving the 'chicken and egg' in a prospective analysis. *Psychiatric Quarterly*, *85*, 103–110. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11126-013-9276-0>
- AQ: 16 Ferguson, C. J., Coulson, M., & Barnett, J. (2011). A meta-analysis of pathological gaming prevalence and comorbidity with mental health, academic and social problems. *Journal of Psychiatric Research*, *45*, 1573–1578. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychires.2011.09.005>
- Frances, A. (2013). *Saving normal: An insider's revolt against out-of-control psychiatric diagnosis, DSM-5, Big Pharma, and the medicalization of ordinary life*. New York, NY: William Morrow & Co.
- Golub, A., & Lingley, K. (2008). "Just Like the Qing Empire" Internet addiction, MMOGs, and Moral Crisis in Contemporary China. *Games and Culture*, *3*, 59–75. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1555412007309526>
- Griffiths, M. (2014). Press to play: Is gaming really more addictive than heroin? *Gamasutra*. Retrieved from https://www.gamasutra.com/blogs/MarkGriffiths/20140715/221010/Press_to_play_Is_gaming_really_more_addictive_than_heroin.php
- Griffiths, M. D., & Hunt, N. (1998). Dependence on computer games by adolescents. *Psychological Reports*, *82*, 475–480. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1998.82.2.475>
- Hellman, M., Schoenmakers, T. M., Nordstrom, B. R., & van Holst, R. J. (2013). Is there such a thing as online video game addiction? A cross-disciplinary review. *Addiction Research and Theory*, *21*, 102–112. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3109/16066359.2012.693222>
- Kardefelt-Winther, D. (2015). A critical account of DSM-5 criteria for Internet gaming disorder. *Addiction Research and Theory*, *23*, 93–98. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3109/16066359.2014.935350>
- Kardefelt-Winther, D. (2017). Conceptualizing Internet use disorders: Addiction or coping process? *Psychiatry and Clinical Neurosciences*, *71*, 459–466. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/pcn.12413>
- Király, O., Griffiths, M. D., King, D. L., Lee, H.-K., Lee, S.-Y., Bányai, F., . . . Demetrovics, Z. (2018). Policy responses to problematic video game use: A systematic review of current measures and future possibilities. *Journal of Behavioral Addictions*, *7*, 503–517. Advance online publication. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1556/2006.6.2017.050>
- Klik, K. A., Williams, S. L., & Reynolds, K. J. (2019). Toward understanding mental illness stigma and help-seeking: A social identity perspective. *Social Science and Medicine*, *222*, 35–43. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2018.12.001>
- Kühn, S., Romanowski, A., Schilling, C., Lorenz, R., Mörsen, C., Seifert, N., . . . Gallinat, J. (2011). The neural basis of video gaming. *Translational Psychiatry*, *1*, e53. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/tp.2011.53>
- Kuss, D. J., Griffiths, M. D., & Pontes, H. M. (2017). Chaos and confusion in DSM-5 diagnosis of Internet Gaming Disorder: Issues, concerns, and recommendations for clarity in the field. *Journal of Behavioral Addictions*, *6*, 103–109. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1556/2006.5.2016.062>
- Lee, C., Kim, H., & Hong, A. (2017). Ex-post evaluation of illegalizing juvenile online game after midnight: A case of shutdown policy in South Korea. *Telematics and Informatics*, *34*, 1597–1606. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2017.07.006>
- Lilienfeld, S. O., & Lynn, S. J. (2003). Dissociative identity disorder: Multiple personalities, multiple controversies. In S. O. Lilienfeld, S. J. Lynn, & J. M. Lohr (Eds.), *Science and pseudoscience in clinical psychology* (pp. 109–142). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Lindsay, D. S., & Briere, J. (1997). The controversy regarding recovered memories of childhood sexual abuse: Pitfalls, bridges and future directions. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *12*, 631–647. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/088626097012005002>
- Maraz, A., Urbán, R., Griffiths, M. D., & Demetrovics, Z. (2015). An empirical investigation of dance addiction. *PLoS ONE*, *10*, e0125988. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0125988>
- Nielsen, R. K. L. (2017). *Is game addiction a mental disorder? A dissertation on the history and science of the concept of Internet gaming disorder (Doctoral dissertation)*. IT University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen. Retrieved from <https://www.forskningsdatabasen.dk/en/catalog/2372696152>
- Nielsen, R. K. L., & Grabarczyk, P. (2018). Are loot boxes gambling? Random reward mechanisms in video games. In *DiGRA '18 - Proceedings of the 2018 DiGRA International Conference: The Game is the Message*. Turin, Italy.
- Nielsen, R. K. L., & Karhulahti, V. M. (2017, August). The problematic coexistence of internet gaming disorder and esports. In *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on the Foundations of Digital Games*. New York, NY: ACM.
- Pontes, H. (2018). Making the case for video game addiction: Does it exist or not? In C. J. Ferguson (Ed.), *Video game influences on aggression, cognition and attention* (pp. 41–57). Cham, Switzerland: Springer. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-95495-0_4
- Przybylski, A. K. (2018). Digital screen time and pediatric sleep: Evidence from a preregistered cohort study. *The Journal of Pediatrics*, *205*, 218–223. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jpeds.2018.09.054>
- Przybylski, A. K., Rigby, C. S., & Ryan, R. M. (2010). A motivational model of video game engagement. *Review of General Psychology*, *14*, 154–166. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0019440>
- Przybylski, A. K., Weinstein, N., & Murayama, K. (2017). Internet gaming disorder: Investigating the clinical relevance of a new phenomenon. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, *174*, 230–236. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2016.16020224>
- Przybylski, A. K., Weinstein, N., Ryan, R. M., & Rigby, C. S. (2009). Having to versus wanting to play: Background and consequences of harmonious versus obsessive engagement in video games. *Cyberpsychology and Behavior*, *12*, 485–492. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1089/cpb.2009.0083>
- Quandt, T. (2017). Stepping back to advance: Why IGD needs an intensified debate instead of a consensus: Commentary on: Chaos and confusion in DSM-5 diagnosis of Internet Gaming Disorder: Issues, concerns, and recommendations for clarity in the field (Kuss et al.). *Journal of Behavioral Addictions*, *6*, 121–123. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1556/2006.6.2017.014>
- Rothmund, T., Klimmt, C., & Gollwitzer, M. (2018). Low temporal stability of excessive video game use in German adolescents. *Journal of Media Psychology*, *30*, 53–65. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1027/1864-1105/a000177>
- Scharkow, M., Festl, R., & Quandt, T. (2014). Longitudinal patterns of problematic computer game use among adolescents and adults—A 2-year panel study. *Addiction*, *109*, 1910–1917. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/add.12662>
- Shotton, M. A. (1989). *Computer addiction? A study of computer dependency*. London, United Kingdom: Taylor & Francis.
- Shotton, M. A. (1991). The costs and benefits of 'computer addiction'. *Behaviour and Information Technology*, *10*, 219–230. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01449299108924284>
- Society for Media Psychology and Technology and Special Interest Group in Media The Arts and Cyberpsychology. (2018). *An Official** Division 46 Statement on the WHO Proposal to Include Gaming Related Disorders in ICD-11*. Retrieved from <https://div46amplifier.com/2018/06/21/an-official-division-46-statement-on-the-who-proposal-to-include-gaming-related-disorders-in-icd-11/>
- Soper, W. B., & Miller, M. J. (1983). Junk-time junkies: An emerging addiction among students. *School Counselor*, *31*, 40–43.
- Sung, W. (2014). A study on the effect of the policy of online game shutdown on the game time of youth. *Social Science Research Review*, *30*, 233–256.
- Tear, M. J., & Nielsen, M. (2013). Failure to demonstrate that playing violent video games diminishes prosocial behavior. *PLoS ONE*, *8*, e68382. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0068382>

- Van Rooij, A. J., Meerkerk, G.-J., Schoenmakers, T. M., Griffiths, M., & van de Mheen, D. (2010). Video game addiction and social responsibility. *Addiction Research and Theory, 18*, 489–493. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3109/16066350903168579>
- Vousooghi, N., Zarei, S. Z., Sadat-Shirazi, M.-S., Eghbali, F., & Zarrindast, M. R. (2015). mRNA expression of dopamine receptors in peripheral blood lymphocytes of computer game addicts. *Journal of Neural Transmission, 122*, 1391–1398. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00702-015-1408-2>
- Weinstein, N., Przybylski, A. K., & Murayama, K. (2017). A prospective study of the motivational and health dynamics of Internet Gaming Disorder. *PeerJ, 5*, e3838. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7717/peerj.3838>

Received December 26, 2018

Revision received April 24, 2019

Accepted May 15, 2019 ■

APA PROOFS

AUTHOR QUERIES

AUTHOR PLEASE ANSWER ALL QUERIES

1

AQau—Please confirm the given-names and surnames are identified properly by the colors.

■ = Given-Name, ■ = Surname

The colors are for proofing purposes only. The colors will not appear online or in print.

AQ1—Author: Please be sure to provide the name of the department(s) with which you and your coauthors are affiliated at your respective institutes if you have not already done so. If you are affiliated with a governmental department, business, hospital, clinic, VA center, or other nonuniversity-based institute, please provide the city and U.S. state (or the city, province, and country) in which the institute is based. Departments should be listed in the author footnote only, not the byline. If you or your coauthors have changed affiliations since the article was written, please include a separate note indicating the new department/affiliation: [author's name] is now at [affiliation].

AQ2—Author: Please provide city and state if its independent practice.

AQ3—Author: Please confirm if the edits made to the sentence “As clinicians rely heavily on clearly . . .” convey your intended meaning. Amend the same if necessary.

AQ4—Author: Please confirm if the edits made to the sentence “Research into this area has been convoluted . . .” convey your intended meaning. Amend the same if necessary.

AQ5—Author: Please confirm the hierarchy of the levels of headings introduced.

AQ6—Author: Please confirm if the edits made to the sentence “Our perspective is based both on data . . .” convey your intended meaning. Amend the same if necessary.

AQ7—Author: Please note that the sentence “This number, interestingly, was greater . . .” is unclear. Kindly amend the same for clarity.

AQ8—Author: “Ferguson & Colwell, 2017” is not included in your references. Please add to the reference list or delete this citation.


AQ9—Author: Please confirm if the edits made to the sentence “Furthermore, many researchers have expressed . . .” convey your intended meaning. Amend the same if necessary.

AQ10—Author: Please note that the sentence “Specifically, dopamine or particular brain . . .” is unclear. Kindly amend the same for clarity.


AUTHOR QUERIES


AUTHOR PLEASE ANSWER ALL QUERIES

2


AQ11—Author: Please confirm if the edits made to the sentence “Claiming that the well-established and vitable . . .” convey your intended meaning. Amend the same if necessary.

AQ12—Author: Please note that the sentence “Comments about dopamine of fMRI studies . . .” is unclear. Kindly amend the same for clarity.

AQ13—Author: Please confirm if the edits made to the sentence “Gaming is, of course, a . . .” convey your intended meaning. Amend the same if necessary.

AQ14—Author: Please confirm if the edits made to the sentence “By using these key points, it . . .” convey your intended meaning. Amend the same if necessary.

AQ15—Author: Please provide work title for reference “Brown v, E. M. A. (2011)”

AQ16—Author: “Ferguson, C. J., Coulson, M., & Barnett, J. (2011)” is not cited in the text. Please cite in the text or delete from the references.

AQ17—Author: Please check and confirm the updated URL is correct as set for reference “Nielsen, R. K. L. (2017)”

