

2. Leung P. T. M., Macdonald E. M., Stanbrook M. B., Dhalla I. A., Juurlink D. N. A 1980 letter on the risk of opioid addiction. *N Engl J Med* 2017; **376**: 2194–5.
3. Volkow N. D., Collins F. S. The role of science in addressing the opioid crisis. *N Engl J Med* 2017; **377**: 391–4.
4. Volkow N. D., McLellan A. T. Opioid abuse in chronic pain—misconceptions and mitigation strategies. *N Engl J Med* 2016; **374**: 1253–63.
5. Collins F. S., Koroshetz W. J., Volkow N. D. Helping to end addiction over the long-term: the research plan for the NIH HEAL initiative. *JAMA* 2018; <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2018.8826>.
6. Shapiro A. K., Shapiro E. *The Powerful Placebo: From Ancient Priest to Modern Physician*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press; 2000.
7. Finniss D. G., Kaptchuk T. J., Miller F., Benedetti F. Biological, clinical, and ethical advances of placebo effects. *Lancet* 2010; **375**: 686–95.
8. Kaptchuk T. J., Miller F. G. Placebo effects in medicine. *N Engl J Med* 2015; **373**: 8–9.
9. Beecher H. K. The powerful placebo. *JAMA* 1955; **159**: 1602–6.
10. Forsberg J. T., Martinussen M., Flaten M. A. The placebo analgesic effect in healthy individuals and patients: a meta-analysis. *Psychosom Med* 2017; **79**: 388–94.
11. Pollo A., Benedetti F. Pain the placebo/nocebo effect. In: Moore R. H., editor. *Handbook of Pain and Palliative Care*. New York: Springer; 2012, pp. 331–46.
12. Benedetti F., Mayberg H. S., Wager T. D., Stohler C. S., Zubieta J.-K. Neurobiological mechanisms of the placebo effect. *J Neurosci* 2005; **25**: 10390–402.
13. Park L. C., Covi L. Nonblind placebo trial: an exploration of neurotic patients' responses to placebo when its inert content is disclosed. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 1965; **12**: 336–45.
14. Kaptchuk T. J., Friedlander E., Kelley J. M., Sanchez M. N., Kokkotou E., Singer J. P. *et al.* Placebos without deception: a randomized controlled trial in irritable bowel syndrome. *PLOS ONE* 2010; **5**: e15591.
15. Charlesworth J. E., Petkovic G., Kelley J. M., Hunter M., Onakpoya I., Roberts N. *et al.* Effects of placebos without deception compared with no treatment: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Evid Based Med* 2017; **10**: 97–107.
16. Locher C., Nascimento A. E., Kirsch I., Kossowsky J., Meyer A., Gaab J. Is the rationale more important than deception? A randomized controlled trial of open-label placebo analgesia. *Pain* 2017; **158**: 2320–8.
17. Carvalho C., Caetano J. M., Cunha L., Rebouta P., Kaptchuk T. J., Kirsch I. Open-label placebo treatment in chronic low back pain: a randomized controlled trial. *Pain* 2016; **157**: 2766–72.

COMMENT ON THE GLOBAL GAMING INDUSTRY'S STATEMENT ON ICD-11 GAMING DISORDER: A CORPORATE STRATEGY TO DISREGARD HARM AND DEFLECT SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY?

Following the announcement that gaming disorder (GD) will be included in the World Health Organization's (WHO) International Classification of Diseases (ICD-11) [1], multiple gaming industry organizations (henceforth

'the industry') have issued a statement in opposition to GD [2]. The industry advances several arguments, including the notions that: gaming is predominantly enjoyed 'safely and sensibly'; gaming has various personal benefits; the GD evidence base is 'highly contested and inconclusive'; and GD would create moral panic and 'abuse of diagnosis'. We believe that, regardless of whether GD is embraced by all researchers, arguments highlighting the popularity and benefits of gaming and disputing GD should not enable the industry to ignore the global evidence of gaming-related harms. The industry statement does not recognize clinical and public health needs and evidence identifying the adverse impacts of problematic gaming (e.g. social isolation, displaced sleep, physical inactivity and dietary problems, decreased psychological wellbeing, academic or job interference and interpersonal conflicts) [3,4]. Instead, the industry could reflect upon its strong capabilities to protect vulnerable consumers and its share of responsibility for the reduction of gaming-related harms [5].

Corporate strategy refers broadly to a company's pattern of decisions that determines its goals and plans [6]. The gaming industry's corporate strategy involves the pursuit of economic gain from gaming products and services. This strategy is aided by promoting the view that all gaming, without exception, enhances people's quality of life. The industry's statement demonstrates this by: (1) extolling the value and popularity of gaming in absolute terms, without any comment on the risks or harms associated with excessive gaming involvement; (2) drawing a false equivalence between the benefits of educational software and commercial video games in general and ignoring research evidence that finds certain benefits to be negligible [7]; and (3) selectively referring to academics who appear to support the industry's position while ignoring these same authors' acknowledgement in the quoted article that 'there are some people whose play of video games is related to life problems' [8].

The industry is encouraged to recognize the important epidemiological [9–14], neurobiological [15,16] and clinical [17,18] evidence on problematic gaming. Although there is healthy discussion concerning the conceptualization of problematic gaming as a disorder, gaming-related harm is acknowledged by many who oppose the concept of GD [8], and academic debates should not be misused to support the notion that gaming is always innocuous. The industry should recognize that its business model, despite its many successes, has ethical and social responsibilities. Gaming can enrich people's lives, but it can also have adverse impacts and generate harms among vulnerable individuals and their families. As with any product which attracts a disproportionate volume of usage and revenue from a minority of consumers, the industry is encouraged to adopt an approach that minimizes harm and consistently involves responsible practices [19].

Acknowledging gaming-related harms will promote more ethical game design standards and business practices, as well as other organized and collaborative efforts to respond to the needs of problematic users.

Declaration of interests

D.L.K. is a member of a World Health Organization Advisory Group on Gaming Disorder. He has received no funding for research or other activities from the gaming industry. The author and other contributors alone are responsible for the views expressed in this publication and do not necessarily represent the official position, policies, views or decisions of any other organization.

Acknowledgements

D.L.K. received financial support from a Discovery Early Career Researcher Award (DECRA) DE170101198 funded by the Australian Research Council (ARC).

Keywords Gaming disorder, harm, ICD-11, industry, public health, social responsibility.

DANIEL L. KING  & Gaming Industry
Response Consortium

School of Psychology, The University of Adelaide, Adelaide, Australia

E-mail: daniel.king@adelaide.edu.au

References

- World Health Organization. Gaming disorder (6C51). Available at: <https://icd.who.int/browse11/l-m/en#/http://id.who.int/icd/entity/1448597234> (accessed 18 June 2018) (Archived at <http://www.webcitation.org/71Flsv5yv> on 27 July 2018).
- European Games Developer Foundation. Statement on WHO ICD-11 list and the inclusion of gaming. 2018 15 June. Available at: <http://www.egdf.eu/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/Industry-Statement-on-18-June-WHO-ICD-11.pdf> (Archived at <http://www.webcitation.org/7OU6I0i4S>).
- Rumpf H., Achab S., Billieux J., Carragher N., Demetrovics Z., Bowden-Jones H. *et al.* Including gaming disorder in ICD-11: the need to do so from a clinical and public health perspective. *J Behav Addict* 2018; **https://doi.org/10.1556/2006.7.2018.59**.
- Saunders J. B., Hao W., Long J., King D. L., Mann K., Fauth-Bühler M. *et al.* Gaming disorder: its delineation as an important condition for diagnosis, management, and prevention. *J Behav Addict* 2017; **6**: 271–9.
- Van Rooij A. J., Meerkerk G. J., Schoenmakers T. M., Griffiths M., Van de Mheen D. Video game addiction and social responsibility. *Addict Res Theory* 2010; **18**: 489–93.
- Andrews K. R. The concept of corporate strategy. In: Foss N. J., editor. *Resources, Firms and Strategies*. New York: Oxford; 1971, pp. 52–9.
- Sala G., Tatlidil K. S., Gobet F. Video game training does not enhance cognitive ability: a comprehensive meta-analytic investigation. *Psychol Bull* 2018; **144**: 111–39.
- van Rooij A. J., Ferguson C. J., Colder Carras M., Kardefelt-Winther D., Shi J., Aarseth E. *et al.* A weak scientific basis for gaming disorder: let us err on the side of caution. *J Behav Addict* 2018; **7**: 1–9.
- Rehbein E., Kliem S., Baier D., Mößle T., Petry N. M. Prevalence of internet gaming disorder in German adolescents: diagnostic contribution of the nine DSM-5 criteria in a state-wide representative sample. *Addiction* 2015; **110**: 842–51.
- Przybylski A. K., Weinstein N., Murayama K. Internet gaming disorder: investigating the clinical relevance of a new phenomenon. *Am J Psychiatry* 2016; **174**: 230–6.
- Mihara S., Higuchi S. Cross-sectional and longitudinal epidemiological studies of internet gaming disorder: a systematic review of the literature. *Psychiatry Clin Neurosci* 2017; **71**: 425–44.
- Müller K. W., Janikian M., Dreier M., Wöfling K., Beutel M. E., Tzavara C., *et al.* Regular gaming behavior and internet gaming disorder in European adolescents: results from a cross-national representative survey of prevalence, predictors, and psychopathological correlates. *Eur Child Adolesc Psychiatry* 2015; **24**: 565–74.
- Wartberg L., Kriston L., Zieglermeier M., Lincoln T., Kammerl R. A longitudinal study on psychosocial causes and consequences of internet gaming disorder in adolescence. *Psychol Med* 2018; **1–8**; <https://doi.org/10.1017/S003329171800082X>.
- Gentile D. A., Choo H., Liau A., Sim T., Li D., Fung D., *et al.* Pathological video game use among youths: a two-year longitudinal study. *Pediatrics* 2011; **127**: 319–29.
- Dong G., DeVito E., Huang J., Du X. Diffusion tensor imaging reveals thalamus and posterior cingulate cortex abnormalities in internet gaming addicts. *J Psychiatr Res* 2012; **46**: 1212–6.
- Ko C. H., Hsieh T. J., Wang P. W., Lin W. C., Yen C. F., Chen C. S. *et al.* Altered gray matter density and disrupted functional connectivity of the amygdala in adults with internet gaming disorder. *Prog Neuropsychopharmacol Biol Psychiatry* 2015; **57**: 185–92.
- Sakuma H., Mihara S., Nakayama H., Miura K., Kitayuguchi T., Maezono M. *et al.* Treatment with the self-discovery camp (SDiC) improves internet gaming disorder. *Addict Behav* 2017; **64**: 357–62.
- Müller K. W., Beutel M. E., Egloff B., Wöfling K. 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. *Eur Addict Res* 2014; **20**: 129–36.
- Loh C. M., Deegan C., Inglis R. The changing trends of corporate social and environmental disclosure within the Australian gambling industry. *Account Finance* 2015; **55**: 783–823.

Supporting Information

Additional supporting information may be found online in the Supporting Information section at the end of the article.

Appendix S1 The complete list of contributors in the Gaming Industry Response Consortium.