**Biopsychosocial factors of gaming disorder: A systematic review employing
screening tools with well-defined psychometric properties**

Rose Seoyoung Chang¹, Minju Lee¹, Jamie Jooyeon Im¹, Kee-Hong Choi², Jueun Kim³,
Jeanyung Chey¹, Suk-Ho Shin⁴, Woo-Young Ahn¹

¹ Department of Psychology, Seoul National University, Seoul, South Korea

² School of Psychology, Korea University, Seoul, South Korea

³ Department of Psychology, Chungnam National University, Daejeon, South Korea

⁴ Dr. Shin's Neuropsychiatric Clinic, Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, Seoul, South Korea

* Corresponding author:

Woo-Young Ahn, Ph.D.

Department of Psychology

Seoul National University

Seoul, Korea 08826

Email: wahn55@snu.ac.kr

ABSTRACT

Background and aims: Considering the growing number of gamers worldwide and increasing public concerns regarding the negative consequences of problematic gaming, the aim of the present systematic review was to provide a comprehensive overview of gaming disorder (GD) by identifying empirical studies investigating biological, psychological, and social factors of GD using screening tools with well-defined psychometric properties.

Methods: A systematic literature search was conducted through PsycINFO, PubMed, RISS, and KISS, and papers published up to January 2022 were included. Studies were screened based on the GD diagnostic tool usage, and only five scales with well-established psychometric properties were included. A total of 93 studies were included in the synthesis, and the results were classified into three groups based on biological, psychological, and social factors.

Results: Biological factors (n=8) included reward, self-concept, brain structure, and functional connectivity. Psychological factors (n=67) included psychiatric symptoms, psychological health, emotion regulation, personality traits, and other dimensions. Social factors (n=29) included family, social interaction, culture, school, and social support.

Discussion: When the excess amount of assessment tools with varying psychometric properties were controlled for, mixed results were observed with regards to impulsivity, social relations, and family-related factors, and some domains suffered from a lack of study results to confirm any relevant patterns.

Conclusions: More longitudinal and neurobiological studies, consensus on a diagnostic tool with well-defined psychometric properties, and an in-depth understanding of gaming-related factors should be established to settle the debate regarding psychometric weaknesses of the current diagnostic system and for GD to gain greater legitimacy in the field of behavioral addiction.

Keywords: Gaming disorder, GD, Problematic gaming, Pathological gaming, Behavioral addiction, Biopsychosocial model

Highlights

- There is an ongoing debate on the current gaming disorder diagnostic system
- This review screened available gaming disorder findings according to diagnostic tools with well-supported evidence
- Various biological, psychological, and social factors are related to gaming disorder
- More longitudinal and biological studies and control for the excessive tool usage are crucial

1. INTRODUCTION

Gaming is a widely and commonly enjoyed leisure activity. The number of active video gamers worldwide has marked 2.69 billion by the end of 2020 and is expected to continue its growing pattern (Fernandes, 2020). The recent trend towards more gaming engagement has been partly attributed to the widespread COVID-19 lockdown, which has hindered engagement in other interpersonal connections (“More People Are Gaming,” 2020). While healthy usage of gaming brings certain emotional, social, and educational benefits, problematic gaming has been associated with negative consequences (Ferguson, 2010; Sublette & Mullan, 2012; Ferguson & Olson, 2013; Granic, Lobel, & Engels, 2014). Taking the inevitable link between the perils of addiction to games and mental health into account, Internet gaming disorder was included in the 5th edition of the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (DSM-5) as a “condition for further study” (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). Furthermore, gaming disorder (GD) was recently included in the 11th Revision of the International Classification of Diseases (ICD-11; World Health Organization, 2018).

However, there has been an ongoing debate among experts and researchers in the field on the issue of GD being officially recognized as a non-substance addiction disorder (Hellman et al., 2013; Petry et al., 2014). One of the main difficulties in settling this debate stems from the implementation of different GD screening and assessment tools with varying psychometric properties. King et al. (2020) reported that more than 40 diagnostic tools with different evaluative properties were being employed in GD research studies. The number of screening tools continues to grow due to the adaption or development of new tools in lieu of utilizing already established ones. The plethora of new tools with questionable psychometric properties led many researchers in the field to criticize assessment and measure inconsistencies in GD

papers and to argue that adequate psychometric properties of the scales need to be established for the effective comparability of the study results (Gomez et al., 2018; Kircaburun et al., 2020; Stevens et al., 2021). Therefore, in order to systematically review GD papers effectively, it is crucial to start from similar, if not the same, criteria for GD as much as possible. In other words, the excessive tool usage in GD research needs to be controlled in an attempt to accurately compare and analyze the results of existing GD studies.

King et al. (2020) evaluated all available GD screening tools according to their DSM/ICD coverage, empirical evidence, and psychometric properties. While no single tool was found to be superior, they reported five scales with greater evidential support for their psychometric properties: (1) Assessment of Internet and Computer Addiction Scale-Gaming (AICA-Sgaming), (2) Seven-Item Game Addiction Scale (GAS-7), (3) Ten-Item Internet Gaming Disorder Test (IGDT-10), (4) Internet Gaming Disorder Scale-Short Form (IGDS9-SF), and (5) Internet Gaming Disorder Scale (Lemmens IGD-9). In a recent meta-analysis, all five instruments were found to have good internal consistency and test-retest reliability (Yoon et al., 2021). Thus, in order to control for the abundance of GD tools in the field, the present review sought to implement an incisive approach of gathering and comparing results of studies that have utilized one of these five GD tools with relatively greater evidential support.

Another difficulty in settling the debate on the issue of GD being officially recognized as an addictive disorder stems from the lack of systematic reviews of scientific literature on GD that identify comprehensive factors associated with gaming. To our knowledge, there exist a small number of comprehensive systematic reviews. Mihara & Higuchi (2017) reviewed cross-sectional and longitudinal epidemiological studies of GD that were published up to May 2016. They reported that the comparison of the findings was hindered by insufficient longitudinal

studies along with diversified methodologies utilized in each study. Paulus et al. (2018) reviewed literature that investigated GD factors in children and adolescents that were published up to August 2016. They concluded that while GD can be characterized as a complex and endangering disorder, its concept and pathways leading to it cannot be fully analyzed due to the lack of longitudinal studies. Similarly, Sugaya et al. (2019) reviewed literature that investigated biopsychosocial factors of GD in children and adolescents that were published up to February 2018. They summarized various factors that were associated with the presence of GD yet acknowledged that diverse methods of classifications yielded differences in results.

None of the prior reviews have imposed restrictions on the diagnostic tool usage, which hindered the comparison of the findings. Furthermore, there is a need for an updated literature search considering the increased attention GD has received since the ICD-11 release year as well as the rapid growth of novel coronavirus disease 19 (COVID-19). Therefore, the aim of the present review was to overcome the limitations of existing reviews and to provide a more up-to-date, comprehensive overview of GD by systematically identifying and summarizing the findings of studies that used one of five aforementioned diagnostic tools to investigate biopsychosocial factors of GD.

1. METHODS

The present systematic review sought to collect the findings of all published studies reporting biological, psychological, or social factors related to gaming disorder. Included literature used various terms for describing problematic gaming behaviors; to maintain consistency and to avoid confusion, we use the term GD for all classification styles. A systematic

approach following the PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) guidelines were utilized (Liberati et al., 2009).

2.1 Search process and eligibility criteria

Figure 1. Flow diagram of the paper selection process for the systematic review

Figure 1 presents a summary of the search process for the systematic review. The search included all publication years (up to January 2022) using four large electronic databases: PsycINFO, PubMed, RISS (Research Information Sharing Service; <http://www.riss.kr/index.do>), and KISS (Koreanstudies Information Service System; <https://kiss.kstudy.com/index.asp>). The latter two are large South Korean research databases and were implemented in the search for the

inclusion of relevant literature published in Korean; this step was added, considering the high internet penetration rate in Asia and the importance of exploring international databases (Chia et al., 2020). The title or abstract terms used for the search for PsycINFO and PubMed were: (“pathology*” OR “problem*” OR “compulsive” OR “overuse” OR “abuse” OR “dependen*” OR “disorder*” OR “excess*” OR “addict*”) AND (“video” OR “computer” OR “internet” OR “online” OR “offline”) AND (“gaming” OR “game”). The terms used for the search for RISS and KISS were: “gaming addiction” OR “gaming disorder” OR “excessive gaming” OR “gaming use disorder” OR “gaming dependence” translated in Korean. The discrepancy in search terms was due to language and search setting differences. The initial search yielded 5,297 results. After removing the duplicates, the titles and abstracts of the remaining results ($n = 4,855$) were evaluated according to the following inclusion criteria: (1) published in peer-reviewed journals, (2) written in English or Korean, (3) empirical studies with primary data, (4) full-text availability, (5) investigated biopsychosocial characteristics of GD, and (6) utilized one of five scales (GAS-7, AICA-Sgaming, IGDS9-SF, Lemmens IGD-9, or IGDT10) to assess GD symptoms. The remaining full-text articles ($n = 721$) were read thoroughly. Six studies were not empirical studies, 587 studies did not utilize GD scales of choice, and 35 studies did not investigate biopsychosocial factors of GD thus were excluded. This resulted in 93 articles being included in the qualitative synthesis. The quality of each article was evaluated using the Kmet quality checklist (Kmet, Cook, & Lee, 2004; see Appendix A in supplementary material). Throughout the search process, three researchers independently selected articles that met the inclusion criteria and any disagreements were resolved by consensus.

-----Please insert Figure 1 around here-----

2.2 Scale descriptions

Studies were selected based on the GD screening tools recommended by King et al. (2020): IGDS9-SF, GAS-7, Lemmens IGD-9, AICA-Sgaming, and IGDT-10. These were chosen upon a critical evaluation of all available GD tools in terms of their DSM/ICD coverage, quantitative evidence base, and psychometric properties. See Appendix B in the supplementary material for the detailed descriptions for each scale.

2.3 Data extraction and synthesis

Information from 93 studies was extracted regarding the participant characteristics, GD diagnostic information, key findings, and statistical analyses used. Results were then grouped by categories (biological, psychological, or social) and corresponding subcategories.

2. RESULTS

3.1 Study characteristics

Information extracted from the studies included in the review are presented in Tables 1~3. Results were classified into three groups: biological (n=8), psychological (n=67), or social (n=29). Since psychological and social factors were often studied together, eleven studies were included in both groups. Approximately 70% of the studies were published within the past four years (2019-2022). Geographically, studies were carried out in Europe (n=40), Asia (n=38 including n=13 from the Middle East), North America (n=3), South America (n=2), and worldwide (n=10). As for the gender of study samples, six studies reported samples of only males while the remaining reported samples of all genders. The study samples included young adults/adult population (n=51), adolescents/children (n=31), or all age ranges (n=11). Following

the inclusion criteria, all studies utilized one of the five diagnostic scales: IGDS9-SF (n=40), GAS-7 (n=23), Lemmens IGD-9 (n=17), AICA-Sgaming (n=7), and IGDT10 (n=6). When assessed for quality, the summary score (total score divided by the total possible score) of all studies ranged from 0.75 to 1.00, which met the conservative cut-point (0.75) suggested by the quality assessment guidelines (Kmet, Cook, & Lee, 2004).

3.2 Biological factors associated with IGD

A total of eight studies have investigated psychological factors related to GD (Table 1). Among them, three studies investigated reward-related activities and two studies investigated self-concept. The remaining three were specifically related to neurobiology, with one focusing on the brain structure and the other two focusing on functional connectivity (FC).

Table 1. Biological findings in gaming disorder (IGD) included

Author(s) (year)	Participants (country of study)	Diagnostic scale for IGD	Measures	Main findings	Design
< Reward >					
Ariatama, Effendy, & Amin (2019)	N = 48, 20~40 years. (Indonesia)	IGDS9-SF	● DAT level	● IGD was associated with lower DAT level.	Cross-sectional
Duven, Müller, Beutel, & Wölfling (2015)	* <i>males only</i> PCG: N = 14, 24.29 ± 5.84 years. CG: N = 13, 23.31 ± 3.01 years. (Germany)	AICA- Sgaming	● functional EEG	● PCG showed attenuated amplitude of P300 in response to rewards compared to CG. ● PCG showed prolonged latency and increased amplitude of N100 compared to CG.	Cross-sectional
Turel, He, Wei, & Bechara (2021)	intensive players: N = 26, 20.46 ± 2.10 years. HC: N = 26, 20.69 ± 2.21 years. (China)	IGDS9-SF	● fMRI	● Players showed stronger activation in the ventral striatum compared to HC. ● Players showed weaker activation in the DLPFC compared to HC. ● Players showed higher activation in the left insula compared to HC when shown game-relating videos/cues.	Cross-sectional

< Self-concept >					
Dieter et al. (2015)	Addicted: N = 15, 28.73 ± 7.73 years. Non-addicted: N = 17, 24.94 ± 4.16 years. (Germany)	AICA-Sgaming	● fMRI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Addicted group showed enhanced activation in the left AG compared to the non-addicted during avatar-related vs. self-related reflection. ● Addicted group showed stronger identification with the avatar in the game compared to the non-addicted. 	● Cross-sectional
Leménager et al. (2016)	PG: N = 19, 25.68 ± 6.69 years. HC: N = 19, 27.68 ± 7.95 years. (Germany)	AICA-Sgaming	● fMRI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● PG showed hyperactivation in the left AG compared to HC during avatar reflection. ● PG considered their avatar's popularity significantly superior than their own. 	● Cross-sectional
< Brain Structure >					
Choi et al. (2017)	* <i>males only</i> IGD: N = 27, 29.45 ± 4.74 years. IGC: N = 29, 30.00 ± 5.75 years. NGC: N = 26, 27.21 ± 4.88 years. (South Korea)	Lemmens IGD-9	● sMRI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IGD showed decreased gray matter density in the left DLPFC compared to IGC and NGC. 	● Cross-sectional
< Functional Connectivity (FC) >					
Chun et al. (2020)	IGD: N = 45, 27.76 ± 5.31 years. HC: N = 45, 25.29 ± 4.07 years. (South Korea)	Lemmens IGD-9	● rs-fMRI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IGD showed lower FC between the VLPFC and DLPFC and between the PPC and DLPFC in the CEN compared to HC. 	● Cross-sectional

Kim et al. (2019)	* <i>males only</i> IGD: N = 22, 28.27 ± 5.33 years. HC: N = 24, 28.17 ± 5.93 years. (South Korea)	Lemmens IGD-9	● rs-fMRI	● IGD showed lower FC from the bilateral OFC to frontal, striatal, temporal, and occipital regions compared to HC.	● Cross-sectional
----------------------	---	------------------	-----------	---	-------------------

Note.

AG = angular gyrus

ANCOVA = analysis of covariance

ANOVA = analysis of variance

CEN = central executive network

CG = casual computer gaming

DAT = dopamine transporter

DLPFC = dorsolateral prefrontal cortex

EEG = electroencephalography

fMRI = functional magnetic resonance imaging

HC = healthy controls

IGC = internet gaming control

IGD = Internet gaming disorder

NGC = non-gaming control

OFC = orbitofrontal cortex

PCG = pathological computer gaming

rs-fMRI = resting state-functional magnetic resonance imaging

sMRI = structural magnetic resonance imaging

VLPFC = ventrolateral prefrontal cortex

3.2.1 Reward activity

Using electroencephalography (EEG), one study reported reduced peak amplitudes and longer latencies in response to rewards in pathological computer game players compared to casual players, suggesting a reduced reward sensitivity to gaming rewards in GD (Duven, Müller, Beutel, & Wölfling, 2015). Another study using functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) found deficits in the reward and self-control brain systems in response to video gaming cues (Turel, He, Wei, & Bechara, 2021). Specifically, intensive gamers showed stronger activation in the ventral striatum and weaker activation in the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (DLPFC) compared to controls when watching game-related videos, and GD scores of the gamers were positively associated with the right ventral striatum activity and negatively associated with the right DLPFC activity. Moreover, in a game-deprived state, gamers showed activation in the left insula when exposed to video gaming cues, and the insular activation in the deprivation condition was associated with increased striatal activity and decreased prefrontal activity, which showed similarity to other addictive behaviors. Lower dopamine transporter level has also been associated with more severe GD symptoms in those with GD (Ariatama, Effendy, & Amin, 2019). These studies suggest distinctive functioning of brain regions related to reward in GD.

3.2.2 Self-concept

Two studies consistently reported anomalies in various aspects of self-concept in GD individuals (Dieter et al., 2015; Lemenager et al., 2016). Individuals with GD considered their game avatar significantly superior to their self in terms of social and emotional competencies and they showed hyperactivation in the left angular gyrus (AG), a region that has previously been

found to be associated with self-concept-related processing (Decety & Grèzes, 2006; Ganesh, Van Schie, De Lange, Thompson, & Wigboldus, 2012), during avatar reflection relative to self-reflection compared to healthy controls. Furthermore, a significant positive correlation was found between the left AG activation and GD severity (Lemenager et al., 2016).

3.2.3 Brain structure

GD individuals exhibited decreased gray matter density in the left DLPFC compared to healthy controls and non-problematic game players (Choi et al., 2017). Moreover, lower gray matter density in the DLPFC was associated with longer lifetime usage of gaming and more severe GD symptoms.

3.2.4 Resting-state fMRI functional connectivity

In an fMRI study that assessed functional connectivity (FC) during resting state, the GD individuals displayed lower FC from the bilateral orbitofrontal cortex to the overall brain (frontal, striatal, temporal, and occipital) regions compared to the healthy controls (Kim et al., 2019). Another study with a larger sample size reported weaker FC in the central executive network, salience network, and default mode network during resting state in GD individuals compared to healthy controls (Chun et al., 2020). Specifically, GD individuals showed lower FC between the ventrolateral prefrontal cortex and DLPFC and between the posterior parietal cortex and DLPFC in the central executive network, between the dorsal anterior cingulate cortex and fronto-insular cortex and ventral striatum in the salience network, and in the medial prefrontal cortex of the anterior default mode network compared to healthy controls. Taken together,

altered functional connectivity found in these studies might suggest impairments in the capacity of the core brain networks in GD, although more studies are needed to confirm these patterns.

3.3 Psychological factors associated with GD

A total of 67 studies have investigated psychological factors related to GD (Table 2). Among them, 24 studies investigated psychiatric symptoms. Seven papers investigated psychological health, with a focus on general well-being. Six investigated emotion regulation and the other five investigated rewards, discounting and impulsivity. Five investigated personality traits, and three investigated stress. Cognitive approach, self-concept, and sleep each included two studies. Considering the current COVID-19 pandemic, a section was designated for COVID-19 which included 8 studies. The remaining studies were categorized as miscellaneous, with one study investigating flow and the other psychological needs.

Table 2. Psychological findings in gaming disorder (IGD) included

Author(s) (year)	Participants (country of study)	Diagnostic criteria	Measures	Psychological factors	Analytical strategy
< Psychiatric symptoms >					
Evren, Evren, Dalbudak, Topcu, & Kutlu (2019)	Probable ADHD Absent: N = 355, 24.48 ± 5.44 years. Present: N = 102, 23.43 ± 3.63 years. (Turkey)	Lemmens IGD-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● ASRS-v1.1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IGD was associated with higher probable ADHD symptoms. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional
Bonnaire & Baptista (2019)	PG: N = 273, 20.5 ± 2.5 years. NPG: N = 156, 21.2 ± 2.6 years. (France)	GAS-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● TAS-20 ● HADS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IGD was associated with being alexithymic, depression scores, and anxiety scores. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional
* De Pasquale et al. (2020)	N = 566, 22.74 ± 4.83 years. (Italy)	IGDS9-SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SCL-90-R ● The APA symptom checklist 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IGD was associated with higher symptoms of somatization, depression, and sleep disturbances. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional
Concerto et al. (2021)	N = 4,260, 18-55 years. (Italy)	IGDS9-SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● AQ ● ASRS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IGD was associated with autistic traits and ADHD symptoms after controlling for demographic variables. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional

* Haghbin et al. (2013)	N = 326, high school students. (Iran)	GAS-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Self-Control Scale ● ASRS-v1.1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The presence of ADHD was significantly related in the relationship between video game addiction and other variables (self-control and academic achievement). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional
Pontes (2017)	N = 509, 13.02 ± 1.64 years. (Portugal)	IGDS9-SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Bergen Facebook Addiction Scale ● DASS-21 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IGD was associated with younger age, male gender, and SNS addiction. ● IGD affected depression, anxiety, and stress levels. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional
Horváth et al. (2021)	N = 2,768, 16.73 ± 1.21 years. (Hungary)	IGDT-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Alcohol Consumption ● Illicit Drug Use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Polysubstance users presented higher levels of IGD symptoms compared to high-risk alcohol, moderate alcohol, and infrequent substance users. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional
Ismail et al. (2021)	N = 237, 19~27 years. (Malaysia)	IGDS9-SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● DASS-21 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There was no association between IGD and anxiety symptoms. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional
Kircaburun, Griffiths, & Billieux (2019)	N = 242, 18.87 ± 4.57 years. (Turkey)	IGDT10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Short depression-happiness scale ● CTQ ● Single item self-esteem scale ● Social anxiety scale for adolescents short form ● ULS-4 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Depressive symptoms fully mediated the relationship between childhood trauma and IGD. ● IGD was associated with higher levels of emotional trauma, loneliness, self-esteem, and social anxiety. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional

* Wartberg, Kriston, & Thomasius (2017)	N = 1,531, 18.86 ± 4.06 years. (Germany)	Lemmens IGD-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Patient Health Questionnaire-2 ● The Generalized Anxiety Disorder Scale-2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IGD was associated with higher levels of depression and anxiety. ● IGD was associated with more frequent neglect of social contacts. 	● Cross-sectional
* Männikkö, Billieux, & Kääriäinen (2015)	N = 293, 18.7 ± 3.4 years. (Finland)	GAS-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Social health questionnaire ● SWLS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IGD was associated with higher depression, fatigue, sleep problems, concentration problems, and anxiety. ● Depression and a preference for online social interaction predicted IGD. 	● Cross-sectional
Mentzoni et al. (2011)	N = 2,500, 15~40 years. (Norway)	GASA (GAS-7)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SWLS ● HADS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IGD was associated with more antisocial behavior, anger control problems, emotional distress, and hyperactivity & inattention in adolescents. 	● Cross-sectional
Murray, Mannion, Chen, & Leader (2021)	ASD: N = 230, 31.32 ± 11.03 years. HC: N = 272, 29.51 ± 13.53 years. (Ireland)	IGDT-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● AQ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Individuals in the ASD group showed higher IGD symptoms. 	● Cross-sectional
Musetti et al. (2019)	N = 142/86/76/62 (passionate/occasional/preoccupied/disordered gamers), 21.64 ± 3.77 years. (Italy)	IGDS9-SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Personality Inventory for DSM-5 Brief Form 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Disordered gamers presented highest levels of psychoticism, psychotic symptoms, and suicidal ideation compared to other groups. 	● Cross-sectional

Severo et al. (2020)	N = 555, 14+ years. (Brazil)	IGDS9-SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● BDI ● PSQI ● The Mini-Social Phobia Inventory 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IGD was associated with severe depressive symptoms. ● IGD was associated with poor sleep quality. 	● Cross-sectional
Singh, Dahiya, Singh, Kumar, & Balhara (2019)	N = 306, 22.73 ± 3.97 years. (India)	IGDS9-SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Patient Health Questionnaire-9 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IGD was associated with higher levels of depressive symptoms. 	● Cross-sectional
Siste et al. (2021)	N = 639, 20.23 ± 0.13 years. (Indonesia)	IGDT-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SCL-90-R ● The Indonesian version of the modified Temperament and Character Inventory 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IGD was associated with more experiences of all psychopathologies assessed, excepting phobic anxiety. 	● Cross-sectional
Stavropoulos et al. (2019)	Australian: N = 164, 23.01 ± 3.35 years. American: N = 457, 25.25 ± 2.76 years. (Australia & USA)	IGDS9-SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● ASRS-v1.1 ● EPQR-A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Those presenting higher inattention and hyperactivity symptoms exhibited more IGD symptoms. 	● Cross-sectional
Stavropoulos, Vassallo, Burleigh, Gomez, & Colder Carras (2021)	N = 964, 25.74 years. (Australia & USA)	IGDS9-SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● DASS-21 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IGD was associated with more depression symptoms. 	● Cross-sectional

* Stockdale & Coyne (2018)	VGA: N = 87, 20.80 ± 2.18 years. HC: N = 87, 20.80 ± 2.18 years. (USA)	Lemmens IGD-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● ASRS-v1.1 ● The Neuro-QOL ● BPAQ-SF ● The Cyber Pornography Use Inventory-9 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IGD was associated with higher degree of ADHD symptoms, anxiety, depression, aggression, and pornography addiction. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional
Turhan- Gürbüz et al. (2021)	N = 93, 15-24 years. (Turkey)	IGDS9-SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Substance use disorder 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Lower IGD scores were found in the substance use patient group compared to the non-patient group. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional
Vally (2021)	N = 214, 20.64 ± 4.34 years. (UAE)	IGDS9-SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● ASRS-v1.1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Increased symptoms of inattention and impulsivity were associated with elevated risk for IGD. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional
Choi (2018)	* <i>males only</i> N = 240, 20.53 ± 1.39 years. (China)	IGDS9-SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● State-Trait Anxiety Inventory ● SWLS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IGD was associated with lower levels of life satisfaction. ● Higher levels of anxiety fully mediated the relationship between IGD and life satisfaction. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional
Wong et al. (2020)	N = 300, 20.89 ± 1.48 years. (Hong Kong)	IGDS9-SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● BSMAS ● DASS-21 ● PSQI 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IGD was associated with higher levels of social media addiction, depression, anxiety, and stress. ● IGD was associated with poor sleep quality. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional

< Psychological health >

Buiza-Aguado, Alonso-Canovas, Conde-Mateos, Buiza-Navarrete, & Gentile (2018)	N = 708, 15.6 ± 2.7 years. (Spain)	Lemmens IGD-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Self-Esteem Scale • SWLS • SDQ • BPAQ • ULS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IGD was negatively associated with self-esteem, life satisfaction, and prosocial behaviors. • IGD was positively associated with loneliness and physical aggression. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-sectional
Kim, Jung, & Cho (2021)	Male: N = 209 Female: N = 429 Univ. students (South Korea)	Lemmens IGD-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suicidal Probability Scale • The event related rumination inventory 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Males have shown higher tendency to IGD. • Females have shown higher intrusive rumination and suicide risk. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-sectional
Evren, Evren, Dalbudak, Topcu, & Kutlu (2020)	NSSI present: N = 207, 21.51 ± 3.14 years. NSSI absent: N = 803, 21.93 ± 3.44 years. (Turkey)	IGDS9-SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lifetime history of NSSI 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IGD was associated with the presence of lifetime NSSI behaviors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-sectional

Wartberg, Zieglmeier, & Kammerl (2021)	T1 = 1095, T2 = 985 dyads 12.98 ± 0.82 years. (Germany)	Lemmens IGD-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Young Diagnostic Questionnaire • The Reynolds Adolescent Adjustment Screening Inventory • The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire • The Generalized Anxiety Disorder Scale-2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IGD at T2 was predicted by more self-esteem problems at T1. • IGD at T2 was predicted by higher symptoms of hyperactivity/inattention at T1. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Longitudinal
* Wartberg et al. (2017)	N = 1,095, 12.99 ± 0.82 years. (Germany)	Lemmens IGD-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SPS-J-II • SDQ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IGD was associated with higher levels of adolescent antisocial behavior, anger control problems, and hyperactivity & inattention. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-sectional
Phan, Prieur, Bonnaire, & Obradovic (2020)	IGD-: N = 182, 14.83 ± 0.05 years. IGD+: N = 516, 14.86 ± 0.09 years. Patients: N = 43, 15.74 ± 0.38 years. (France)	GAS-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Life Satisfaction Scale • Adolescent Depression Rating Scale • The Liebowitz Social Anxiety Scale 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IGD was associated with decreased male's quality of life, which was not found in females. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-sectional

* Teng et al. (2020)	T1 = 1054, T2 = 924, T3 = 931 17-21 (China)	IGDS9-SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale ● Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support ● The Satisfaction with Life Scale 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IGD negatively affected self-esteem, social support, and life satisfaction, but not vice versa. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Longitudinal
----------------------	---	----------	---	---	--

< Emotion regulation >

Evren, Evren, Dalbudak, Topcu, & Kutlu (2019)	N = 987, 23.65 ± 6.37 years. (Turkey)	IGDS9-SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● TAS-20 ● BPAQ ● SCL-90-R 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Higher levels of alexithymia and aggression predicted IGD symptoms. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional
Wartberg, Kriston, Zieglmeier, Lincoln, & Kammerl (2019)	T1: N = 1,095, 12.99 ± 0.82 years. T2: N = 985, 13.89 ± 0.89 years. (Germany)	Lemmens IGD-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SPS-J-II 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IGD at T1 was a predictor for more subsequent emotional distress at T2. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Longitudinal

Kim & Kwon (2018)	IGD: N = 49, 26.00 ± 5.00 years. Control: N = 50, 24.26 ± 6.59 years. (South Korea)	Lemmens IGD-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SWLS ● Brief Symptom Inventory ● Korean version of the Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale ● Korean Version of the Self-Control Scale 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IGD was associated with higher levels of negative emotions and lower levels of positive emotions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional
Müller & Bonnaire (2021)	PG = 37, NPG = 133, NG = 37 19.02 ± 4.20 years. (France)	GAS-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Player-Avatar Identification Scale ● The Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale ● The Emotion Regulation Questionnaire for Children and Adolescents ● The Interpersonal Regulation Questionnaire 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● PG had higher scores in lack of emotional consciousness, lack of emotional clarity, and expressive suppression compared to NG and NPG. ● PG had lower scores in cognitive reappraisal and interpersonal emotion regulation compared to NG and NPG. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional
* T'ng, Ho, Sim, Yu, & Wong (2020)	N = 410, 23.9 years. (Malaysia)	IGDS9-SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● BPAQ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IGD was associated with more physical and verbal aggression, anger, and hostility. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional
* Uçur & Dönmez (2021)	With PIG: N = 144 Without PIG: N = 923 14.80 ± 1.60 years. (Turkey)	GAS-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Difficulties in emotion regulation scale 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IGD was associated with high emotional dysregulation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional

< Reward, discounting & impulsivity >

Acuff et al. (2021)	N = 1,406, 20.92 ± 3.71 years. (Argentina, Australia, India, Malaysia, UK, and US)	GAS-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Problematic Internet Use Questionnaire ● Internet Purchase Task ● The eight-item Delayed Reward Discounting Task 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There was no significant association between reward sensitivity and online gaming. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional
Cerniglia et al. (2019)	N = 656, 16.32 ± 1.54 years. (Italy)	IGDS9-SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● BIS-11-A ● SCL-90-R 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IGD was associated with higher impulsivity levels. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional
Wölfling, Duven, Wejbera, Beutel, & Müller (2020)	* <i>males only</i> IGD: N = 30, 26.9 ± 5.97 years. GD: N = 31, 35.0 ± 11.44 years. HC: N = 27, 25.6 ± 3.25 years. (Germany)	AICA-Sgaming	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The two-item Lie/Bet-Questionnaire ● BIS-11 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There were no group differences in impulsivity levels ● IGD showed faster ability to adopt advantageous decision strategies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional
Macur & Pontes (2021)	N = 1,023, 13.44 ± 0.59 years. (Slovenia)	IGDS9-SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Self-control measure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● High risk gamers showed lower levels of self-control compared to low risk gamers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional
Moudiab & Spada (2019)	N = 79, 21.3 ± 3.2 years. (United Kingdom)	IGDT10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Motives for Online Gaming Questionnaire ● Maladaptive Gaming-Related Cognitions Scale 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Higher maladaptive cognitions relating to overvaluing of gaming rewards and motives relating to coping and skills development predicted IGD. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional

< Personality traits >

Borzikow sky & Bernhardt (2018)	N = 305, 28.44 ± 8.88 years. (Germany)	GAS-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • German Version of the Short Grit Scale 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grit significantly reduced the likelihood of IGD. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-sectional
Müller, Beutel, Egloff, & Wölfling (2014)	* <i>males only</i> N = 115/74/122/93 (IGD/Clinical control/GD/HC), 16 + years. (Germany)	AICA-Sgaming	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The NEO Five-Factor Inventory 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IGD was positively associated with neuroticism. • IGD was negatively associated with extraversion, openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-sectional
Müller, Werthmann, Beutel, Wölfling, & Egloff (2021)	IRD (Internet related disorder) = 102, GD (gambling) = 106, CG(HC) = 89 25.5 ± 8.11 years. (Germany)	AICA-Sgaming	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Personality Inventory for DSM-5–Brief Form • The Virtual Expectancy Questionnaire • The Global Assessment of Functioning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IRD showed higher scores in each maladaptive trait compared to GD or HC. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-sectional
Sánchez-llorens et al. (2021)	N = 119, 14.85 ± 0.79 years. (Spain)	GAS-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BFQ-NA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IGD was positively associated with neuroticism. • IGD was negatively associated with extraversion and conscientiousness. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-sectional
* Wittek et al. (2016)	N = 3,389, 32.6 years. (addicted/problem/engaged /normal gamers) (Norway)	GAS-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Mini International Item Pool • An eight-item scale to assess 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IGD was positively associated with neuroticism. • IGD was negatively associated with extraversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-sectional

			psychosomatic health symptoms		
< Stress >					
* Andreetta, The, Burleigh, Gomez, & Stavropoulos (2020)	N = 605, 24.01 ± 6.11 years. (Italy)	IGDS9-SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Individualism and Collectivism Scale ● Cultural Orientation Scale ● DASS-21 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Higher levels of stress increased IGD risk. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional
Canale et al. (2019)	N = 605, 24.01 ± 6.11 years. (Italy)	IGDS9-SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● PSS ● the 10-item Resilience Scale 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IGD was associated with higher levels of perceived stress and lower psychological resilience. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional
Rajab et al. (2020)	Addiction-Y: N = 130, 15.76 ± 1.71 years. Addiction-N: N = 2,407, 16.09 ± 1.58 years. (Saudi Arabia)	GAS-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● PSS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IGD was associated with higher levels of stress. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional
< Cognitive approach >					
Bodi, Maintenant, & Pennequin (2021)	Online gamer: N = 229, 28.34 ± 6.98 years. Offline: N = 217, 27.75 ± 6.93 years. (France)	GAS-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Video Game Cognition Scale ● HADS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cognitive salience and completion predicted both online and offline IGD. ● Virtual comfort and time spent gaming predicted only online IGD. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional
Efrati, Kolubinski, Marino,	N = 471, 15.73 ± 1.31 years. (Israel)	IGDS9-SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Metacognitions Questionnaire 30 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Thought suppression and impulsiveness mediated the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional

& Spada (2021)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● BIS-11 ● Food Thought Suppression Inventor 	relationship between metacognitions and IGD.	
-------------------	--	--	---	--	--

< Self-concept >

Concetta De Pasquale, Dinaro, & Sciacca (2018)	N = 221, 21.56 ± 1.42 years. (Italy)	IGDS9-SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Dissociative Experience Scale for adolescents and young adults 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IGD was positively associated with dissociative experiences (depersonalization and derealization; absorption and imaginative involvement; and passive influence). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional
Stavropoulos, Gomez, Mueller, Yucel, & Griffiths (2020)	N = 1,032, 24 ± 7 years. (Australia & USA)	IGDS9-SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The User-Avatar Questionnaire ● The Proteus-Effect Scale 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IGD was higher in gamers who highly identified or fused with game avatars than those who differentiated themselves from the avatars. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional

< Sleep >

Nakayama, Matsuzaki, Mihara, Kitayuguchi, & Higuchi (2020)	PG = 35, NG = 514 12-13 (Japan)	IGDT10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Items regarding age, gender, night-time sleep, age at which weekly gaming started, time spent on Internet and gaming 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IGD was associated with later bedtime and wake-up time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional
--	---------------------------------------	--------	--	---	---

Wang, Mati, & Cai (2021)	N = 1040, 20.32 ± 1.43 years. (China)	GAS-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SCL-90-R ● PSQI 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Sleep quality mediated the relationship between IGD and psychological distress. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional
--------------------------	---------------------------------------	-------	--	---	---

< Flow >

Hu, Stavropoulos, Anderson, Scerri, & Collard (2019)	N = 237, 18~59 years. (mostly Australia and New Zealand)	IGDS9-SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Online Flow Questionnaire 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Flow fully mediated the relationship between preference for social games and IGD. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional
--	--	----------	---	---	---

< Psychological Needs >

Chamarro, Oberst, Cladellas, & Fuster (2020)	N = 471, 21.73 ± 10.10 years. (Spain)	IGDS9-SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Need Satisfaction and Frustration Scale ● Internet Use Expectancies Scale 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IGD was associated with higher level of need frustration. ● Game expectancies and time spent playing mediated this relationship. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional
--	---------------------------------------	----------	--	---	---

< COVID-19 >

Chen, Chen, O'Brien, Latner, & Lin (2021)	<p>N = 1,357, 10.7 years. (China)</p> <p>Not overweight: N = 1,121, 10.67 ± 1.11 years.</p> <p>Overweight: N = 236, 10.78 ± 0.93 years.</p>	IGDS9-SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● DASS-21 ● Smartphone Application-Based Addiction Scale ● BSMAS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IGD was associated with higher levels of stress, anxiety, and depression in non-overweight children. ● IGD was associated with lower levels of stress in overweight children. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional
---	---	----------	--	--	---

Chen, Chen, Pakpour, Lin, & Griffiths (2021)	N = 2,026, 10.71 ± 1.07 years. (China)	IGDS9-SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● DASS-21 ● Smartphone Application-Based Addiction Scale ● BSMAS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IGD mediated the association between psychological distress (depression, anxiety, and stress) and increased gaming time during the school hiatus. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional
Fazeli et al. (2020)	N = 1,512, 15.51 ± 2.75 years. (Iran)	IGDS9-SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● DASS-21 ● Insomnia Severity Index ● Pediatric Quality of Life Inventory™ 4.0 Short Form 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Depression, anxiety, and stress mediated the relationship between IGD and insomnia & quality of life during the pandemic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional
Oka et al. (2021)	N = 3,938, 46.6 ± 11.8 years. (Japan)	Lemmens IGD-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Demographic information ● COVID-19 infection status 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IGD symptoms significantly increased during the pandemic. ● COVID-19 infection and young age were associated with IGD exacerbation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional
Sallie, Ritou, Bowden-Jones, & Voon (2021)	N = 1,344, 28.93 ± 12.46 years. (International)	IGDS9-SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● COVID-19 related stress factors ● TIPI ● HADS ● SUPPS-P 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Greater IGD severity during the quarantine was associated with greater depression, anxiety, and mood-based impulsivity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional
Teng, Pontes, Nie, Griffiths, & Guo (2021)	N = 1,778 (China) Children: N = 875 (4th grade) Adolescents: N = 903 (7th grade)	IGDS9-SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Perceived COVID-19 impacts ● Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale ● State-Trait Anxiety Inventory 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Video game use increased for both children and adolescents, and IGD increased only for adolescents during the pandemic. ● IGD was associated with higher symptoms of depression and anxiety. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional

Ting & Essau (2021)	N = 178, 22.56 ± 2.93 years. (Malaysia)	GAS-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SSRQ ● FCV-19S ● K6 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Time spent on gaming had increased during the lockdown. ● IGD was associated with lower levels of self-regulation and higher levels of COVID-19 fear and psychological distress. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional
Zhu, Zhuang, Lee, Li, & Wong (2021)	N = 2,863, 12.6 ± 1.32 years. (Hong Kong)	GAS-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support ● Parental Monitoring Scale ● Patient Health Questionnaire-9 ● Generalized Anxiety Disorder-7 scale 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IGD was associated with higher levels of loneliness. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional

Note. * also included in another (social) category

ASRS = Adult ADHD Self-Report Scale

AQ = Autism-spectrum Quotient

ASD = Autism Spectrum Disorder

BDI = the Beck Depression Inventory

BFQ-NA = Big Five Personality Questionnaire for children and adolescents

Big five (N = neuroticism; E = extraversion; O = openness; A = agreeableness; C = conscientiousness)

BIS-11-A = the Barratt Impulsiveness Scale for Adolescents

BPAQ-SF = the Short-Form Buss Perry Aggression Questionnaire

BSMAS = Bergen Social Media Addiction Scale

CTQ = Childhood Trauma Questionnaire

DASS-21 = Depression Anxiety Stress Scales

EPQR-A = Eysenck personality questionnaire revised abbreviated form

FCV-19S = Fear of COVID-19 Scale

GA = Gaming Addiction

GD = Gambling Disorder

HADS = the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale

K6 = Kessler Distress Scale

NSSI = Non-Suicidal Self-Injury

PG = Pathological Gaming
PSQI = Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index
PSS = the Perceived Stress Scale
SCL-90-R = the Symptom Checklist-90-R
SDQ = the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire
SMA = Social Media Addiction
SPS-J-II = Screening psychischer Störungen im Jugendalter-II; German adaptation of the Reynolds Adolescent Adjustment Screening Inventory
SSRQ = Short Self-Regulation Questionnaire
SUPPS-P = UPPS-P Impulsive-Behavior Scale
SWLS = the Satisfaction with Life Scale
TAS-20 = Toronto Alexithymia Scale
TIPI = Ten-Item Personality Inventory
ULS = UCLA loneliness scale
VGA = Video Game Addiction

3.3.1 Psychiatric symptoms

Stockdale and Coyne (2018) reported that individuals with GD presented a higher degree of ADHD, anxiety, depression, aggression, and pornography addiction than those without GD. In terms of ADHD, in addition to a bidirectional relationship between GD and ADHD (Stavropoulos et al., 2019), a unidirectional relationship from ADHD to GD (Concerto et al., 2021; Valley, 2021) as well as from GD to ADHD were found (Evren, Evren, Dalbudak, Topcu, & Kutlu, 2019) in regression analyses.

In terms of depression and anxiety, a positive association with GD was consistently reported (Bonnaire & Baptista, 2019; De Pasquale et al., 2020; Männikkö, Billieux, & Kääriäinen, 2015; Mentzoni et al., 2011; Siste et al., 2021; Wartberg, Kriston, & Thomasius, 2017) with some studies reporting that GD positively predicted the levels of depression and anxiety (Pontes, 2017; Wong et al., 2020). When focusing on depression or anxiety independently, Severo et al. (2020) found a positive association between GD symptoms and depressive symptoms, Singh, Dahiya, Singh, Kumar, and Balhara (2019) found that depressive symptoms predicted GD, and Stavropoulos, Vassallo, Burleigh, Gomez, and Colder Carras (2021) found that GD predicted higher depressive symptoms. One study revealed that depressive symptoms fully mediated the association between children's emotional trauma and GD (Kircaburun, Griffiths, & Billieux, 2019). In one study, GD scores had positive correlations with anxiety (Choi, 2018) while no association was found in another study (Ismail et al., 2021). Overall, these suggest that GD is associated with ADHD, depression, and anxiety. However, there is a lack of temporal findings to confirm the directionalities.

With regards to other psychiatric symptoms, Musetti et al. (2019) found that, compared to non-problematic gamers, problematic gamers displayed higher levels of psychotic symptoms.

Murray, Mannion, Chen, and Leader (2021) found that individuals with autism spectrum disorder showed significantly higher GD scores compared to HC. There have been mixed results regarding the substance use patterns, with one study reporting an association between GD severity and polysubstance use (Horváth et al., 2021), while another study reported significantly lower GD symptom scores in individuals with substance use disorder compared to those without the disorder (Turhan Gürbüz et al., 2021).

3.3.2 Psychological health

In one study, GD predicted low self-esteem, perceived social support, and life satisfaction 6 months and 1-year later, suggesting that GD can possibly lead to decreased psychosocial well-being (Teng et al., 2020). Several studies have found a relationship between GD and antisocial behavior, anger control problems, and hyperactivity and inattention (Wartberg et al., 2017; Wartberg, Zieglmeier, & Kammerl, 2021). In a Spanish sample, self-esteem, life satisfaction, prosocial behavior, loneliness, and physical aggression predicted GD (Buiza-Aguado, Alonso-Canovas, Conde-Mateos, Buiza-Navarrete, & Gentile, 2018). Among Turkish adults, GD symptoms predicted the presence of lifetime non-suicidal self-injurious behaviors (Evren, Evren, Dalbudak, Topcu, & Kutlu, 2020). Some studies also found gender effects. Phan, Prieur, Bonnaire, and Obradovic (2020) found that GD led to decreased quality of life in males, but not in females. Furthermore, the influence of GD tendency on suicide risk was higher in male college students, although female college students showed higher suicide risk on average (Kim, Jung, & Cho, 2021). These results suggest that GD is generally associated with poor psychological health while more studies are needed to confirm gender effects.

3.3.3 Emotion regulation

The inability to manage one's emotional experience has often been found to be associated with GD (Müller & Bonnaire, 2021; Uçur & Dönmez, 2021). Kim and Kwon (2018) confirmed that negative emotional experience along with the tendency to play games for mood modification positively predicted GD. Alexithymia, a difficulty describing feelings, and physical aggression also predicted GD symptoms (Evren, Evren, Dalbudak, Topcu, & Kutlu, 2019). Furthermore, T'ng, Ho, Sim, Yu, and Wong (2020) reported that GD symptoms significantly predicted physical aggression, verbal aggression, anger, and hostility, while Wartberg, Kriston, Zieglmeier, Lincoln, and Kammerl (2019) found that GD significantly predicted subsequent emotional distress one year later. These suggest that GD is associated with a poor ability to manage negative emotional responses.

3.3.4 Personality traits

Personality traits are relatively stable characteristics of an individual. The Big Five personality traits are widely used—openness to new experiences, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism (Costa & McCrae, 1992). High neuroticism has consistently been found to predict GD while there have been contrasting findings regarding other traits (Müller, Beutel, Egloff, & Wölfling, 2014; Sánchez-llorens et al., 2021; Wittek et al., 2016). With regards to other personality dimensions, Borzikowsky and Bernhardt (2018) found that grit, the perseverance of effort, significantly reduced the GD likelihood, suggesting grit as a potential protective trait against GD. In addition, Müller, Werthmann, Beutel, Wölfling, and Egloff (2021) confirmed that higher scores on maladaptive traits, such as negative affectivity, were

significantly associated with GD. These suggest that high neuroticism is associated with GD while more studies are needed to confirm other predisposing traits related to GD.

3.3.5 Reward, discounting & impulsivity

Wölfling, Duvén, Wejbera, Beutel, and Müller (2020) performed a delay discounting task to investigate decision-making in individuals with GD and gambling disorder. They found that the former group showed a faster ability to adapt decision strategies than the latter while there was no significant correlation between GD severity and choice impulsivity. On the other hand, one study found a positive correlation between self-reported impulsivity levels and GD (Cerniglia et al., 2019). Macur and Pontes (2021) reported that gamers with a high GD risk presented significantly lower levels of self-control compared to low-risk gamers or non-gamers. In terms of reward-related decisions, Moudiab and Spada (2019) found that overvaluing of gaming rewards predicted GD severity (c.f., Acuff et al., 2021). When combined with biological findings, these suggest that GD is associated with aberrant reward activities and cognition, while a specific pattern is yet to be confirmed.

3.3.6 Stress

All included studies confirmed a positive association between stress and GD (Andreetta, Teh, Burleigh, Gomez, & Stavropoulos, 2020; Rajab et al., 2020) and perceived stress predicted more GD symptoms (Canale et al., 2019).

3.3.7 Cognitive approach

Bodi, Maintenant, and Pennequin (2021) found that cognitive salience (e.g., planning what to do next in games) and completion (e.g., feeling the need to achieve objectives as soon as possible) were strong predictors of both online and offline gaming addiction. In addition, Efrati, Kolubinski, Marino, and Spada (2021) found a positive association between GD and metacognition, an awareness of one's own thinking, which was mediated by thought suppression. This could signify that a lack of cognitive confidence and beliefs about the need to control thoughts are two metacognitions closely aligned with GD.

3.3.8 Self-concept

Concetta De Pasquale, Dinaro, and Sciacca (2018) found a positive association between GD and dissociative experiences (e.g., depersonalization and derealization, absorption and imaginative involvement), suggesting that gamers' predominant immersion in the virtual world could potentially lead to GD. Furthermore, Stavoropoulos, Gomez, Mueller, Yucel, and Griffiths (2020) found that problematic gaming was more prevalent in gamers highly fused with their game avatars compared to those who successfully differentiated themselves from their avatars. These add to the biological findings that suggest self-concept deficits in GD.

3.3.9 Sleep

Nakayama, Matsuzaki, Mihara, Kitayuguchi, and Higuchi (2020) reported that problematic gamers had significantly later bedtime and wake-up time. Furthermore, Wang, Mati, and Cai (2021) found that problematic gaming led individuals to feel that they have poorer sleep quality in general. These suggest the association between poor sleep quality and GD.

3.3.10 Miscellaneous factors

One study has investigated the relationship between GD and psychological flow, defined by the authors as “the feeling of enjoyment and pleasure arising from deep immersion in an activity” (Hu, Stavropoulos, Anderson, Scerri, & Collard, 2019). They found that flow fully mediated the relationship between the preference for social games and GD, suggesting that GD behaviors may derive from a need to experience flow, especially in a social setting.

Another study has investigated the relationship between GD and need frustration (e.g., when somebody is excluded or rejected by others) (Chamarro, Oberst, Cladellas, & Fuster, 2020). They found that game expectancies and time spent on games had a mediating effect on the relationship between the frustration of psychological needs and GD, suggesting that gamers’ need frustration may lead to a greater probability of experiencing GD.

3.3.11 COVID-19

School closures, lockdowns, and social distancing due to the COVID-19 pandemic have profoundly impacted the daily lives of people, leading to increased indoor activities. Time spent on online gaming (Sallie, Ritou, Bowden-Jones, & Voon, 2021; Ting & Essau, 2021) as well as probable GD prevalence and GD symptoms (Oka et al., 2021) have constantly increased during the quarantine periods. A longitudinal study found that the levels of video game use and GD severity significantly increased in young populations during the pandemic, and depressive and anxiety symptom scores were associated with such videogame use (Teng, Pontes, Nie, Griffiths, & Guo, 2021; Sallie, Ritou, Bowden-Jones, & Voon, 2021). In addition, COVID-19 related fear, COVID-19 infection status, and psychological distress were found to be associated with GD (Oka et al., 2021; Ting & Essau, 2021). Loneliness, potentially stemming from the lockdown,

was associated with GD behaviors as well (Zhu, Zhuang, Lee, Li, & Wong, 2021). Regarding mediating roles, one study reported that GD was a mediator in the association between psychological distress and increased game time during the school hiatus (Chen, Chen, Pakpour, Lin, & Griffiths, 2021). Another study found that psychological distress mediated the relationship between GD and insomnia and quality of life during the pandemic (Fazeli et al., 2020). Interestingly, GD behaviors were associated with higher levels of psychological distress only in children who were not overweight (Chen, Chen, O'Brien, Latner, & Lin, 2021). These suggest a certain degree of impact COVID-19 has on GD, yet more studies are needed to confirm its long-term effects.

3.4 Social factors associated with GD

A total of 29 studies have investigated social factors related to GD (Table 3). Among them, nine studies investigated family-related variables. Eight papers investigated social interactions. Four investigated cultural factors and the other four investigated school-related factors. Lastly, four studies investigated social support.

Table 3. Social findings in gaming disorder (IGD) included

Author(s) (year)	Participants (country of study)	Diagnostic scale for IGD	Measures	Social factors	Analysis
< Family >					
Bonnaire & Phan (2017)	N = 434, 13.2 $\pm$ 0.5 years for males; 13.1 $\pm$ 0.5 years for females. (France)	GAS-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Parental attitudes to gaming use ● FRI 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IGD was associated with banning video games, more rules about video game use, and poor family relationship. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional
Irmak & Erdogan (2019)	N = 865, 16.5 $\pm$ 0.95 years. (Turkey)	GAS-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Family Environment Scale 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Family environment predicted IGD in females only. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional
Koning, Peeters, Finkenauer, & Van Den Eijnden (2018)	N = 354, 13.90 $\pm$ 0.74 years. (Netherlands)	Lemmens IGD-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reactive restrictions ● Frequency of communication 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Frequency of communication regarding Internet predicted IGD. ● IGD predicted reactive rules and lower quality of communication. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional
Lin, Potenza, Broström, & Pakpour (2021)	Participants: N = 320, 15.52 $\pm$ 1.98 years. Siblings: N = 320, 16.98 $\pm$ 2.91 years. (Iran)	IGDS9-SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● DASS-21 ● ISI 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Adolescents' IGD scores affected their own depression, anxiety, stress, and insomnia. ● Adolescents' siblings' IGD scores affected adolescents' depression anxiety, stress, and insomnia. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional

* Wartber et al. (2017)	N = 1,095, 12.99 ± 0.82 years. (Germany)	Lemmens IGD-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● PHQ-2 ● GAD-2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IGD was associated with higher parental anxiety and depression. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional
Stockdale & Coyne (2020)	Mothers: N = 481, 30.97 ± 7.76 years. Fathers: N = 374, 32.44 ± 6.54 years. Children: 5.83 ± 3.50 months. (USA)	Lemmens IGD-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Parenting Sense of Competence Scale ● CES-10 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IGD was associated with decreased feelings of parental efficacy. ● IGD was associated with increased depression for mothers and fathers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Longitudinal
Sung, Kim, & Cho (2020)	N = 546, college students. (South Korea)	Lemmens IGD-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● ACE ● Event Related Rumination Inventory ● NEO-II 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IGD tendency, rumination, and externalizing were higher in groups with adverse childhood experiences. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional
Throuvala, Janikian, Griffiths, Rennolds on, & Kuss (2019)	N = 172, 23.3 ± 1.83 years. (Greece)	AICA-Sgaming	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● PARQ ● CSES 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Perceived parental rejection influenced IGD only via the mediating factor of core self-evaluations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional
* Teng, Griffiths, Nie, Xiang, & Guo (2020)	N = 1,054, 18.25 ± 0.73 years. (China)	IGDS9-SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IPPA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IGD predicted subsequent attachment with mother but negatively predicted father attachment. ● Father and mother attachment did not predict subsequent IGD. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Longitudinal

< Social interaction >

* De Pasquale et al. (2020)	N = 566, 22.74 ± 4.83 years. (Italy)	IGDS9-SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social Adaptation Self Evaluation Scale 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IGD was associated with poorer family and extra-family relationships. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-sectional
Duman & Ozkara (2019)	N = 318, all age range (Turkey)	GAS-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FoMO scale • Social Identity Scale 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IGD was associated with a higher FoMO score. • FoMO mediated the effect of social identity on IGD. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-sectional
Festl, Scharkow, & Quandt (2012)	N = 4,207, 37.8 years. (Germany)	GAS-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • California Psychological Inventory • BSSS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IGD was associated with lower levels of sociability and less perceived social support. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-sectional
* Wartberg, Kriston, & Thomasius (2017)	N = 1,531, 18.86 ± 4.06 years. (Germany)	Lemmens IGD-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How often do you neglect social contacts (e.g., friends or family members), who used to be important to you, because of computer game playing? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IGD was associated with more frequent neglect of social contacts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-sectional

* Männikkö, Billieux, & Kääriäinen (2015)	N = 293, 18.7 ± 3.4 years. (Finland)	GAS-7	● Preferences for online interaction scale	● IGD was associated with lower sociability and a stronger preference for online interaction.	● Cross-sectional
* T'ng et al. (2020)	N = 410, 23.9 years. (Malaysia)	IGDS9-SF	● Revised UCLA Loneliness Scale	● IGD was associated with greater loneliness.	● Cross-sectional
Tullett-Prado, Stavropoulos, Mueller, Sharples, & Footitt (2021)	N = 1,032, 24 ± 7 years. (USA, UK, Australia, New Zealand)	IGDS9-SF	● Four Social Engagement questions	● High IGD risk profile was linked with higher unemployment, lower levels of education, and living with divorced parents or friends.	● Cross-sectional
Stavropoulos et al. (2019)	N = 611, 23.38 ± 3.50 years for Australians; 25.25 ± 2.76 years for Americans. (Australia & USA)	IGDS9-SF	● HSWS	● IGD was associated with higher Hikikomori symptoms.	● Cross-sectional
< Culture/Ethnicity >					
* Andreetta et al. (2020)	N = 964, 25 ± 7 years. (Australia, UK, & USA)	IGDS9-SF	● ICS	● Presence of vertically individualistic tendencies moderated the relationship between stress and IGD.	● Cross-sectional

Stavropoulos et al. (2020)	N = 1,032, 24 ± 7 years. (Australia & USA)	IGDS9-SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ICS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IGD was associated with a more vertically-individualistic cultural orientation. • Cultural orientation moderated the relationship between inattention and IGD. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-sectional
Stavropoulos et al. (2021)	N = 1,032 (worldwide)	IGDS9-SF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ICS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Those who are aversive to collectivism displayed higher IGD behaviors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-sectional
* Wittek et al. (2016)	N = 3,389, 16~74 years. (Norway)	GAS-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birthplace (Norway, Nordic region, Europe, Africa, Asia, North America, South America, Central America, Oceania) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Place of birth (Africa, Asia, South- and Middle America) were positively associated with IGD. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-sectional
< School >					
Brunborg, Mentzoni, & Frøyland (2014)	N = 1,928, 13~17 years. (Norway)	GAS-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade Average in Written Norwegian, Mathematics, and English 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IGD was associated with poor academic achievement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-sectional

Wang et al. (2014)	N = 503, 14.54 ± 1.42 years for girls; 14.62 ± 1.35 years for boys. (Hong Kong)	GAS-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social and Demographic Information • Self-rated academic performance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IGD was associated with having more than 7 close friends and poor academic performance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-sectional
* Haghbin, Shaterian, Hosseinzadeh, & Griffiths (2013)	N = 326, high school students. (Iran)	GAS-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade Point Average 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IGD was associated with poor academic achievement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-sectional
Richard, Marchica, Ivoska, & Derevensky (2021)	N = 6,353, 14.74 ± 1.76 years. (USA)	IGDS-SF9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bullying Victimization • PSS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internalizing and externalizing mediated the relationship between bullying and IGD. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-sectional
< Social support >					
Wartberg, Kriston, & Kammerl (2017)	N = 1,095, 12.99 ± 0.82 years. (Germany)	Lemmens IGD-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OSSS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perceived social support did not predict IGD. • High proportion of friends only known through the Internet predicted IGD. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross-sectional

Scharkow, Festl, & Quandt (2014)	N = 4,500, 37.7 years. (Germany)	GAS-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Social capital (i.e. the number of trusted people) ● Perceived social support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Perceived social support did not predict IGD. ● Social capital did not predict IGD. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional
* Stockdale & Coyne (2018)	Video game addicts: N = 87, 20.80 ± 2.18 years. HC: N = 87 (USA)	Lemmens IGD-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● PROMIS Social Isolation Short Form 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Those with IGD felt significantly more socially isolated. ● There were no differences in feelings of companionship and emotional support. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional
* Uçur & Dönmez (2021)	With PIG: N = 144, Without PIG: N = 923, 14.80 ± 1.60 years. (Turkey)	GAS-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● MSPSS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IGD was associated with low perceived social support. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cross-sectional

Note. * also included in another (psychological) category

ACE = Adverse Childhood Experiences Questionnaire

BSSS = Berlin Social Support Scales

CES-10 = 10 item Center for Epidemiological Studies Short Depression Scale

CSES = Core Self-Evaluations Scale

DASS-21 = Depression ANxiety Stress Scale-21

FoMO = fear of missing out

FRI = Family Relationship Index

GAD-2 = Generalized Anxiety Disorder Scale-2

HC = healthy controls

HSWS = Hikikomori Social Withdrawal Scale

ICS = Individualism and Collectivism Scale

IPPA = Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment

ISI = Insomnia Severity Index

MSPSS = Multidimensional scale of perceived social support

OSSS = Oslo Social Support Scale

PARQ = Adult Parental Acceptance-Rejection Questionnaire

PHQ-2 = Patient Health Questionnaire-2

PIG = problematic internet gaming

PROMIS = Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System

PSS = Ohio Scales Youth Problem Severity Scale

3.4.1 Family

Bonnaire and Phan (2017) found a significantly lower family cohesion, more family conflicts, and a poorer family relationship in problematic gamers compared to non-problematic gamers. Irmak and Erdogan (2019) also found that negative family environments predicted GD behaviors but in females only. Sung, Kim, and Cho (2020) reported that young adults with adverse childhood experiences had significantly higher GD tendencies compared to those without such experiences. These suggest the link between GD and a family environment and adverse childhood events.

The association between GD and the mental health of family members were often studied together. Wartberg et al. (2017) found that self-reported parental anxiety and depression were positively correlated with adolescents' GD behaviors. Stockdale and Coyne (2020) found a direct relationship between problematic gaming and parental efficacy, which was mediated by their depressive symptoms. Lin, Potenza, Broström, and Pakpour (2021) focused on the mental health of siblings and found that adolescents' and their siblings' GD behaviors had significant effects on each other's depression and anxiety levels. These suggest a role that family members' mental health plays in the development and maintenance of GD.

Several studies examined the relationship between parenting and GD. In a two-wave study, Koning, Peeters, Finkenauer, and van den Eijnden (2018) found that, regardless of gender, GD symptoms predicted more internet-related reactive rules and lower communication quality. Among boys, more frequent internet-related communication predicted GD symptoms. Throuvala, Janikian, Griffiths, Rennoldson, and Kuss (2019) found a significant effect of perceived parental rejection on GD symptoms via the mediating factor of low core self-evaluations (e.g., low self-esteem). In a longitudinal study, Teng, Griffiths, Nie, Xiang, and Guo (2020) found that GD

negatively predicted children's subsequent attachment with parents, and the link was stronger in males. These findings suggest a role of parenting on GD, while gender effects are not consistent.

3.4.2 Social interaction

Two studies have reported a significant association between GD and lower levels of sociability as well as less perceived social support (Festl, Scharkow, & Quandt, 2012; Mannikko et al., 2015). Interestingly, Duman and Ozkara (2019) found that fear of missing out was a critical predictor of GD. Both the lack of tendency to engage in interpersonal relationships and the need to belong seem to be important factors of GD, although their potential interactions are yet to be studied.

Several studies have investigated social engagements in individuals with GD. In one study, participants were asked "How often do you neglect social contacts because of computer game playing?" and more frequent neglects were found to predict GD (Wartberg, Kriston, & Thomasius, 2017). Stavropoulos et al. (2019) found a positive association between GD and symptoms of Hikikomori, prolonged self-imposed home isolation in addition to avoidance of social engagements. Similarly, De Pasquale et al. (2020) reported a significant relationship between GD symptoms as well as a decrease in social relationships and the presence of difficulties in social adaptation. Tullett-Prado, Stavropoulos, Mueller, Sharples, and Footitt (2021) found that a high GD risk profile was associated with higher unemployment and a tendency to live with divorced parents or friends. Meanwhile, T'ng and colleagues (2020) found that greater loneliness predicted GD symptoms. These suggest that GD is related to a lack of social engagement and feelings of loneliness.

3.4.3 Culture/Ethnicity

Wittek and colleagues (2016) conducted a national survey in Norway and found that individuals born in Africa, Asia, South- or Central America were 4.9 times more likely to belong to the GD group compared to those born in Norway. In terms of cultural orientations, Andreetta et al. (2020) and Stavropoulos et al. (2020) found a positive association between GD symptoms and vertical individualism, suggesting that gamers who endorse more individualistic cultural orientation potentially have a higher risk of GD. Similarly, Stavropoulos et al. (2021) reported that gamers aversive to collectivism displayed more GD behaviors and addiction-related symptoms (e.g., withdrawal) compared to those who were neutral. These imply that individualistic cultural orientation is more related to GD compared to collectivism, while its association with specific ethnic groups is yet to be found.

3.4.4 School

Hagbin, Shaterian, Hosseinzadeh, and Griffiths (2013) reported a significant negative relationship between GD and high school students' grade point average. Along the same lines, in a two-wave longitudinal study, Brunborg, Mentzoni, and Froyland (2014) found that GD at time point 1 was negatively correlated with academic achievement both at time points 1 and 2. Specifically, a 10% increase in GD symptoms was associated with a 1.7 point decrease in average grades. Wang et al. (2014) also found that children with poor self-reported academic performance were significantly more likely to have GD compared to those with good academic performance.

In addition to academics, peer relations take up a significant proportion of children and adolescents' school life. In the above study, they found that children who reported having more

friends (7 or more) were more likely to have GD than others. On the other hand, Richard, Marchica, Ivoska, and Derevensky (2021) reported a significant relationship between bullying experiences and GD. These suggest that poor academic achievements are consistently found in GD, but the effect of peer relations needs further investigation.

3.4.5 Social support

No significant interdependencies between GD and perceived social support nor social capital was found (Scharkow, Festl, & Quant, 2014; L. Wartberg, Kriston, & Kammerl, 2017). Similarly, Stockdale and Coyne (2018) found no differences in social support or feelings of companionship between individuals with and without GD. Contrary to these null findings, Ucur and Donmez (2021) found that perceived social support was significantly lower in adolescents with GD. These suggest that there is little evidence that GD is related to negative changes in psychosocial status.

3. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Using the PRISMA guidelines (Moher et al., 2009), we performed a systematic review to provide an up-to-date, comprehensive review of the empirical evidence of GD. We explored biopsychosocial factors of GD by systematically identifying studies that have utilized one of five GD screening tools that possess greater evidential support. Our review elucidated various factors in the biological, psychological, and social domains that were associated with GD. On the other hand, we have identified critical gaps in the literature related to study designs and assessment tool usage.

Notwithstanding the importance of neurobiological explorations in understanding a psychiatric condition, biological mechanisms underlying GD are relatively poorly understood (Fauth-Bühler & Mann, 2017; Pontes & Griffiths, 2014). Studies in the review compared reward activation, self-concept, brain structure, and functional connectivity between individuals with and without GD. GD was generally associated with reduced reward sensitivity to gaming-related rewards, heightened activation in the reward-related brain regions to gaming-related cues, and deficiencies in dopaminergic activities. However, one study included in the review suggested the absence of an association between reward sensitivity and gaming behaviors, (Acuff et al., 2021) which was in line with previous studies that have reported conflicting results regarding reward-related activations in individuals with GD (Antons, Brand, & Potenza, 2020; Park, Han, & Roh, 2017). In addition, reward networks in individuals with GD and those with other addictive disorders also yielded inconsistent results (Leeman & Potenza, 2013; Weinstein, Livny, & Weizman, 2017). Although many studies in the review suggest certain reward patterns in GD, the lack of studies makes it difficult to draw a conclusion regarding the resemblance of GD to other well-defined addictive disorders.

In terms of self-concept in GD, the gamers' tendency to identify with their game avatars increased as they transitioned from normal to problematic users. This follows the past review that reported self-concept deficits and increased identification with the gaming character in individuals with GD (Lemenager, Neissner, Sabo, Mann, & Kiefer, 2020), further highlighting the discrepancy between the real self and the virtual self in GD. With regards to brain structure and connectivity, lower gray matter density in the left DLPFC and lower FC between bilateral orbitofrontal cortex and overall brain regions were observed but due to the lack of studies included, it is premature to establish these as a general pattern of the GD.

Most of the studies have investigated psychological aspects of GD, suggesting abnormalities in multiple domains. The most robust association was found between GD and other psychiatric conditions (e.g., ADHD, depression, and anxiety). Studies investigating the effect of COVID-19 on GD have also discovered a significant role depression and anxiety play in GD. This is in accordance with previous studies that have proposed comorbidities between GD and a range of psychological symptoms including anxiety, depression, and attention problems, both in adults and adolescents (Müller et al., 2015; Ostinelli et al., 2021; Yen et al., 2017). While this could be suggestive of the relevant impact that mood disturbances and attention problems have on GD, this also raises a question as to whether GD possesses a unique profile or whether the symptoms stem from underlying conditions (Bean, Nielsen, Van Rooij, & Ferguson, 2017; Müller & Wölfling, 2017). While a mere existence of comorbidities does not automatically explain the observed health conditions better, this still highlights the need to control for underlying issues when investigating unique features of the GD. In terms of overall psychological health, GD was associated with low self-esteem, low life satisfaction, high suicidality, high maladaptive personality traits, and high levels of stress yet direct casualties could not be drawn due to the cross-sectional designs of the studies.

Differential results were found with regards to cognitive approach and patterns. While higher impulsivity and maladaptive cognition were found to be associated with GD in one study (Cerniglia et al., 2019), another study had found no such association and even found that individuals with GD adopted more advantageous decision strategies compared to those with gambling disorder or healthy individuals (Wölfling et al., 2020). The lack of consistency in the results contradicts many GD models that emphasize higher impulsivity and difficulties of decision-making (Paulus et al., 2018; Şalvarlı & Griffiths, 2019) as important features of GD.

This warrants more studies to settle the accuracy of these models, especially since impulsivity and abnormal decision-making processes are considered significant features of addiction (Bikel et al., 2018; Lee, Hoppenbrouwers, & Franken, 2019).

For social factors, family members' mental health, individualistic cultural orientation, and poor academic achievement were consistently found to be associated with GD. On the other hand, some noticeable variabilities were observed, specifically with regards to family-related factors. This included certain gender effects in terms of how family rules and attachment affect children's GD symptoms as well as the directionality of the association between GD and family issues. Furthermore, it could not be concluded whether the family issues directly affect children's GD, or whether there is a mediating factor concerning the traits of the children themselves. The contributions of social support and extra-family relationships to GD symptoms also yielded mixed results (e.g., having many friends vs. neglect of social contacts, low social support vs. no significant differences), making it difficult to conceptualize the role of social factors in the development and maintenance of GD. As family factors hugely impact children's and adolescents' development, studies should track temporal patterns of GD symptoms in order to unravel the complicated relationships (Festl et al., 2013).

Several gaps in the field of GD research were detected in the present review. First, more longitudinal and long-term follow-up studies are needed. Most studies included in this review were cross-sectional thus causal relationships nor predictive functions of each biopsychosocial variable could not be drawn. As mere correlations are not adequate to support a formalization of a disorder, a more sophisticated and deeper level of evidence of GD is needed (Van Rooij et al., 2018). As one way to examine longitudinal aspects of gaming, we advise researchers to actively utilize large-scale projects, such as the ABCD (Adolescent Brain and Cognitive Development;

Barch et al., 2018) study or the Project M.E.D.I.A. (Media Effects on Development from Infancy to Adulthood; <https://www.projectmediadenver.com/>) to name a few, which are ongoing, longitudinal studies on child development.

Second, standardized approaches to GD assessment tools are essential. The problems that arise from the variability in GD screening tools in addition to the need for a unified approach have been highlighted by many researchers (Griffiths et al., 2014; Kircaburun et al., 2020; Stavropoulos, Gomez, & Motti-Stefanidi, 2019; Stevens et al., 2021). Even though we have made an attempt to control for these issues by only including studies that have utilized one of five scales with greater evidential support, we could not fully rule out the differences that exist between these five scales. Therefore, rather than constantly developing new diagnostic tools with varying conceptual properties, assessment consistency should initially be established to improve the comparability of different research studies.

Third, it was apparent from the review that there were not enough studies that have investigated biological factors of GD using screening tools of choice. During the literature search, we found that scales developed to measure general internet addiction rather than GD were being widely used in studies that collected neural and behavioral data, while it has constantly been argued that internet addiction should be conceptually and clinically distinguished from GD (Balhara et al., 2021; Montag et al., 2015). More studies focusing on the neurobiology and genetics of GD while using screening tools with evidential support or clinical interview are needed to uncover its underlying biological mechanisms. This will allow researchers to gain insight into the biological mechanisms, especially since animal models that have facilitated understanding of substance use disorders are lacking for GD (Feng, Ramo, Chan, & Bourgeois, 2017).

Lastly, game-related factors (e.g., game genres, game time) should be taken into consideration when designing studies. It has been argued that the ‘social’ aspect of gaming is what leads to various problems instead of ‘gaming’ itself (Gong, Zhang, Chen, Cheung, & Lee, 2020). As mixed and varying results were observed with regards to social factors, future studies should control for game genres as much as possible. Furthermore, there have been contrasting results regarding whether the amount of game time could be considered a reliable predictor of GD, questioning the idea that intense gaming itself is problematic (Király, Tóth, Urbán, Demetrovics, & Maraz, 2017). Colder Carras and Kardefelt-Winther (2018) have also raised concerns that highly involved gamers could be misclassified simply due to the time they engage in gaming. Future studies should examine the association between game time and GD for more accurate clinical diagnostic criteria.

In conclusion, this was the first systematic review on GD to control for the excess amount of assessment tools with varying psychometric properties to provide an up-to-date and comprehensive overview of biopsychosocial factors associated with GD. While several biological, psychological, and social factors--impaired self-concept, comorbidities, emotional dysregulation, and poor academic performance--were consistently confirmed, mixed results were observed mainly with regards to reward activities, impulsivity, social relations, and family relationships. To settle the debate in terms of psychometric weaknesses of the current diagnostic system, collaborative approaches among experts in education, mental health, and the gaming industry seem crucial (Colder Carras et al., 2018; Zhao & Hao, 2019). We conclude that more longitudinal and neurobiological studies, consensus on a diagnostic tool with well-defined psychometric properties, and an in-depth understanding of gaming-related factors should be established.

References

1. 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 J Behav Addict*, 6(3), 267-270. doi:10.1556/2006.5.2016.088
2. Acuff, S. F., Pilatti, A., Collins, M., Hides, L., Thingujam, N. S., Chai, W. J., . . . Murphy, J. G. (2021). Reinforcer pathology of internet-related behaviors among college students: Data from six countries. *Exp Clin Psychopharmacol*. doi:10.1037/pha0000459
3. American Psychiatric Association (1994) *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (4th ed). Washington, DC: American psychiatric association.
4. American Psychiatric Association, A. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders: DSM-5* (Vol. 10): Washington, DC: American psychiatric association.
5. Andreetta, J., Teh, J., Burleigh, T. L., Gomez, R., & Stavropoulos, V. (2020). Associations between comorbid stress and Internet Gaming Disorder symptoms: Are there cultural and gender variations? *Asia-Pacific Psychiatry*, 12(2), e12387. doi:10.1111/appy.12387
6. Antons, S., Brand, M., & Potenza, M. N. (2020). Neurobiology of cue-reactivity, craving, and inhibitory control in non-substance addictive behaviors. *J Neurol Sci*, 415, 116952. doi:10.1016/j.jns.2020.116952
7. Ariatama, B., Effendy, E., & Amin, M. M. (2019). Relationship between Internet Gaming Disorder with Depressive Syndrome and Dopamine Transporter Condition in Online Games Player. *Open access Macedonian journal of medical sciences*, 7(16), 2638-2642. doi:10.3889/oamjms.2019.476
8. Balhara, Y. P. S., Singh, S., Saini, R., Dahiya, N., Singh, A. B., & Kumar, R. (2021). Should Internet gaming disorder be considered a subtype of generalized problematic internet use? Findings from a study among medical college students. *Perspectives in Psychiatric Care*, 57(1), 272-278. doi:10.1111/ppc.12558
9. Barch, D. M., Albaugh, M. D., Avenevoli, S., Chang, L., Clark, D. B., Glantz, M. D., . . . Sher, K. J. (2018). Demographic, physical and mental health assessments in the adolescent brain and cognitive development study: Rationale and description. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*, 32, 55-66. doi:10.1016/j.dcn.2017.10.010
10. Bean, A. M., Nielsen, R. K., Van Rooij, A. J., & Ferguson, C. J. (2017). Video game addiction: The push to pathologize video games. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 48(5), 378. doi: 10.1037/pro0000150
11. Bickel, W. K., Mellis, A. M., Snider, S. E., Athamneh, L. N., Stein, J. S., & Pope, D. A. (2018). 21st century neurobehavioral theories of decision making in addiction: Review and evaluation. *Pharmacology Biochemistry and Behavior*, 164, 4-21. doi:10.1016/j.pbb.2017.09.009
12. Bodi, G., Maintenant, C., & Pennequin, V. (2021). The role of maladaptive cognitions in gaming disorder: Differences between online and offline gaming types. *Addict Behav*, 112, 106595. doi:10.1016/j.addbeh.2020.106595
13. Bonnaire, C., & Baptista, D. (2019). Internet gaming disorder in male and female young adults: The role of alexithymia, depression, anxiety and gaming type. *Psychiatry research*, 272, 521-530. doi:10.1016/j.psychres.2018.12.158

14. Bonnaire, C., & Phan, O. (2017). Relationships between parental attitudes, family functioning and Internet gaming disorder in adolescents attending school. *Psychiatry research*, 255, 104-110. doi:10.1016/j.psychres.2017.05.030
15. Borzikowsky, C., & Bernhardt, F. (2018). Lost in virtual gaming worlds: Grit and its prognostic value for online game addiction. *The American Journal on Addictions*, 27(5), 433-438. doi:10.1111/ajad.12762
16. Brunborg, G. S., Mentzoni, R. A., & Frøyland, L. R. (2014). Is video gaming, or video game addiction, associated with depression, academic achievement, heavy episodic drinking, or conduct problems? *Journal of Behavioral Addictions JBA*, 3(1), 27. doi:10.1556/jba.3.2014.002
17. Buiza-Aguado, C., Alonso-Canovas, A., Conde-Mateos, C., Buiza-Navarrete, J. J., & Gentile, D. (2018). Problematic video gaming in a young Spanish population: association with psychosocial health. *Cyberpsychology, behavior, and social networking*, 21(6), 388-394. doi:10.1089/cyber.2017.0599
18. Canale, N., Marino, C., Griffiths, M. D., Scacchi, L., Monaci, M. G., & Vieno, A. (2019). The association between problematic online gaming and perceived stress: The moderating effect of psychological resilience. *Journal of Behavioral Addictions*, 8(1), 174-180. doi:10.1556/2006.8.2019.01
19. Cerniglia, L., Guicciardi, M., Sinatra, M., Monacis, L., Simonelli, A., & Cimino, S. (2019). The Use of Digital Technologies, Impulsivity and Psychopathological Symptoms in Adolescence. *Behavioral Sciences*, 9(8), 82. doi:10.3390/bs9080082
20. Chamarro, A., Oberst, U., Cladellas, R., & Fuster, H. (2020). Effect of the Frustration of Psychological Needs on Addictive Behaviors in Mobile Videogamers—The Mediating Role of Use Expectancies and Time Spent Gaming. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 17(17), 6429. doi:10.3390/ijerph17176429
21. Chen, C. Y., Chen, I. H., O'Brien, K. S., Latner, J. D., & Lin, C. Y. (2021). Psychological distress and internet-related behaviors between schoolchildren with and without overweight during the COVID-19 outbreak. *Int J Obes (Lond)*, 45(3), 677-686. doi:10.1038/s41366-021-00741-5
22. Chen, C. Y., Chen, I. H., Pakpour, A. H., Lin, C. Y., & Griffiths, M. D. (2021). Internet-Related Behaviors and Psychological Distress Among Schoolchildren During the COVID-19 School Hiatus. *Cyberpsychol Behav Soc Netw*. doi:10.1089/cyber.2020.0497
23. Chia, D. X. Y., Ng, C. W. L., Kandasami, G., Seow, M. Y. L., Choo, C. C., Chew, P. K. H., . . . Zhang, M. W. B. (2020). Prevalence of Internet Addiction and Gaming Disorders in Southeast Asia: A Meta-Analysis. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*, 17(7). doi:10.3390/ijerph17072582
24. Choi, J., Cho, H., Kim, J.-Y., Jung, D. J., Ahn, K. J., Kang, H.-B., . . . Kim, D.-J. (2017). Structural alterations in the prefrontal cortex mediate the relationship between Internet gaming disorder and depressed mood. *Scientific reports*, 7(1), 1-10. doi:10.1038/s41598-017-01275-5
25. Choi, W.-S. (2018). The Mediating Effect of Anxiety on the Relationship between Internet Game Addiction and Life Satisfaction: Focusing on Male University Students in Harbin, China. *Korean Journal of Family Welfare*, 23(4), 613-632. doi:10.13049/kfwa.2018.23.4.4

26. Chun, J.-W., Park, C.-H., Kim, J.-Y., Choi, J., Cho, H., Jung, D. J., . . . Choi, I. Y. (2020). Altered core networks of brain connectivity and personality traits in internet gaming disorder. *Journal of Behavioral Addictions*. doi:10.1556/2006.2020.00014
27. 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 & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 27(4), 513-525. doi:10.1007/s00787-018-1108-1
28. Colder Carras, M., Porter, A. M., Van Rooij, A. J., King, D., Lange, A., Carras, M., & Labrique, A. (2018). Gamers' insights into the phenomenology of normal gaming and game "addiction": A mixed methods study. *Computers in human behavior*, 79, 238-246. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2017.10.029
29. Concerto, C., Rodolico, A., Avanzato, C., Fusar-Poli, L., Signorelli, M. S., Battaglia, F., & Aguglia, E. (2021). Autistic Traits and Attention-Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder Symptoms Predict the Severity of Internet Gaming Disorder in an Italian Adult Population. *Brain Sci*, 11(6). doi:10.3390/brainsci11060774
30. Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. (1992). Professional manual for the NEO PI-R and NEO-Ffi. *Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources*.
31. Decety, J., & Grèzes, J. (2006). The power of simulation: imagining one's own and other's behavior. *Brain research*, 1079(1), 4-14. doi: [10.1016/j.brainres.2005.12.115](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brainres.2005.12.115)
32. De Pasquale, C., Dinaro, C., & Sciacca, F. (2018). Relationship of Internet gaming disorder with dissociative experience in Italian university students. *Annals of general psychiatry*, 17(1), 1-7. doi:10.1186/s12991-018-0198-y
33. De Pasquale, C., Sciacca, F., Martinelli, V., Chiappedi, M., Dinaro, C., & Hichy, Z. (2020). Relationship of Internet Gaming Disorder with Psychopathology and Social Adaptation in Italian Young Adults. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*, 17(21). doi:10.3390/ijerph17218201
34. Dieter, J., Hill, H., Sell, M., Reinhard, I., Vollstädt-Klein, S., Kiefer, F., . . . Leménager, T. (2015). Avatar's neurobiological traces in the self-concept of massively multiplayer online role-playing game (MMORPG) addicts. *Behavioral Neuroscience*, 129(1), 8. doi:10.1037/bne0000025
35. Duman, H., & Ozkara, B. Y. (2019). The impact of social identity on online game addiction: the mediating role of the fear of missing out (FoMO) and the moderating role of the need to belong. *Current Psychology*, 1-10. doi:10.1007/s12144-019-00392-w
36. Duven, E. C. P., Müller, K. W., Beutel, M. E., & Wölfling, K. (2015). Altered reward processing in pathological computer gamers—ERP-results from a semi-natural Gaming-Design. *Brain and Behavior*, 5(1), e00293. doi:10.1002/brb3.293
37. Efrati, Y., Kolubinski, D. C., Marino, C., & Spada, M. M. (2021). Modelling the Contribution of Metacognitions, Impulsiveness, and Thought Suppression to Behavioural Addictions in Adolescents. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*, 18(7). doi:10.3390/ijerph18073820
38. Evren, B., Evren, C., Dalbudak, E., Topcu, M., & Kutlu, N. (2019). Neuroticism and introversion mediates the relationship between probable ADHD and symptoms of Internet gaming disorder: results of an online survey. *Psychiatry and Clinical Psychopharmacology*, 29(1), 90-96. doi:10.1080/24750573.2018.1490095
39. Evren, C., Evren, B., Dalbudak, E., Topcu, M., & Kutlu, N. (2019). Relationship of internet gaming disorder severity with symptoms of anxiety, depression, alexithymia, and

- aggression among university students. *Dusunen Adam The Journal of Psychiatry and Neurological Sciences*, 32(3), 227. doi:10.14744/DAJPNS.2019.00032
40. Evren, C., Evren, B., Dalbudak, E., Topcu, M., & Kutlu, N. (2020). Relationship of Internet gaming disorder symptom severity with non-suicidal self-injury among young adults. *Dusunen Adam*, 33(1), 79-86. doi:10.14744/DAJPNS.2019.00063
 41. Fauth-Bühler, M., & Mann, K. (2017). Neurobiological correlates of internet gaming disorder: Similarities to pathological gambling. *Addictive Behaviors*, 64, 349-356. doi:10.1016/j.addbeh.2015.11.004
 42. Fazeli, S., Zeidi, I. M., Lin, C.-Y., Namdar, P., Griffiths, M. D., Ahorsu, D. K., & Pakpour, A. H. (2020). Depression, anxiety, and stress mediate the associations between internet gaming disorder, insomnia, and quality of life during the COVID-19 outbreak. *Addictive Behaviors Reports*, 12, 100307. doi:10.1016/j.abrep.2020.100307
 43. Feng, W., Ramo, D. E., Chan, S. R., & Bourgeois, J. A. (2017). Internet gaming disorder: Trends in prevalence 1998-2016. *Addictive Behaviors*, 75, 17-24. doi:10.1016/j.addbeh.2017.06.010
 44. Ferguson, C. J. (2010). Blazing angels or resident evil? Can violent video games be a force for good? *Review of general psychology*, 14(2), 68-81. doi:10.1037/a0018941
 45. Ferguson, C. J., & Olson, C. K. (2013). Friends, fun, frustration and fantasy: Child motivations for video game play. *Motivation and Emotion*, 37(1), 154-164. doi:10.1007/s11031-012-9284-7
 46. Fernandes, G. (2020, 3 Sep). Half a Billion Dollars in 2020: The Cloud Gaming Market Evolves as Consumer Engagement & Spending Soar. *Newzoo*. Retrieved from <https://newzoo.com/insights/articles/global-cloud-gaming-market-report-consumer-engagement-spending-revenues-2020-2023/>
 47. Festl, R., Scharkow, M., & Quandt, T. (2013). Problematic computer game use among adolescents, younger and older adults. *Addiction*, 108(3), 592-599. doi:10.1111/add.12016
 48. Ganesh, S., Van Schie, H. T., De Lange, F. P., Thompson, E., & Wigboldus, D. H. (2012). How the human brain goes virtual: distinct cortical regions of the person-processing network are involved in self-identification with virtual agents. *Cerebral Cortex*, 22(7), 1577-1585. doi:10.1093/cercor/bhr227
 49. Gomez, R., Stavropoulos, V., Beard, C., & Pontes, H. M. (2019). Item Response Theory Analysis of the Recoded Internet Gaming Disorder Scale-Short-Form (IGDS9-SF). *International journal of mental health and addiction*, 17(4), 859-879. doi:10.1007/s11469-018-9890-z
 50. Gong, X., Zhang, K. Z. K., Chen, C., Cheung, C. M. K., & Lee, M. K. O. (2020). Antecedents and consequences of excessive online social gaming: a social learning perspective. *Information technology & people*, 33(2), 657-688. doi:10.1108/ITP-03-2018-0138
 51. Granic, I., Lobel, A., & Engels, R. C. (2014). The benefits of playing video games. *American psychologist*, 69(1), 66. doi:10.1037/a0034857
 52. Griffiths, M., King, D., & Demetrovics, Z. (2014). DSM-5 internet gaming disorder needs a unified approach to assessment. *Neuropsychiatry*, 4(1), 1-4. doi:10.2217/NPY.13.82
 53. Haghbin, M., Shaterian, F., Hosseinzadeh, D., & Griffiths, M. D. (2013). A brief report on the relationship between self-control, video game addiction and academic

- achievement in normal and ADHD students. *Journal of Behavioral Addictions*, 2(4), 239-243. doi:10.1556/jba.2.2013.4.7
54. 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 & Theory*, 21(2), 102-112. doi:10.3109/16066359.2012.693222
 55. Horváth, Z., Király, O., Demetrovics, Z., Németh, Á., Várnai, D., & Urbán, R. (2021). Polysubstance Use Is Positively Associated with Gaming Disorder Symptom Severity: A Latent Class Analytical Study. *Eur Addict Res*, 1-11. doi:10.1159/000517042
 56. Hu, E., Stavropoulos, V., Anderson, A., Scerri, M., & Collard, J. (2019). Internet gaming disorder: Feeling the flow of social games. *Addictive Behaviors Reports*, 9, 100140. doi:10.1016/j.abrep.2018.10.004
 57. Irmak, A. Y., & Erdogan, S. (2019). Predictors for digital game addiction among Turkish adolescents: a Cox's interaction model-based study. *Journal of addictions nursing*, 30(1), 49-56. doi:10.1097/JAN.0000000000000265
 58. Kim, C. K., Jung, D. K., & Cho, M. K. (2021). Structural Analysis among University Students' Intrusive Rumination, Deliberate Rumination, Game Addiction Tendency and Suicidal Risk: Multi-Group Analysis according to Gender. *Journal of Emotional & Behavioral Disorders*, 37(1), 283-307. doi:10.33770/JEBD.37.1.13
 59. Kim, J.-Y., Chun, J.-W., Park, C.-H., Cho, H., Choi, J., Yang, S., & Ahn, K.-J. (2019). The correlation between the frontostriatal network and impulsivity in internet gaming disorder. *Scientific reports*, 9(1), 1-9. doi:10.1038/s41598-018-37702-4
 60. Kim, S., & Kwon, J.-H. (2018). Effects of emotion experiences and gaming motivations on internet gaming behaviors in daily life: An ecological momentary assessment study. *Korean Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 37(4), 573-589. doi:10.15842/kjcp.2018.37.4.009
 61. King, D. L., Chamberlain, S. R., Carragher, N., Billieux, J., Stein, D., Mueller, K., . . . Starcevic, V. (2020). Screening and assessment tools for gaming disorder: A comprehensive systematic review. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 77, 101831. doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2020.101831
 62. Király, O., Griffiths, M. D., & Demetrovics, Z. (2015). Internet Gaming Disorder and the DSM-5: Conceptualization, Debates, and Controversies. *Current Addiction Reports*, 2(3), 254-262. doi:10.1007/s40429-015-0066-7
 63. Király, O., Tóth, D., Urbán, R., Demetrovics, Z., & Maraz, A. (2017). Intense video gaming is not essentially problematic. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 31(7), 807-817. doi:10.1037/adb0000316
 64. Kircaburun, K., Griffiths, M. D., & Billieux, J. (2019). Psychosocial factors mediating the relationship between childhood emotional trauma and internet gaming disorder: a pilot study. *European Journal of Psychotraumatology*, 10(1), 1565031. doi:10.1080/20008198.2018.1565031
 65. Kircaburun, K., Pontes, H. M., Stavropoulos, V., & Griffiths, M. D. (2020). A brief psychological overview of disordered gaming. *Curr Opin Psychol*, 36, 38-43. doi:10.1016/j.copsyc.2020.03.004
 66. Kmet, L. M., Cook, L. S., & Lee, R. C. (2004). Standard quality assessment criteria for evaluating primary research papers from a variety of fields. doi:10.7939/R37M04F16
 67. Koning, I. M., Peeters, M., Finkenauer, C., & Van Den Eijnden, R. J. J. M. (2018). Bidirectional effects of Internet-specific parenting practices and compulsive social media

and Internet game use. *Journal of Behavioral Addictions*, 7(3), 624-632.
doi:10.1556/2006.7.2018.68

68. Lee, R. S. C., Hoppenbrouwers, S., & Franken, I. (2019). A Systematic Meta-Review of Impulsivity and Compulsivity in Addictive Behaviors. *Neuropsychology Review*, 29(1), 14-26. doi:10.1007/s11065-019-09402-x
69. Leeman, R. F., & Potenza, M. N. (2013). A Targeted Review of the Neurobiology and Genetics of Behavioural Addictions: An Emerging Area of Research. *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, 58(5), 260-273. doi:10.1177/070674371305800503
70. Lemenager, T., Dieter, J., Hill, H., Hoffmann, S., Reinhard, I., Beutel, M., . . . Mann, K. (2016). Exploring the neural basis of avatar identification in pathological Internet gamers and of self-reflection in pathological social network users. *Journal of Behavioral Addictions*, 5(3), 485-499. doi:10.1556/2006.5.2016.048
71. Lemenager, T., Neissner, M., Sabo, T., Mann, K., & Kiefer, F. (2020). “Who Am I” and “How Should I Be”: a Systematic Review on Self-Concept and Avatar Identification in Gaming Disorder. *Current Addiction Reports*, 7(2), 166-193. doi:10.1007/s40429-020-00307-x
72. Liberati, A., Altman, D. G., Tetzlaff, J., Mulrow, C., Gøtzsche, P. C., Ioannidis, J. P., . . . Moher, D. (2009). The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate health care interventions: explanation and elaboration. *Journal of clinical epidemiology*, 62(10), e1-e34. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2009.06.006
73. Lin, C. Y., Potenza, M. N., Broström, A., & Pakpour, A. H. (2021). Internet gaming disorder, psychological distress, and insomnia in adolescent students and their siblings: An actor-partner interdependence model approach. *Addict Behav Rep*, 13, 100332. doi:10.1016/j.abrep.2020.100332
74. Macur, M., & Pontes, H. M. (2021). Internet Gaming Disorder in adolescence: investigating profiles and associated risk factors. *BMC Public Health*, 21(1), 1547. doi:10.1186/s12889-021-11394-4
75. Männikkö, N., Billieux, J., & Kääriäinen, M. (2015). Problematic digital gaming behavior and its relation to the psychological, social and physical health of Finnish adolescents and young adults. *Journal of Behavioral Addictions*, 4(4), 281-288. doi:10.1556/2006.4.2015.040
76. Mentzoni, R. A., Brunborg, G. S., Molde, H., Myrseth, H., Skouverø, K. J. M., Hetland, J., & Pallesen, S. (2011). Problematic video game use: estimated prevalence and associations with mental and physical health. *Cyberpsychology, behavior, and social networking*, 14(10), 591-596. doi:10.1089/cyber.2010.0260
77. Mihara, S., & Higuchi, S. (2017). Cross-sectional and longitudinal epidemiological studies of Internet gaming disorder: A systematic review of the literature. *Psychiatry and clinical neurosciences*, 71(7), 425-444. doi:10.1111/pcn.12532
78. Montag, C., Bey, K., Sha, P., Li, M., Chen, Y.-F., Liu, W.-Y., . . . Reuter, M. (2015). Is it meaningful to distinguish between generalized and specific Internet addiction? Evidence from a cross-cultural study from Germany, Sweden, Taiwan and China. *Asia-Pacific Psychiatry*, 7(1), 20-26. doi:10.1111/appy.12122
79. More People Are Gaming In The U.S., And They’re Doing So Across More Platforms. (2020, 20 July). *npd*. Retrieved from <https://www.npd.com/news/press-releases/2020/more-people-are-gaming-in-the-us/>

80. Moudiab, S., & Spada, M. M. (2019). The relative contribution of motives and maladaptive cognitions to levels of Internet Gaming Disorder. *Addictive Behaviors Reports*, 9, 100160. doi:10.1016/j.abrep.2019.100160
81. Müller, K. W., Beutel, M. E., Egloff, B., & Wölfling, K. (2014). Investigating risk factors for Internet gaming disorder: a comparison of patients with addictive gaming, pathological gamblers and healthy controls regarding the big five personality traits. *European addiction research*, 20(3), 129-136. doi:10.1159/000355832
82. Müller, K. W., Janikian, M., Dreier, M., Wölfling, K., Beutel, M. E., Tzavara, C., . . . Tsitsika, A. (2015). Regular gaming behavior and internet gaming disorder in European adolescents: results from a cross-national representative survey of prevalence, predictors, and psychopathological correlates. *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 24(5), 565-574. doi:10.1007/s00787-014-0611-2
83. Müller, K. W., Werthmann, J., Beutel, M. E., Wölfling, K., & Egloff, B. (2021). Maladaptive Personality Traits and Their Interaction with Outcome Expectancies in Gaming Disorder and Internet-Related Disorders. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*, 18(8). doi:10.3390/ijerph18083967
84. Müller, K. W., & Wölfling, K. (2017). Both sides of the story: Addiction is not a pastime activity: Commentary on: Scholars' open debate paper on the World Health Organization ICD-11 Gaming Disorder proposal (Aarseth et al.). *Journal of Behavioral Addictions J Behav Addict*, 6(2), 118-120. doi:10.1556/2006.6.2017.038
85. Müller, T., & Bonnaire, C. (2021). Intrapersonal and interpersonal emotion regulation and identity: A preliminary study of avatar identification and gaming in adolescents and young adults. *Psychiatry Res*, 295, 113627. doi:10.1016/j.psychres.2020.113627
86. Murray, A., Mannion, A., Chen, J. L., & Leader, G. (2021). Gaming Disorder in Adults with Autism Spectrum Disorder. *J Autism Dev Disord*. doi:10.1007/s10803-021-05138-x
87. Musetti, A., Mancini, T., Corsano, P., Santoro, G., Cavallini, M. C., & Schimmenti, A. (2019). Maladaptive personality functioning and psychopathological symptoms in problematic video game players: A person-centered approach. *Frontiers in psychology*, 10, 2559. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02559
88. Nakayama, H., Matsuzaki, T., Mihara, S., Kitayuguchi, T., & Higuchi, S. (2020). Relationship between problematic gaming and age at the onset of habitual gaming. *Pediatr Int*, 62(11), 1275-1281. doi:10.1111/ped.14290
89. Oka, T., Hamamura, T., Miyake, Y., Kobayashi, N., Honjo, M., Kawato, M., . . . Chiba, T. (2021). Prevalence and risk factors of internet gaming disorder and problematic internet use before and during the COVID-19 pandemic: A large online survey of Japanese adults. *J Psychiatr Res*, 142, 218-225. doi: [10.1016/j.jpsychires.2021.07.054](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychires.2021.07.054)
90. Ostinelli, E. G., Zangani, C., Giordano, B., Maestri, D., Gambini, O., D'Agostino, A., . . . Purgato, M. (2021). Depressive symptoms and depression in individuals with internet gaming disorder: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Affect Disord*, 284, 136-142. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2021.02.014
91. Park, B., Han, D. H., & Roh, S. (2017). Neurobiological findings related to Internet use disorders. *Psychiatry and clinical neurosciences*, 71(7), 467-478. doi:10.1111/pcn.12422
92. Paulus, F. W., Ohmann, S., Von Gontard, A., & Popow, C. (2018). Internet gaming disorder in children and adolescents: a systematic review. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology*, 60(7), 645-659. doi:10.1111/dmcn.13754

93. Petry, N. M., Rehbein, F., Gentile, D. A., Lemmens, J. S., Rumpf, H. J., Möble, T., . . . Borges, G. (2014). An international consensus for assessing internet gaming disorder using the new DSM-5 approach. *Addiction*, 109(9), 1399-1406. doi:10.1111/add.12457
94. Phan, O., Prieur, C., Bonnaire, C., & Obradovic, I. (2020). Internet Gaming Disorder: Exploring Its Impact on Satisfaction in Life in PELLEAS Adolescent Sample. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 17(1), 3. doi:10.3390/ijerph17010003
95. Pontes, H. M. (2017). Investigating the differential effects of social networking site addiction and Internet gaming disorder on psychological health. *Journal of Behavioral Addictions*, 6(4), 601-610. doi:10.1556/2006.6.2017.075
96. Pontes, H. M., & Griffiths, M. D. (2014). Assessment of internet gaming disorder in clinical research: Past and present perspectives. *Clinical Research and Regulatory Affairs*, 31(2-4), 35-48. doi:10.3109/10601333.2014.962748
97. Rajab, A. M., Zaghloul, M. S., Enabi, S., Rajab, T. M., Al-Khani, A. M., Basalah, A., . . . Billah, S. M. B. (2020). Gaming addiction and perceived stress among Saudi adolescents. *Addictive Behaviors Reports*, 11, 100261. doi:10.1016/j.abrep.2020.100261
98. Richard, J., Marchica, L., Ivoska, W., & Derevensky, J. (2021). Bullying Victimization and Problem Video Gaming: The Mediating Role of Externalizing and Internalizing Problems. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*, 18(4). doi:10.3390/ijerph18041930
99. Sallie, S. N., Ritou, V. J. E., Bowden-Jones, H., & Voon, V. (2021). Assessing online gaming and pornography consumption patterns during COVID-19 isolation using an online survey: Highlighting distinct avenues of problematic internet behavior. *Addict Behav*, 123, 107044. doi: 10.1016/j.addbeh.2021.107044
100. Sánchez-Llorens, M., Marí-Sanmillán, M. I., Benito, A., Rodríguez-Ruiz, F., Castellano-García, F., Almodóvar, I., & Haro, G. (2021). Personality traits and psychopathology in adolescents with videogame addiction. *Adicciones*, 0(0), 1629.
101. Şalvarlı, Ş. İ., & Griffiths, M. D. (2019). The Association Between Internet Gaming Disorder and Impulsivity: A Systematic Review of Literature. *International journal of mental health and addiction*. doi:10.1007/s11469-019-00126-w
102. Scharrow, M., Festl, R., & Quandt, T. (2014). Longitudinal patterns of problematic computer game use among adolescents and adults—A 2-year panel study. *Addiction*, 109(11), 1910-1917. doi:10.1111/add.12662
103. Severo, R. B., Soares, J. M., Affonso, J. P., Giusti, D. A., de Souza Junior, A. A., de Figueiredo, V. L., . . . Pontes, H. M. (2020). Prevalence and risk factors for internet gaming disorder. *Brazilian Journal of Psychiatry*, 42(5), 532-535. doi:10.1590/1516-4446-2019-0760
104. Singh, S., Dahiya, N., Singh, A. B., Kumar, R., & Balhara, Y. P. S. (2019). Gaming disorder among medical college students from India: Exploring the pattern and correlates. *Industrial psychiatry journal*, 28(1), 107. doi:10.4103/ipj.ipj_96_18
105. Siste, K., Hanafi, E., Sen, L. T., Wahjoepramono, P. O. P., Kurniawan, A., & Yudistiro, R. (2021). Potential Correlates of Internet Gaming Disorder Among Indonesian Medical Students: Cross-sectional Study. *J Med Internet Res*, 23(4), e25468. doi:10.2196/25468
106. Stavropoulos, V., Adams, B. L. M., Beard, C. L., Dumble, E., Trawley, S., Gomez, R., & Pontes, H. M. (2019). Associations between attention deficit hyperactivity and internet gaming disorder symptoms: Is there consistency across types of symptoms, gender and countries? *Addictive Behaviors Reports*, 9, 100158. doi:10.1016/j.abrep.2018.100158

107. Stavropoulos, V., Anderson, E. E., Beard, C., Latifi, M. Q., Kuss, D., & Griffiths, M. (2019). A preliminary cross-cultural study of Hikikomori and Internet Gaming Disorder: The moderating effects of game-playing time and living with parents. *Addictive Behaviors Reports*, 9, 100137. doi:10.1016/j.abrep.2018.10.001
108. Stavropoulos, V., Baynes, K. L., O'Farrel, D. L., Gomez, R., Mueller, A., Yucel, M., & Griffiths, M. (2020). Inattention and disordered gaming: does culture matter? *Psychiatric quarterly*, 91(2), 333-348. doi:10.1007/s11126-019-09702-8
109. Stavropoulos, V., Frost, T. M. J., Brown, T., Gill, P., Footitt, T. A., & Kannis-Dymand, L. (2021). Internet gaming disorder behaviours: a preliminary exploration of individualism and collectivism profiles. *BMC Psychiatry*, 21(1), 262. doi:10.1186/s12888-021-03245-8
110. Stavropoulos, V., Gomez, R., & Motti-Stefanidi, F. (2019). Editorial: Internet Gaming Disorder: A Pathway Towards Assessment Consensus. *Front Psychol*, 10, 1822. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01822
111. Stavropoulos, V., Gomez, R., Mueller, A., Yucel, M., & Griffiths, M. (2020). User-avatar bond profiles: How do they associate with disordered gaming? *Addictive Behaviors*, 103, 106245. doi:10.1016/j.addbeh.2019.106245
112. Stavropoulos, V., Vassallo, J., Burleigh, T. L., Gomez, R., & Colder Carras, M. (2021). The role of internet gaming in the association between anxiety and depression: A preliminary cross-sectional study. *Asia Pac Psychiatry*, e12474. doi:10.1111/appy.12474
113. Stevens, M. W., Dorstyn, D., Delfabbro, P. H., & King, D. L. (2021). Global prevalence of gaming disorder: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Aust N Z J Psychiatry*, 55(6), 553-568. doi:10.1177/0004867420962851
114. Stockdale, L., & Coyne, S. M. (2018). Video game addiction in emerging adulthood: Cross-sectional evidence of pathology in video game addicts as compared to matched healthy controls. *Journal of affective disorders*, 225, 265-272. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2017.08.045
115. Stockdale, L., & Coyne, S. M. (2020). Parenting paused: Pathological video game use and parenting outcomes. *Addictive Behaviors Reports*, 11, 100244. doi:10.1016/j.abrep.2019.100244
116. Sublette, V. A., & Mullan, B. (2012). Consequences of play: A systematic review of the effects of online gaming. *International journal of mental health and addiction*, 10(1), 3-23. doi:10.1007/s11469-010-9304-3
117. Sugaya, N., Shirasaka, T., Takahashi, K., & Kanda, H. (2019). Bio-psychosocial factors of children and adolescents with internet gaming disorder: a systematic review. *BioPsychoSocial medicine*, 13(1), 1-16. doi:10.1186/s13030-019-0144-5
118. Sung, J.-H., Kim, C.-K., & Cho, M.-K. (2020). A Structural Analysis among Intrusive rumination, Externalizing and Game addiction tendency: Multi-Group Analysis according to Adverse Childhood Experiences. *Korean Association for Learner-centered Curriculum and Instruction*, 20(21), 471-491. doi:10.22251/jlcci.2020.20.21.471
119. T'ng, S. T., Ho, K. H., Sim, D. E., Yu, C. H., & Wong, P. Y. (2020). The mediating effect of Internet gaming disorder's symptoms on loneliness and aggression among undergraduate students and working adults in Malaysia. *PsyCh journal*, 9(1), 96-107. doi:10.1002/pchj.320
120. Teng, Z., Griffiths, M. D., Nie, Q., Xiang, G., & Guo, C. (2020). Parent-adolescent attachment and peer attachment associated with Internet Gaming Disorder: A longitudinal

- study of first-year undergraduate students. *Journal of Behavioral Addictions*, 9(1), 116-128. doi:10.1556/2006.2020.00011
121. Teng, Z., Pontes, H. M., Nie, Q., Griffiths, M. D., & Guo, C. (2021). Depression and anxiety symptoms associated with internet gaming disorder before and during the COVID-19 pandemic: A longitudinal study. *J Behav Addict*. doi:10.1556/2006.2021.00016
 122. Teng, Z., Pontes, H. M., Nie, Q., Xiang, G., Griffiths, M. D., & Guo, C. (2020). Internet gaming disorder and psychosocial well-being: A longitudinal study of older-aged adolescents and emerging adults. *Addictive Behaviors*, 110, 106530. doi:10.1016/j.addbeh.2020.106530
 123. Throuvala, M. A., Janikian, M., Griffiths, M. D., Rennoldson, M., & Kuss, D. J. (2019). The role of family and personality traits in Internet gaming disorder: A mediation model combining cognitive and attachment perspectives. *Journal of Behavioral Addictions*, 8(1), 48-62. doi:10.1556/2006.8.2019.05
 124. Ting, C. H., & Essau, C. (2021). Addictive behaviours among university students in Malaysia during COVID-19 pandemic. *Addict Behav Rep*, 14, 100375. doi: [10.1016/j.abrep.2021.100375](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.abrep.2021.100375)
 125. Tullett-Prado, D., Stavropoulos, V., Mueller, K., Sharples, J., & Footitt, T. A. (2021). Internet Gaming Disorder profiles and their associations with social engagement behaviours. *J Psychiatr Res*, 138, 393-403. doi:10.1016/j.jpsychires.2021.04.037
 126. Turel, O., He, Q., Wei, L., & Bechara, A. (2021). The role of the insula in internet gaming disorder. *Addiction biology*, 26(2), e12894. doi:10.1111/adb.12894
 127. Turhan Gürbüz, P., Çoban Ö, G., Erdoğan, A., Kopuz, H. Y., Adanir, A. S., & Önder, A. (2021). Evaluation of Internet Gaming Disorder, Social Media Addiction, and Levels of Loneliness in Adolescents and Youth with Substance Use. *Subst Use Misuse*, 1-6. doi:10.1080/10826084.2021.1958856
 128. Uçur, Ö., & Dönmez, Y. E. (2021). Problematic internet gaming in adolescents, and its relationship with emotional regulation and perceived social support. *Psychiatry Res*, 296, 113678. doi:10.1016/j.psychres.2020.113678
 129. Vally, Z. (2021). Symptoms of Internet Gaming Disorder, Inattention, and Impulsivity: a Cross-Sectional Study Conducted in the United Arab Emirates. *Psychiatric quarterly*, 92(1), 301-310. doi:10.1007/s1126-020-09799-2
 130. Van Rooij, A. J., Ferguson, C. J., Colder Carras, M., Kardefelt-Winther, D., Shi, J., Aarseth, E., ... & Przybylski, A. K. (2018). A weak scientific basis for gaming disorder: Let us err on the side of caution. *Journal of behavioral addictions*, 7(1), 1-9. doi: [10.1556/2006.7.2018.19](https://doi.org/10.1556/2006.7.2018.19)
 131. Wang, C.-W., Chan, C. L. W., Mak, K.-K., Ho, S.-Y., Wong, P. W. C., & Ho, R. T. H. (2014). Prevalence and correlates of video and Internet gaming addiction among Hong Kong adolescents: A pilot study. *The Scientific World Journal*, 2014. doi:10.1155/2014/874648
 132. Wang, Q., Mati, K., & Cai, Y. (2021). The link between problematic internet use, problematic gaming, and psychological distress: does sleep quality matter? *BMC Psychiatry*, 21(1), 103. doi:10.1186/s12888-021-03105-5
 133. Wartberg, L., Kriston, L., & Kammerl, R. (2017). Associations of social support, friends only known through the internet, and health-related quality of life with internet gaming

- disorder in adolescence. *Cyberpsychology, behavior, and social networking*, 20(7), 436-441. doi:10.1089/cyber.2016.0535
134. Wartberg, L., Kriston, L., Kramer, M., Schwedler, A., Lincoln, T. M., & Kammerl, R. (2017). Internet gaming disorder in early adolescence: Associations with parental and adolescent mental health. *European Psychiatry*, 43, 14-18. doi:10.1016/j.eurpsy.2016.12.013
 135. Wartberg, L., Kriston, L., & Thomasius, R. (2017). The prevalence and psychosocial correlates of internet gaming disorder: analysis in a nationally representative sample of 12-to 25-Year-Olds. *Deutsches Ärzteblatt International*, 114(25), 419. doi:10.3238/arztebl.2017.0419
 136. Wartberg, L., Kriston, L., Zieglmeier, M., Lincoln, T., & Kammerl, R. (2019). A longitudinal study on psychosocial causes and consequences of Internet gaming disorder in adolescence. *Psychological medicine*, 49(2), 287-294. doi:10.1017/S003329171800082X
 137. Wartberg, L., Zieglmeier, M., & Kammerl, R. (2021). An Empirical Exploration of Longitudinal Predictors for Problematic Internet Use and Problematic Gaming Behavior. *Psychol Rep*, 124(2), 543-554. doi:10.1177/0033294120913488
 138. Weinstein, A., Livny, A., & Weizman, A. (2017). New developments in brain research of internet and gaming disorder. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 75, 314-330. doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2017.01.040
 139. Wittek, C. T., Finserås, T. R., Pallesen, S., Mentzoni, R. A., Hanss, D., Griffiths, M. D., & Molde, H. (2016). Prevalence and predictors of video game addiction: A study based on a national representative sample of gamers. *International journal of mental health and addiction*, 14(5), 672-686. doi:10.1007/s11469-015-9592-8
 140. Wölfling, K., Duvén, E., Wejbera, M., Beutel, M. E., & Müller, K. W. (2020). Discounting delayed monetary rewards and decision making in behavioral addictions—A comparison between patients with gambling disorder and internet gaming disorder. *Addictive Behaviors*, 108, 106446. doi:10.1016/j.addbeh.2020.106446
 141. Wong, H. Y., Mo, H. Y., Potenza, M. N., Chan, M. N. M., Lau, W. M., Chui, T. K., . . . Lin, C.-Y. (2020). Relationships between severity of internet gaming disorder, severity of problematic social media use, sleep quality and psychological distress. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 17(6), 1879. doi:10.3390/ijerph17061879
 142. Wood, R. T. A. (2008). Problems with the Concept of Video Game “Addiction”: Some Case Study Examples. *International journal of mental health and addiction*, 6(2), 169-178. doi:10.1007/s11469-007-9118-0
 143. World Health Organization, W. (2018). International classification of diseases for mortality and morbidity statistics (11th Revision). In.
 144. Yen, J.-Y., Liu, T.-L., Wang, P.-W., Chen, C.-S., Yen, C.-F., & Ko, C.-H. (2017). Association between Internet gaming disorder and adult attention deficit and hyperactivity disorder and their correlates: Impulsivity and hostility. *Addictive Behaviors*, 64, 308-313. doi:10.1016/j.addbeh.2016.04.024
 145. Yoon, S., Yang, Y., Ro, E., Ahn, W.-Y., Kim, J., Shin, S.-H., . . . Choi, K.-H. (2021). Reliability, and Convergent and Discriminant Validity of Gaming Disorder Scales: A Meta-Analysis. *Frontiers in psychology*, 12. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2021.764209

146. Zhao, M., & Hao, W. (2019). Challenges of gaming disorder: suggestions from a public health perspective. *General Psychiatry*, 32(3). doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/gpsych-2019-100086>
147. Zhu, S., Zhuang, Y., Lee, P., Li, J. C.-M., & Wong, P. W. C. (2021). Leisure and Problem Gaming Behaviors Among Children and Adolescents During School Closures Caused by COVID-19 in Hong Kong: Quantitative Cross-sectional Survey Study. *JMIR Serious Games*, 9(2). doi:10.2196/26808

Supplementary material:

Is there adequate evidence for "game addiction?": A systematic review of biopsychosocial factors of gaming disorder

- **Appendix A.** Kmet quantitative analysis for included studies
- **Appendix B.** Descriptions for five diagnostic tools

Appendix A. Kmet quantitative analysis for included studies

(a) Kmet analysis for studies included in the biological category (YES (2), PARTIAL (1), NO (0), N/A)

[illegible]

6	If interventional and blinding of investigators was possible, was it reported?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
7	If interventional and blinding of subjects was possible, was it reported?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
8	Outcome and (if applicable) exposure measure(s) well defined and robust to measurement/misclassification bias? Means of assessment reported?	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
9	Sample size appropriate?	2	2	2	1	1	2	1	2
10	Analytic methods described/justified and appropriate?	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
11	Some estimate of variance is reported for the main results?	0	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
12	Controlled for confounding?	0	2	2	2	1	2	1	2
13	Results reported in sufficient detail?	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
14	Conclusions supported by the results?	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
	Total sum	17	22	22	21	20	21	20	22

Total possible sum	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22
Summary Score (total sum / total possible sum)	0.77	1.00	1.00	0.95	0.91	0.95	0.91	1.00

(b) Kmet analysis for studies included in both psychological and social categories (YES (2), PARTIAL (1), NO (0), N/A)

[illegible]

[illegible]

14	Conclusions supported by the results?	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	2	2	2
	Total sum	19	15	16	21	21	18	20	18	19	21
	Total possible sum	20	20	20	22	22	20	22	20	20	22
	Summary Score (total sum / total possible sum)	0.95	0.75	0.80	0.95	0.95	0.90	0.91	0.90	0.95	0.95

(c) Kmet analysis for studies included in the psychological category (YES (2), PARTIAL (1), NO (0), N/A)

[illegible]

	possible, was it described?											
6	If interventional and blinding of investigators was possible, was it reported?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
7	If interventional and blinding of subjects was possible, was it reported?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
8	Outcome and (if applicable) exposure measure(s) well defined and robust to measurement/misclassification bias? Means of assessment reported?	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
9	Sample size appropriate?	N/A	1	1	N/A	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	2	2
10	Analytic methods described/justified and appropriate?	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
11	Some estimate of variance is reported for the main results?	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	2	2	2	2
12	Controlled for confounding?	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	1	1
13	Results reported in sufficient detail?	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2

14	Conclusions supported by the results?	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
	Total sum	18	19	21	20	19	17	18	20	20	21	21
	Total possible sum	20	22	22	20	22	20	20	20	22	22	22
	Summary Score (total sum / total possible sum)	0.90	0.86	0.95	1.00	0.86	0.85	0.90	1.00	0.91	0.95	0.95

[illegible]

Total sum	20	17	20	17	22	19	22	22	20	18	18	21
Total possible sum	20	20	22	20	22	20	22	22	20	22	22	22
Summary Score (total sum / total possible sum)	1.00	0.85	0.91	0.85	1.00	0.95	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.82	0.82	0.95

[illegible]

Total sum	18	21	20	17	20	22	22	22	21	19	20	22
Total possible sum	20	22	20	20	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22
Summary Score (total sum / total possible sum)	0.90	0.95	1.00	0.85	0.91	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.95	0.86	0.91	1.00

	possible, was it described?												
6	If interventional and blinding of investigators was possible, was it reported?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
7	If interventional and blinding of subjects was possible, was it reported?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
8	Outcome and (if applicable) exposure measure(s) well defined and robust to measurement/misclassification bias? Means of assessment reported?	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
9	Sample size appropriate?	N/A	2	2	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	N/A	2	2
10	Analytic methods described/justified and appropriate?	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
11	Some estimate of variance is reported for the main results?	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
12	Controlled for confounding?	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
13	Results reported in sufficient detail?	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
14	Conclusions supported by the results?	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
	Total sum	19	22	22	20	16	19	19	19	20	20	22	22

	Total possible sum	20	22	22	22	20	20	20	20	22	20	22	22
	Summary Score (total sum / total possible sum)	0.95	1.00	1.00	0.91	0.80	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.91	1.00	1.00	1.00
Criteria	QUESTION	Teng, Pontes, Nie, Griffiths, & Guo (2021)	Turhan Gürbüç et al. (2021)	Vally (2021)	Wang, Mati, & Cai (2021)	Wartberg, Kriston, Zieglmeier, Lincoln, & Kammerl (2019)	Wartberg, Zieglmeier, & Kammerl (2021)	Wölfling, Duven, Wejbera, Beutel, & Müller (2020)	Wong et al. (2020)	Zhu, Zhuang, Lee, Li, & Wong (2021)			
1	Question/objective sufficiently described?	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2			
2	Study design evident and appropriate?	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2			
3	Method of subject/comparison group selection or source of information/input variables described and appropriate?	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	2			
4	Subject (and comparison group, if applicable) characteristics sufficiently described?	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2			

12	Controlled for confounding?	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	2	2
13	Results reported in sufficient detail?	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	2
14	Conclusions supported by the results?	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
	Total sum	22	21	19	20	20	18	20	22	22
	Total possible sum	22	22	20	20	22	22	20	22	22
	Summary Score (total sum / total possible sum)	1.00	0.95	0.95	1.00	0.91	0.82	1.00	1.00	1.00

(d) Kmet analysis for studies included in the social category (YES (2), PARTIAL (1), NO (0), N/A)

[illegible]

6	If interventional and blinding of investigators was possible, was it reported?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
7	If interventional and blinding of subjects was possible, was it reported?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
8	Outcome and (if applicable) exposure measure(s) well defined and robust to measurement/misclassification bias? Means of assessment reported?	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
9	Sample size appropriate?	1	1	N/A	1	1	1	1	N/A	1	1	N/A
10	Analytic methods described/justified and appropriate?	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
11	Some estimate of variance is reported for the main results?	2	2	2	2	0	1	2	2	2	2	2
12	Controlled for confounding?	0	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2
13	Results reported in sufficient detail?	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2
14	Conclusions supported by the results?	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2
	Total sum	19	19	19	19	17	20	20	20	21	21	19

Total possible sum	22	22	20	22	22	22	22	20	22	22	20
Summary Score (total sum / total possible sum)	0.86	0.86	0.95	0.86	0.77	0.91	0.91	1.00	0.95	0.95	0.95

Criteria	QUESTION	Stavropoulos et al. (2020)	Stavropoulos et al. (2021)	Stockdale & Coyne (2020)	Sung, Kim, & Cho (2020)	Throuvala, Janikian, Griffiths, Rennoldson, & Kuss (2019)	Tullett-Prado, Stavropoulos, Mueller, Sharples, & Footitt (2021)	Wang et al. (2014)	Wartberg, Kriston, & Kammerl (2017)
1	Question/objective sufficiently described?	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2
2	Study design evident and appropriate?	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
3	Method of subject/comparison group selection or source of information/input variables described and appropriate?	1	1	2	2	2	1	2	2
4	Subject (and comparison group, if applicable) characteristics sufficiently described?	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2

5	If interventional and random allocation was possible, was it described?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
6	If interventional and blinding of investigators was possible, was it reported?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
7	If interventional and blinding of subjects was possible, was it reported?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
8	Outcome and (if applicable) exposure measure(s) well defined and robust to measurement/misclassification bias? Means of assessment reported?	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
9	Sample size appropriate?	N/A	1	1	1	N/A	0	N/A	N/A
10	Analytic methods described/justified and appropriate?	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
11	Some estimate of variance is reported for the main results?	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
12	Controlled for confounding?	2	2	0	0	0	2	N/A	2

13	Results reported in sufficient detail?	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
14	Conclusions supported by the results?	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
	Total sum	19	20	19	19	17	19	17	20
	Total possible sum	20	22	22	22	20	22	18	20
	Summary Score (total sum / total possible sum)	0.95	0.91	0.86	0.86	0.85	0.86	0.94	1.00

Appendix B. Descriptions for five diagnostic tools

1. Internet Gaming Disorder Scale-Short Form (IGDS9-SF)

IGDS9-SF consists of nine items that assess the severity of IGD symptoms (Pontes & Griffiths, 2015). The scale was developed based on the DSM-5 criteria for IGD (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). All items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (very often). Individual item scores are summed and averaged to create a composite score, with higher scores suggesting greater IGD severity.

2. Seven-Item Game Addiction Scale (GAS-7)

GAS-7 is the short version of the GAS measuring gaming disorder in adolescents (Lemmens, Valkenburg, & Peter, 2009). Seven items are based on seven DSM-IV criteria for pathological gambling including salience, tolerance, mood modification, withdrawal, relapse, conflict, and problems (American Psychiatric Association, 1994). Items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (very often). Four items scoring higher than 2 (sometimes or more) indicates problematic use of video games. In the original paper, the GAS-7 had a Cronbach's alpha of .86 in the first sample and .81 in the second sample (Lemmens et al., 2009).

3. Internet Gaming Disorder Scale (Lemmens IGD-9)

The Internet Gaming Disorder Scale (IGDS) has four versions: a long (27-items) and short (9-items) polytomous scale and a long (27-items) and short (9-items) dichotomous scale. Most of the studies included in this review used the dichotomous 9-item version, which comprises nine items on the presence of IGD symptoms based on the nine criteria from the DSM-5 (Lemmens, Valkenburg, & Gentile, 2015). All items are rated as a binary response

(no = 0, yes = 1) and the total score is calculated by summing up the responses. Participants who respond yes to five or more items are classified as having IGD and higher scores indicate more severe cases of IGD. The dichotomous 9-item IGDS showed good reliability with a Cronbach's alpha of .83.

4. Assessment of Internet and Computer Addiction Scale-Gaming (AICA-Sgaming)

AICA-S is a 14-item self-report assessing IGD based on the DSM-IV criteria for gambling and substance-related disorders (Klaus Wölfling, Beutel, & Müller, 2012). Fourteen items cover clinical classification relevant for internet use behavior (e.g., craving, tolerance, withdrawal, loss of control, and unsuccessful attempts to cut back), negative repercussions of internet use according to six areas (e.g., problems with school, work etc.), and time spent online and preferred online activity. A cutoff score of 7 (3 criteria fulfilled) indicates a moderate addictive use and a score of 13.5 (5 criteria fulfilled) or higher is considered a severe addictive use. This scale had good reliability (internal consistency of $\alpha = .89$) and validity (factorial and construct validity) (Müller & Wölfling, 2010; K. Wölfling, Müller, & Beutel, 2011).

5. Ten-Item Internet Gaming Disorder Test (IGDT-10)

IGDT-10 comprises 10 items that assess IGD based on the DSM-5 criteria of IGD (Király et al., 2017). All items are rated on a 3-point Likert scale (never, sometimes, often) but scoring is dichotomized ("never" / "sometimes" = 0, "often" = 1). The composite score ranges from 0 to 9; items 9 and 10 belong to the same criterion thus only a single score is used. The cut-off threshold, as proposed by DSM-5, is the endorsement of five or more criteria and higher scores indicate more severe cases of IGD. The original paper reported Cronbach's alpha of .68 and a Guttman's Lambda-2 value of .69.

REFERENCES FOR SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

- American Psychiatric Association, A. (1994). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (Vol. 4th ed): Washington, DC: American psychiatric association.
- American Psychiatric Association, A. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders: DSM-5* (Vol. 10): Washington, DC: American psychiatric association.
- Király, O., Slezcka, P., Pontes, H. M., Urbán, R., Griffiths, M. D., & Demetrovics, Z. (2017). Validation of the ten-item Internet Gaming Disorder Test (IGDT-10) and evaluation of the nine DSM-5 Internet Gaming Disorder criteria. *Addictive Behaviors*, 64, 253-260. doi:10.1016/j.addbeh.2015.11.005
- Lemmens, J. S., Valkenburg, P. M., & Gentile, D. A. (2015). The Internet gaming disorder scale. *Psychological assessment*, 27(2), 567. doi:10.1037/pas0000062
- Lemmens, J. S., Valkenburg, P. M., & Peter, J. (2009). Development and validation of a game addiction scale for adolescents. *Media psychology*, 12(1), 77-95. doi:10.1080/15213260802669458
- Müller, K. W., & Wölfling, K. (2010). Pathological computer game and internet use: Scientific insights into phenomenology, epidemiology, diagnosis and comorbidity. *Suchtmedizin in Forschung und Praxis*, 12, 45-55.
- Pontes, H. M., & Griffiths, M. D. (2015). Measuring DSM-5 Internet gaming disorder: Development and validation of a short psychometric scale. *Computers in human behavior*, 45, 137-143. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2014.12.006
- Wölfling, K., Beutel, M., & Müller, K. (2012). Construction of a Standardized Clinical Interview to Assess Internet addiction: First Findings Regarding the Usefulness of AICA-C. *Addiction Research & Therapy*, 6, 1-7. doi:10.4172/2155-6105.S6-003
- Wölfling, K., Müller, K. W., & Beutel, M. (2011). [Reliability and validity of the Scale for the Assessment of Pathological Computer-Gaming (CSV-S)]. *Psychother Psychosom Med Psychol*, 61(5), 216-224. doi:10.1055/s-0030-1263145