

Expert Group Online Addictions

Risks and Harms associated with Online Gaming and Gambling

Report

EXPERT GROUP MEMBERS

Alexandra Puhm, Austria
Marko Romic, Bosnia and Herzegovina
Mia Mardešić, Croatia
Roman Petrenko, Czechia
Sotiris Lainas, Greece
Orsolya Király, Hungary
Francesca Valentini, Italy
Belle Gavriel-Fried, Israel
Stian Overå, Norway
Liliana Ignjatova, North Macedonia
Eduarda Ferreira, Portugal
Adam Kurilla, Slovak Republic
Mateja Markl, Slovenia
Jann Schumacher, Chair, Switzerland

CONSULTANTS

Zsolt Demetrovics
Julius Burkauskas

SECRETARIAT

Elena Hedoux
Thomas Kattau

This report was prepared in consultation with the WHO, represented by Vladimir Poznyak. The expert group wishes to acknowledge the contributions by Judith Glynn and Ágnes Zeila.

Please note: the detailed list of references is contained in document P-PG/IT (2024) 3 p.31

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
Key findings	3
1. General Introduction	5
1.1. Aims and scope	5
1.2. Public health approach	6
2. Definition of the problems	6
2.1. Online gambling	6
2.2. Online gaming	7
2.3. Other behaviours related to online gambling and gaming	9
2.3.1. Cyberbullying / toxic behaviour	9
2.3.2. Cybersecurity	9
2.3.3. Social gaming and social casino games	9
2.3.4. Streaming	10
2.3.5. Esports, esports betting and skin gambling	10
2.4. Other online behaviours not discussed in this report	11
2.5. Similarities and differences between gambling and gaming	11
2.6. Convergences between gambling and gaming	11
3. Overview of the problem: online gambling and gaming	12
3.1. Assessment	12
3.2. Epidemiological overview	12
3.3. Demographic issues	12
3.4. Cultural differences	13
3.5. Minority groups	13
3.6. Children and adolescents	14
3.7. Aetiology	15
3.8. Structural characteristics of gambling and gaming	16
4. Risks and harms related to online gambling and gaming	18
4.1. Consequences on physical health	18
4.2. Mental health consequences and co-occurring disorders	19
4.3. Substance use	19
4.4. Interpersonal consequences: Families and social relationships	20
4.5. Society at large	20
4.6. Legal issues	20
5. Current responses on online gambling and gaming	21
5.1. Regulatory approaches and policies	21
5.2. Treatment	23
5.3. Self-help initiatives	25
5.4. Prevention	25
5.5. Harm reduction and harm minimisation in gambling and gaming	26
6. Conclusions	28

Executive Summary

Over the past three decades, technological advancements have revolutionised various aspects of our lives, presenting both advantages and disadvantages. One significant challenge is the addictive use of online technologies and digital devices. This report addresses the excessive and addictive nature of online video games and gambling, now recognised as mental disorders by the World Health Organization. The risks associated with these behaviours extend beyond individual well-being, impacting physical and mental health, relationships, work, education, and finances. Additionally, societal costs are substantial.

Prevalence rates indicate a significant portion of the population is at risk, particularly males, adolescents, and young adults. The development of such problems is influenced by the characteristics of the activity, individual traits, and environmental factors. The intentional design of online activities to be immersive and addictive exacerbates the issue. Moreover, the convergence of gambling and gaming, with features like paid random outcomes, blurs boundaries and targets vulnerable populations, including children and young people.

Regulation is lacking, especially in the video gaming industry, where measures to reduce excessive gaming among minors have shown limited effectiveness. Financial interests often conflict with efforts to address problem behaviours in gambling. Prevention programs, especially those targeting adolescents, are essential and should focus on social support and sustained effects. While prevention, treatment, and harm minimisation measures exist, their effectiveness for online forms and new populations needs further study and implementation. Cooperation with industries is vital for efficient harm reduction, prevention, and intervention. Constant monitoring is necessary to identify emerging challenges and inform timely responses.

Addressing the evolving landscape of online gambling and gaming requires a multifaceted approach involving research, regulation, prevention, treatment, and industry collaboration. Prioritizing efficient measures across all levels is crucial to mitigate harms to individuals and reduce societal costs associated with addictive behaviours in the digital age.

The present report focuses on the excessive and addictive use of online video games and online gambling, which were declared as mental disorders by the World Health Organization in the eleventh revision of the International Classification of Diseases (ICD-11).

Key findings

- Risks and harms associated with online gambling and gaming include negative consequences on physical and mental health, relationships, work and educational performance, and financial difficulties. In addition to the harm caused to individuals, online gambling and gaming problems can be linked to significant economic and societal costs corresponding to a considerable burden of disease in both cases.
- Besides addictive use, the report briefly discusses other challenges related to online gaming and gambling, such as cyberbullying and toxic behaviour within the online environments, cybersecurity issues, problems related to streaming and esports, and the convergence of gambling and gaming.
- Prevalence estimates for problem online gambling risk range from 2.7% to 6.5% in the adult population and are about 1% among adolescents despite age restrictions. Male gender and younger age are factors consistently associated with online gambling problems.
- Prevalence estimates for problem online gaming risk range from 1.96% to 2.4% and are higher for males, adolescents, young adults, and players from Asia.
- The development of online gambling and gaming problems usually results from the interplay of three interrelated factors: (i) the characteristics of the online activity, (ii) the individual's psychological and biological characteristics, and (iii) the environment's characteristics (e.g., family and peer-related factors, cultural context).
- Structural characteristics and game mechanics of both online gambling and online video gaming are carefully and intentionally crafted in ways that make the activities as immersive and addictive as possible. To ensure this, online gambling and gaming providers use persuasive design elements or so-called 'dark-patterns' to manipulate gamers in ways which serve their own commercial interests and are likely to cause direct or indirect consumer detriment in various ways.
- One of the most striking phenomena is the convergence between gambling and gaming, namely that gambling activities increasingly incorporate video gaming features (the 'gamification of gambling'), and

video games are more and more frequently integrating gambling elements in their gameplay (the 'gambification of gaming') such as paid random outcomes and rewards.

- The integration of gambling elements in online video games is especially problematic as minors are heavily targeted, and regulations to protect them are completely lacking at the moment.
- The video gaming industry is largely unregulated. The few policy measures that exist are most frequent in Asian countries and mainly aim to reduce the time spent on online games among minors. Research on the efficacy of such measures is rare; however, existing research shows that such measures are ineffective.
- Another group of regulations target "loot boxes" (i.e., in-game consumable virtual items that can be purchased with real money or obtained in-game as rewards and comprise a random selection of further virtual items with a low probability of desired ones). Such measures range from content labels to disclosing loot box drop rates to banning them entirely in specific countries or among minors. Research on the efficacy of such measures is again rare, with the few existing ones indicating failure or inefficiency regarding their implementation or objective.
- In gambling (both land-based and online), financial interests are in constant tension with efforts to address problem gambling and broader community harm, and social responsibility efforts are imposed or volunteered predominantly to legitimise the progression to more revenue and profit.
- Regulation of online environments has always been challenging. In this global market, several countries and dependent territories established themselves as attractive hosts for online gambling companies through a combination of lower tax rates, lower licensing and registration fees, less prescriptive regulatory frameworks, and access to European or other markets.
- Given the vast amount of data collected in online gambling regarding individual play behaviour, online gambling holds the possibility to identify risk profiles before harm occurs. However, there is no evidence demonstrating that collecting and analysing such data has led to meaningful interactions with players and reduction in risk or harm.
- There is a lack of research to guide public policy and regulatory approaches to gambling, including research that assesses the impact on the public good of various regulatory frameworks or evidence regarding the effectiveness of specific compliance requirements.
- The treatment modality with the strongest evidence of its effectiveness for both online gambling and gaming problems is cognitive behavioural therapy (CBT). CBT is effective in reducing problem severity in the short term; however, its lasting effect on individuals after treatment is unclear.
- Given the high vulnerability of the adolescent population to both problem behaviours, the most widespread prevention programs are those targeting this age group and being carried out in schools. To be successful, such school-based prevention programs should be psychoeducational, comprehensive, and theory-based, with a focus on social support and sustained long-term effects.
- Several prevention, treatment, and harm minimisation measures exist for problem gambling; however, their effectiveness for online forms and new populations (e.g., minors, women) is not sufficiently studied, or they are often not effectively implemented. Similar measures for problem online gaming are much less available, and efficacy studies are rare and often lack methodological rigour.
- Interventions of all kinds need to be based on the research results and prepared and executed with the involvement of all potential stakeholders. The most important stakeholders are user groups, the families and friends of the players, prevention specialists and educators, health care professionals, policymakers, national governmental bodies, international organisations, legislators, and the gaming and gambling industry.
- There is a great need for more research with better quality, especially to identify efficient measures on all levels, including prevention, treatment, and policy.
- Due to rapid technological advancement, online gambling and gaming are continuously changing, posing constant novel challenges to individuals, families, and society. To address this permanent change and deal with possible negative consequences, monitoring systems should be established to detect new products, monetisation models, marketing strategies, and structural characteristics that may contribute to an increased potential for addiction at an early stage.

- It is of utmost importance to achieve cooperation with both industries to provide efficient harm reduction, prevention and intervention and decrease economic and societal costs deriving from online gambling and gaming harm.
- Prevention, intervention, and regulatory/policy approaches and measures cannot be 'one size fits all'. Rather, they should be as specific and tailored to individual needs as possible, while the international harmonisation of such a global problem also calls attention.

1. General Introduction

1.1. Aims and scope

Technological advancements have substantially changed our lives in the past three decades. First, the spreading of personal computers (PC), then the increasing availability of the internet in our homes, and then the rapid advancement of mobile technology has enormously changed how we live and communicate and qualitatively changed a lot of activities. For instance, while thirty years ago we used the post to communicate regularly with people living far from us, we spent a lot of time in different institutions to administer our overhead expenses or banking, we used television and radio ads to promote local events, we used (paper) maps to navigate while travelling, we did our shopping in person and left our homes to learn or work, today if we wish, we can do all of these from our homes using our PCs, laptops or even smartphones. Changes have happened both on the level of software and hardware. We now use social media to connect with others, for entertainment, to get information, to find out the news, or just to pass the time. And with the extremely high rate of smartphone ownership, we hold everything in our pockets. This change is absolutely dramatic. We are available 24/7, and most of humanity's knowledge is readily available to us whenever we want to access it.

Unsurprisingly, this incredible and fast-paced change has both its advantages and challenges. Most of the advantages lie in the ease and comfortability of communication, administration, entertainment, and work, while the most significant challenges include excessive and addictive use of online technologies and digital devices, data safety and privacy issues, and recently, the use of artificial intelligence. The present report *focuses on excessive and addictive use and related challenges*, which were first noted regarding electronic and video games in the 80s, as well as internet use during the 90s and became the topic of massive research since then regarding a list of online activities such as online gaming and gambling, social media use, online shopping, online pornography consumption, and others.

The intense research on behavioural addictions, including the excessive and addictive use of specific online activities led to the creation of the Substance-Related and Addictive Disorders category in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition (DSM-5) by the American Psychiatric Association in 2013 comprising Gambling Disorder besides the substance-related addictive disorders. In addition, Internet Gaming Disorder was included in the Emerging Measures and Models section, warranting further research (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). The other major diagnostic manual, the eleventh revision of the International Classification of Diseases (ICD-11) by the World Health Organization, took a step even further in 2019 by creating the 'Disorders due to addictive behaviours category' in which both Gambling Disorder and Gaming Disorder (aka, video game playing addiction) was included as official mental health diagnoses. Both conditions have two separate types: 'predominantly online' and 'predominantly offline' (World Health Organization, 2019). Consequently, from the potential online addictions, online gambling disorder and online gaming disorder are now considered mental disorders. The present report focuses on these two disorders because of their acknowledgment as mental disorders. However, considering that their addictive feature is only one of the problematic issues of these phenomena, the report also briefly discusses other problems related to online gambling and video gaming. These related problems include excessive use with negative consequences (even if not meeting the diagnostic criteria for disorder or hazardous use), cyberbullying and toxic behaviour within the online environments, cybersecurity issues, problems related to streaming and esports, and the convergence of gambling and gaming.

The current report does not discuss the initiatives aiming to improve health using online applications either. The spreading of the internet opened the way for several online activities and initiatives revolutionizing specific fields. For instance, telemedicine or eHealth refers to the distribution of health-related services and information over the internet. It allows remote patient and clinician contact, care, advice, intervention, monitoring, and remote admissions. Another example is gamification, the strategic attempt to enhance systems, services, organizations, and activities by creating similar experiences to those experienced when playing video games to motivate and engage users. The present report, although it acknowledges all these and similar online

activities and initiatives, does not discuss them, as it solely focuses on gambling and gaming disorder and related aspects.

1.2. Public health approach

The public health approach is a fundamental perspective applied throughout this report. It covers a broad range of approaches. The traditional approach deals with disease control, reducing risks and preventing injuries, whereas the newer approach aims to promote health and well-being, create supportive environments, and focus on education and empowerment (Sallnow et al., 2016). By integrating these two approaches, today's public health policies target specific problems in different populations, identify at-risk groups, and provide guidance for prevention to government and community agencies in the public and private sectors to promote health. The main principles guiding public health models are as follows:

1. They take a population-based approach that aims to improve the health of entire communities and populations rather than only individuals (Childless et al., 2002). They examine how the environment affects individual behaviour (Korn & Shaffer, 1999) and how society can promote people's health. They also explore why different groups in the population manifest different health outcomes (Browne et al., 2016).
2. They endorse holistic, multidimensional, and interdisciplinary perspectives by identifying multiple risk factors across the bio-psycho-social, cultural and financial domains and the interaction between them and by suggesting solutions and developing effective interventions (Childress et al., 2002).
3. They emphasise the need for a comprehensive and interdisciplinary approach and call for collaboration across various sectors and disciplines, stakeholders, government agencies, industries and healthcare providers (Donkin et al., 2017).
4. They lean on evidence-based data and rely on scientific evidence stemming from population-based observations. This evidence is used to inform policies, decision-making, and interventions (Wardle et al., 2019).
5. Many disorders and behaviours can be differentiated based on a continuum of severity (Delfabbro & Kink, 2020; van Schalkwyk et al., 2021), so that there is a different intervention strategy for each level.
6. One important aspect of the public health approach is the continuum of care, i.e., prevention, intervention, treatment, harm reduction and recovery (Korn & Shaffer, 1999). However, prevention and harm reduction are the key components (Shaffer et al., 2020). The rationale is that it is more efficient to treat a large number of minor problems before they further develop than to treat major problems, and that a small improvement in health across a large number of people reduces the total burden of disease as well as economic and social costs.
7. Find the optimal cost-benefit trade-off to maintain public health (Shaffer et al., 2020).

Both gaming and gambling behaviours have been recognised as public health concerns (Abbott, 2020; Long et al., 2022; Shaffer & Korn, 2002). This report will thus use the public health lens to provide a better understanding of their online manifestations.

2. Definition of the problems

2.1. Online gambling

Gambling is the betting or staking of something of value, with consciousness of risk and hope of gain, on the outcome of a game, a contest, or an uncertain event whose result may be determined by chance or accident or have an unexpected result by reason of the bettor's miscalculation. Online gambling is any kind of gambling conducted on the internet. It is also often labelled as remote, internet or interactive gambling.

The definition of gambling disorder according to the DSM-5 can be seen in Table 1. This definition can be applied to the online, land-based, and mixed forms of the disorder.

According to the ICD-11, "gambling disorder, predominantly online is characterised by a pattern of persistent or recurrent gambling behaviour that is primarily conducted over the internet and is manifested by:

1. impaired control over gambling (e.g., onset, frequency, intensity, duration, termination, context);
2. increasing priority given to gambling to the extent that gambling takes precedence over other life interests and daily activities; and
3. continuation or escalation of gambling despite the occurrence of negative consequences. The behaviour pattern is of sufficient severity to result in significant impairment in personal, family, social, educational, occupational or other important areas of functioning.

The pattern of gambling behaviour may be continuous or episodic and recurrent. The gambling behaviour and other features are normally evident over a period of at least 12 months in order for a diagnosis to be assigned, although the required duration may be shortened if all diagnostic requirements are met and symptoms are severe.” (World Health Organization, 2019)

Besides *gambling disorder*, ICD-11 also specifies another category for less severe cases, which still pose considerable harms for the individuals. “*Hazardous* gambling and betting refer to a pattern of gambling or betting that appreciably increases the risk of harmful physical or mental health consequences to the individual or to others around the individual. The increased risk may be from the frequency of gambling or betting, the amount of time spent on these activities, the context of gambling or betting, the neglect of other activities and priorities, risky behaviours associated with gambling or betting or its context, the adverse consequences of gambling or betting, or from the combination of these factors. The pattern of gambling or betting often persists in spite of awareness of increased risk of harm to the individual or to others. This category may be used when the pattern of gambling or betting warrants attention and advice from health professionals but does not meet the diagnostic requirements for Gambling Disorder” (World Health Organization, 2019).

2.2. Online gaming

Gaming refers to playing video games that are played on digital devices (e.g., personal computers, gaming consoles, smartphones, virtual reality devices). Online gaming refers to any kind of video gaming conducted on the internet. The definition of *internet gaming disorder* according to the DSM-5 can be seen in Table 1. Internet gaming disorder most often involves specific internet or online games, but it could involve non-internet computerized games (offline games) as well.

According to the ICD-11, the definition of gaming disorder predominantly online resembles completely the definition of gambling disorder predominantly online, only the term ‘gambling’ is exchanged with ‘gaming’ referring to digital gaming or video gaming. Similarly, to the case of gambling, the ICD-11 specifies another category for less severe cases of problematic gaming, namely *hazardous gaming*. The definition of hazardous gaming resembles almost entirely the one for hazardous gambling, again by replacing two term ‘gambling’ with ‘gaming’.

Table 1. *Definitions of gambling disorder and internet gaming disorder according to the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition (DSM-5) by the American Psychiatric Association*

	Gambling disorder	Internet Gaming Disorder (a condition warranting further research, not an official diagnosis)
General description	Persistent and recurrent problematic gambling behaviour leading to clinically significant impairment or distress, as indicated by the individual exhibiting four (or more) of the following in a 12-month period:	Persistent and recurrent use of the Internet to engage in games, often with other players, leading to clinically significant impairment or distress as indicated by five (or more) of the following in a 12-month period:
Criterion 1	Needs to gamble with increasing amounts of money in order to achieve the desired excitement.	Preoccupation with Internet games. (The individual thinks about previous gaming activity or anticipates playing the next game; Internet gaming becomes the dominant activity in daily life).

Criterion 2	Is restless or irritable when attempting to cut down or stop gambling.	Withdrawal symptoms when Internet gaming is taken away. (These symptoms are typically described as irritability, anxiety, or sadness, but there are no physical signs of pharmacological withdrawal.)
Criterion 3	Has made repeated unsuccessful efforts to control, cut back, or stop gambling.	Tolerance—the need to spend increasing amounts of time engaged in Internet games.
Criterion 4	Is often preoccupied with gambling (e.g., having persistent thoughts of reliving past gambling experiences, handicapping or planning the next venture, thinking of ways to get money with which to gamble).	Unsuccessful attempts to control the participation in Internet games.
Criterion 5	Often gambles when feeling distressed (e.g., helpless, guilty, anxious, depressed).	Loss of interests in previous hobbies and entertainment as a result of, and with the exception of, Internet games.
Criterion 6	After losing money gambling, often returns another day to get even (“chasing” one’s losses).	Continued excessive use of Internet games despite knowledge of psychosocial problems.
Criterion 7	Lies to conceal the extent of involvement with gambling.	Has deceived family members, therapists, or others regarding the amount of Internet gaming.
Criterion 8	Has jeopardized or lost a significant relationship, job, or educational or career opportunity because of gambling.	Use of Internet games to escape or relieve a negative mood (e.g., feelings of helplessness, guilt, anxiety).
Criterion 9	Relies on others to provide money to relieve desperate financial situations caused by gambling.	Has jeopardized or lost a significant relationship, job, or educational or career opportunity because of participation in Internet games.
Note	The gambling behaviour is not better explained by a manic episode.	Only non-gambling Internet games are included in this disorder. Use of the Internet for required activities in a business or profession is not included; nor is the disorder intended to include other recreational or social Internet use. Similarly, sexual Internet sites are excluded.
Specify current severity	<i>Mild:</i> 4-5 criteria met. <i>Moderate:</i> 6-7 criteria met. <i>Severe:</i> 8-9 criteria met.	Internet gaming disorder can be mild, moderate, or severe depending on the degree of disruption of normal activities. Individuals with less severe Internet gaming disorder may exhibit fewer symptoms and less disruption of their lives. Those with severe Internet gaming disorder will have more hours spent on the computer and more severe loss of relationships or career or school opportunities.
Specify if:	<i>Episodic:</i> Meeting diagnostic criteria at more than one time point, with symptoms subsiding between periods of gambling disorder for at least several months. <i>Persistent:</i> Experiencing continuous symptoms, to meet diagnostic criteria for multiple years.	
Specify if:	<i>In early remission:</i> After full criteria for gambling disorder were previously met, none of the criteria for gambling disorder have been met for at least 3 months but for less than 12 months.	

	<p><i>In sustained remission:</i> After full criteria for gambling disorder were previously met, none of the criteria for gambling disorder have been met during a period of 12 months or longer.</p>	
--	---	--

2.3. Other behaviours related to online gambling and gaming

There are several other potentially problematic online behaviours which are related to gambling and gaming. These behaviours are not necessarily problematic because of their addictive nature but due to other aspects. In this section, we briefly present these behaviours, considering that these are closely related to gaming and gambling. Other problematic online behaviours that are not related to gambling or gaming, however, not discussed in this report.

2.3.1. Cyberbullying / toxic behaviour

The proliferation of hostile communication and disruptive behaviours in online gaming has recently received scientific attention. Indeed, toxic behaviours, defined as emotions or actions targeted at individuals or teams which deteriorate team collaboration and enjoyment of social gaming experience, has become an emerging field of cyberbullying research (Kou, 2020). Novel forms of peer aggression in multiplayer gaming can include the usage of offensive language, cheating, spamming, sabotaging teammates' actions, or aiming the enemy team (Blackburn & Kwak, 2014; Kowert, 2020). Further forms of toxicity involve grieving (i.e., intentionally irritating other gamers by destroying buildings created by teammates or stealing others' possessions), sexist or racist comments, and doxing (i.e., sharing private information about a player publicly; Kowert, 2020). Toxic behaviours are frequently reported (Zsila et al., 2022), suggesting that aggression in online gaming environments has become a common experience among gamers in multiplayer settings (Monge & O'Brien, 2022). According to recent studies, such incidents of aggression generate frustration and anger in gamers (Kordyaka, 2018), while some individuals may experience severe psychological distress as a result of toxic interactions (TaeHyuk Keum & Hearn, 2022). Similar to victims of cyberbullying, gamers with repeated experiences of toxic behaviours from others report more symptoms of depression and gaming disorder, while gamers involved in toxic interactions from both sides show higher anxiety levels and anger ruminative tendencies (Zsila et al., 2022). Female, younger and beginner players are at a higher risk of becoming targets of toxic behaviours (Lemerrier-Dugarin et al., 2021; Türkay et al., 2020). Moreover, members of ethnic or sexual minority groups are also more likely to become involved in toxic interactions (TaeHyuk Keum & Hearn, 2022). Playing multiplayer online battle arena (MOBA) and first-person shooter (FPS) games has been associated with an elevated risk of engagement in toxic behaviours (Engelhardt & Bartholow, 2013; Zsila et al., 2022), suggesting that increasing prosocial behaviours in gamer communities would be needed to improve safety in competitive online gaming environments.

2.3.2. Cybersecurity

While cybersecurity initially referred to computer hacking (Choi & Lee, 2017), it today encompasses a wide range of harmful internet-related activities and crimes. This includes different forms of harassment, such as cyberbullying (i.e., the use of technology to harass, threaten, embarrass, or target another person), sexting (i.e., sending, receiving, or forwarding sexually explicit messages, photographs, or videos via digital devices), and defamation (i.e., the action of damaging the good reputation of someone) (Choi et al., 2019; Ngo & Patemoster, 2011), which can also occur in multiplayer gaming environments (Kowert, 2020). Studies suggest that spending more time on social networking sites and using multiple platforms generally increases the risk of victimisation in online harassment (Craig et al., 2020; Nasi et al., 2017). This also includes the risk of being enticed into illegal activities such as drug dealing in online games. In terms of frequency and intensity, those engaging in excessive online activity are significantly more vulnerable to such crime risks and related harms. These risks are further aggravated by the cyber-routine activities' theory, which suggests that both weaker digital security and online lifestyles can explain cybercrime victimisation (Choi, 2008).

2.3.3. Social gaming and social casino games

'Social gaming' refers to games that are connected to social media sites or through smartphone applications ('apps'). 'Social casino games' are a subtype of social gaming referring to games which simulate gambling activities (e.g., poker, slots, roulette, bingo, keno, betting). The difference between social casino games and

gambling is that they do not require payment to play and do not provide a direct pay-out or monetary prizes. In case of wins, players are awarded virtual currency and move up on leader boards, which can be shared with others for acknowledgement of their success. Users interact directly through gameplay, communicating and sharing outcomes. In contrast with gambling activities, social casino games are not always based on random outcomes and chance but employ algorithms designed to increase user enjoyment and engagement (Sapsted, 2013). Users usually get a small amount of virtual currency at the beginning, and they can purchase additional currency to enable further gameplay or an enhanced game experience (e.g., access to additional game features). However, users are not able to exchange the virtual currency for monetary equivalents (Gainsbury et al., 2017).

Social casino games could be a gateway to gambling activities or otherwise normalise the experience of gambling for young people, including children and adolescents, because they do not employ strict age verification methods and are thus easily accessed by minors. Relatedly, the early onset of gambling and the normalisation of the experience may contribute to the development of problem gambling (King et al., 2016).

2.3.4. Streaming

The live streaming of video games is an activity where people broadcast themselves playing games to a live audience online. The practice became popular in the mid-2010s on the US-based site Twitch.tv, before growing to YouTube, Facebook, and other services. According to NewZoo, a trusted source for video games and esports analytics and market research, games live-streaming audience will cross the billion mark by 2023. Professional streamers often combine high-level play and entertaining commentary and earn income from sponsors, subscriptions, ad revenue, and donations.

The main concern regarding online video streaming services is also excessive and problematic use, which may cause significant harm to individuals (Chen & Chang, 2019). Furthermore, it is important to note that this activity is highly popular among children and adolescents who may consider some of the streamers their role models and thus be influenced by them. Concerns have also arisen because gambling-related videos and promotions on major streaming platforms draw more and more viewers, leading to the possible risk of age-inappropriate content access as effective age restrictions are missing from these sites (Koncz et al., 2023).

2.3.5. Esports, esports betting and skin gambling

Esports (i.e., electronic sports) refers to competitive or professional video gaming where teams or individuals compete against each other in a video game. As with other sports, esports now have organised and sanctioned competitions, such as esports tournaments. The events are hosted by sponsors, have live sports commentary, have a large following audience (particularly via streaming platforms like Twitch.tv and YouTube), and offer big money prizes for the winners. Due to the widespread popularity of competitive video gaming, esports are under consideration for becoming a legitimate sporting activity (Bányai et al., 2019).

One concern regarding esports is whether it will result in a higher prevalence of problematic gaming (Chung et al., 2019). Research findings are mixed in this regard so far. Participation in esports, especially on high levels, is a structured and goal-oriented activity, requiring continuously intense and focused training, which improbably leads to symptoms of gaming disorder. Nevertheless, the huge time investment in esports may need so many sacrifices (neglect of other activities, hobbies, and duties) that it can still be harmful to the individual, even without developing gaming disorder (Czakó et al., 2023).

Another concern relates to esports gambling, and especially 'skin gambling'. While esports gambling resembles traditional sports betting (the target of the bets are esports matches or related aspects) and is similarly regulated, 'skin gambling' is largely unregulated and, therefore, raises severe concerns. Skins are virtual items players can collect inside a video game to decorate characters, weapons, etc. The attraction and value of skins lie in their rarity: the rarer the skin, the harder it is to obtain it. Thus, rare skins provide a high/distinct status within the gamer community. Skins from some games (e.g., Counter-Strike: Global Offensive [CSGO], Dota2, Battlegrounds [PUBG]) can be traded for real-life money, and some skins are exchanged for thousands of dollars, creating a skin marketplace worth billions. In addition, skins can be transferred to third-party websites for skin gambling, which means people bet using 'skins', usually on the outcomes of eSports matches. The main concern with these newer forms of gambling is that they blur the lines between gambling and gaming, potentially placing underage consumers at risk of harm (Gambling Commission, 2017).

2.4. Other online behaviours not discussed in this report

The ICD-11 comprises a category called “other specified disorders due to addictive behaviours”, coded as 6C5Y, besides gambling disorder (6C50) and gaming disorder (6C51). This category reflects the idea that other specific poorly controlled and problematic behaviours may also be considered disorders due to addictive behaviours. The most researched potential candidates include problematic pornography use, problematic social media use, problematic online shopping/buying, problematic smartphone use and cyberchondria (extreme, unwarranted anxiety by using the internet to search for medical information) (Brand et al., 2021). However, to date, scientific evidence regarding these problematic behaviours is not convincing enough to result in the establishment of additional diagnoses. Consequently, the present report excludes these topics and focuses on problematic behaviours (i.e., gambling and gaming) and their related aspects, which are supported by solid scientific evidence reflected by their inclusion in the ICD-11 as mental illnesses.

2.5. Similarities and differences between gambling and gaming

The main difference between gaming and gambling is that for video gaming, the outcome is achieved by skill, whereas for gambling, it is achieved by chance. In some cases, gambling may also involve skills such as sports betting, but chance is a substantial component of the outcome. While gambling activities are heavily regulated and closely scrutinised in most jurisdictions, games have minimal regulatory requirements and few impediments to implementing new mechanics. Relatedly, another crucial difference is that, in general, gambling (including online gambling) is illegal for children and adolescents, while video games are legal for minors as well.

An important similarity is the behavioural conditioning aspect of both activities, namely the use of intermittent variable ratio reinforcement schedules (e.g., when rewards are provided following an unpredictable schedule) to keep players involved. Other similarities include the use of persuasive design elements in both gaming and gambling services (e.g., near misses, artificially created last-minute deals, and flexible pricing of virtual goods). These are based on numerous psychological ploys that most users may be unaware of and/or unable to understand and sometimes are even optimised with collecting, tracking and analysing in-game user behaviour (e.g., which marketing strategies are most effective in driving sales). This gives providers an informational advantage which is exploited at the expense of users. Consequently, these design aspects are arguably predatory in both activities.

2.6. Convergences between gambling and gaming

The distinction between gambling and video gaming is increasingly blurring as technology advances. Gambling activities are increasingly incorporating gaming features that focus on skill, social interaction, progress, achievement, and competition. Conversely, games have integrated gambling elements, including randomly determined outcomes and rewards, including those that require payment, and increased monetization of in-game items through legitimate and illegitimate marketplaces (Gainsbury, 2019).

Two of the most prominent examples of this convergence are social casino games (games which simulate gambling activities and are played with virtual currency rather than real-life money) and loot boxes. Loot boxes are in-game consumable virtual items that can be purchased with real money or obtained in-game as rewards and comprise a random selection of further virtual items with a low probability of desired ones. Although officially, these virtual items hold no real-world monetary value, desired items provide players with competitive advantages or are highly praised within the gaming community because of their rare status, thereby increasing the social status of their owner. Gambling mechanisms within video games, such as loot boxes, have generated heated debate because these features evade regulations and, according to certain scholars, permit and promote underage gambling (Király et al., 2022). It is assumed that gambling elements within video games can normalize gambling, creating favourable attitudes and encouraging migration to gambling. Relatedly, according to a recent meta-analysis, loot box spending is consistently weakly to moderately associated with both excessive gaming and problem gambling, two potentially clinically relevant associations (Garea et al., 2021). Moreover, research suggests that individuals who purchase loot boxes in video games appear to have a considerably higher risk of psychological distress compared to non-purchasers, regardless of gender, age, other video game-related spending, or problem gambling symptoms (Drummond et al., 2022).

3. Overview of the problem: online gambling and gaming

3.1. Assessment

Instruments that are currently most recommended for measuring gambling disorder symptoms include the Massachusetts Gambling Screen (MAGS-DSM-IV subscale) (Weinstock et al., 2007), the Problem Gambling Severity Index (Dellis et al., 2014), and the South Oaks Gambling Screen (Goodie et al., 2013). Of these tests, the South Oaks Gambling Screen, originally using DSM-III gambling disorder criteria, has been utilised most frequently in clinical and scientific contexts. The 20-item South Oaks Gambling Screen has a short 5-item version too (Room et al., 1999). Short screens are most useful when approaching individuals with concurrent mental conditions.

As a gambling-vulnerable group, adolescents might require specific questioning targeting their developmental stage. For this reason, several questionnaires have also been developed and are available to use. The most recommended include the Canadian Adolescent Gambling Inventory (Tremblay et al., 2010), and the Gambling Addictive Behavior Scale for Adolescents (Park & Jung, 2012). The South Oaks Gambling Screen has also been used and revised specifically for the adolescent population (Winters et al., 1993) and has been the most widely used measure in this particular population.

Based on the most recent systematic review (King et al., 2020) the most psychometrically sound instruments measuring gaming disorder symptoms include the Assessment of Internet and Computer Addiction Scale – Gaming (Wölfling et al., 2012), the 7-item Game Addiction Scale for Adolescents, the Internet Gaming Disorder Scale-9 Short Form (Pontes & Griffiths, 2015), the Ten-item Internet Gaming Disorder Test (Király et al., 2017) and the 9-items Internet Gaming Disorder Scale (Lemmens et al., 2015). The authors of this systematic review also concluded that the use of a universally recognised instrument on a global level would be of immense value in furthering the area of gaming disorder research.

3.2. Epidemiological overview

Given the large variety of assessment instruments, the prevalence estimates of problem online gambling differ considerably. In the most recent systematic review of studies analysing the prevalence of problem online gambling, which collected data between 2006 and 2019, its prevalence estimates ranged from 2.7% to 6.5% in the general population, and at its highest reached 29.8% in underprivileged and often uninsured populations (Mora-Salgueiro et al., 2021). A systematic review of studies published between 2000 and 2020 comprising adolescent populations shows that between 0.89% and 1% of adolescents exhibited problem online gambling.

Similarly to gambling disorder, it was consistently shown that the occurrence of gaming disorder is higher among those who engage in online gaming as compared to those who participate in offline gaming. According to two recent meta-analyses (Kim et al., 2022; Stevens et al., 2021), the worldwide prevalence estimate of gaming disorder was found to range between 3.05% to 3.3%. When evaluating only studies with representative samples, the prevalence estimates ranged from 1.96% to 2.4%. The prevalence estimates for males exhibited greater values compared to females, with Asia displaying higher estimates than Europe. In a similar vein, a further meta-analysis conducted on prevalence estimates of gaming disorder in Southeast Asia (Chia et al., 2020) yielded an estimated prevalence of 10.1%. One of the most vulnerable groups remains children and adolescents as, according to a systematic review, the mean prevalence estimate of gaming disorder was 5.5% when clinical samples were included, while the estimate in nationally representative samples was, on average, around 2% (Paulus et al., 2018). Nevertheless, it is important to highlight that in the case of uncommon conditions like gaming disorder prevalence estimates are overestimated when assessed using screening instruments (Maráz et al., 2015; Király et al., 2022).

3.3. Demographic issues

Several socio-demographical factors have been found to be associated with problematic online gambling. These factors include not only male gender, younger age, but also belonging to a culturally varied background. Residing with non-biological parents, perceiving a higher financial status within the family, displaying greater involvement in gambling activities, and exhibiting a preference for online gambling mediums have also been reported as factors contributing to the increased likelihood of developing problematic online gambling behaviour. Indeed, the prevalence of problem gambling among young individuals is significantly elevated among those who engage in online gambling, with rates being five times higher compared to other forms of gambling.

It has also been observed that men tend to display symptoms of gaming disorder at a higher frequency than women throughout various age cohorts. There is evidence that suggests that the prevalence rates of gaming disorder seem to be greater among younger individuals, particularly teenagers (Stevens et al., 2021). Lower prevalence rates of gaming disorder symptoms have been indicated among individuals with higher levels of education, income and employment in general. However, the socio-demographic data regarding gaming disorder is rather inconsistent, suggesting the need for more research, while acknowledging the potential influence of cultural variations (Király et al., 2023).

3.4. Cultural differences

According to a systematic review analysing data from studies published between 2000 and 2015 the prevalence rates of problem gambling varied between 2% and 5% in North America. In Asia, the corresponding rates ranged from 0.5% to 5.8%, while in Europe, the prevalence rates of problem gambling fell within the range of 0.1% to 3.4% (Calado & Griffiths, 2016). It is important to acknowledge that the predominant types of gambling seen in the aforementioned research conducted in various countries were lotteries, scratch cards, sports betting, and gambling machines. Conversely, online gambling games were one of the predominant activities engaged in by individuals experiencing problematic gambling (Calado & Griffiths, 2016). The sociocultural context of this behaviour is broad and various explanations for behavioural differences exist, including traditions of the past, gambling offerings, and cultural/national regulation of gambling practices.

The available research indicates that gaming disorder is a matter of worldwide significance and that research on gaming disorder has been undertaken globally. The most recent meta-analysis (Stevens et al., 2021) revealed a higher pooled prevalence estimate of 5.08% for gaming disorder in Asian nations in comparison to a 2.72% estimate of gaming disorder in Europe. Cultural variations seem to play a role in the prevalence of gaming disorder, however they do not significantly impact the gender ratio across nations with gaming disorder being more prevalent among men. Correlation between gaming disorder and psychological difficulties was also observed consistently across the various countries, indicating the presence of a universal association (Cheng et al., 2018). Similarly, relationships between gaming disorder and many factors including psychiatric symptoms, gaming motives, and gaming duration, have been confirmed cross-culturally (Király, 2018; Király et al., 2018).

3.5. Minority groups

Belonging to an ethnic or racial minority group is considered a risk factor of gambling disorder. This evidence was mainly supported by the fact that gambling disorder had a higher prevalence among those groups. However, it was also suggested that it is not the racial or ethnic minority status itself but the underlying possible risk factors such as cultural history, immigration stress and post-immigration adjustment, discrimination, and the acculturation experienced by the minority groups that may lead to higher risk of problematic gambling behaviour (Okuda et al., 2016).

Certain characteristics may be elevated among the individuals belonging to the LGBTQ+ communities that contribute to the emergence of addictive behaviours (Stanmyre et al., 2023). These characteristics include social isolation and a higher susceptibility to various mental disorders. However, as belonging to a minority group is not necessarily directly related to increased levels of gambling behaviour, but perhaps mediated by the aforementioned factors of isolation, etc., the results are inconclusive (Devault-Tousignant et al., 2023). Further research is needed to examine the specific elements that directly contribute to and mediate the vulnerability of minority groups to gambling. Individuals with mental disorders as well as individuals with disabilities are also considered to be disproportionately harmed by gambling (Gáspár-Szilágyi & Pearson, 2022).

As with gambling, belonging to an ethnic and racial minority group is considered a risk factor for excessive online gaming in both young adults and children (Carson et al., 2012; TaeHyuk Keum & Hearn, 2022). However, it is important to note that further research is required to draw definitive conclusions. The current body of evidence on the significance of ethnicity is limited, indicating that this issue is not well investigated. Furthermore, the existing studies that do provide data on this subject present conflicting results. While the role of race and ethnicity in the development of gaming disorder may have some significance, doing research on this topic is challenging owing to the varying interpretations across various cultures and the substantial societal influence it carries. However, as in gambling, this possible association might not only be mediated via cultural history, immigration stress etc., but also through direct experiences of racism, as this might be an embedded element in certain games. The same reasoning applies for the LGBTQ+ communities, where cyberbullying is one of the reported problems associated with online gaming.

3.6. Children and adolescents

The accessibility of online gambling activities has significantly widened in the last decade, making it an appealing activity for young individuals, especially that age restrictions are much easier to evade on online platforms. Additionally, the emergence of esports and esports gambling (i.e., wagering on esports matches) has further contributed to the popularity of gambling among minors. According to a recent analysis, it was suggested that online gambling has a worldwide prevalence of roughly 5–15% young individuals, aged 12 to 17 (King et al., 2020). The results of the 2019 European School Survey Project on Alcohol and Other Drugs (ESPAD) study revealed somewhat similar patterns as, on average, 15 % of students aged 16 years who gambled in the last 12 months met the criteria for excessive gambling, which corresponded to 3.8 % of all students participating in the survey. In addition to this, 5% of students who gambled in the last 12 months met the criteria for problem gambling, corresponding to a prevalence of 1.4 % in the total student population (students aged 16 years) (ESPAD, 2019).

There is also evidence to suggest that the prevalence of gaming disorder is higher among younger individuals, particularly teenagers compared to adults (Stevens et al., 2021). One aspect to consider is that there is a stronger video game engagement among younger persons, who also exhibit higher levels of motivation towards playing video games compared to their older counterparts (Király et al., 2022). Moreover, teenagers exhibit transitional qualities, such as reduced impulse control and novelty seeking, which are recognised as significant risk factors for addictions, including gaming disorder.

In a longitudinal study conducted with a sample of German pupils from Grades 4 to 9, it was found that teenagers at the age of 15 who exhibited problematic gaming behaviours had already shown multiple risk indicators at the age of 10 (Rehbein & Baier, 2013). An important risk factor identified in this study was the experience of being raised in a single-parent household. The observed effect remained consistent over time, even after accounting for parental dedication and supervision. This finding implies that the increased risk experienced by children in single-parent households is not solely attributable to a deficiency in parental nurturing. Rather, it is likely a result of limited time and resources available to single parents, which hinders their ability to offer well-supervised leisure activities for their children. A prospective research (Jeong et al., 2020) conducted over a period of 12 months, focusing on children aged 9–10 years, revealed a clear association between parental marital conflict occurring at an early stage of the child's life and the subsequent manifestation of symptoms related to gaming disorder. Furthermore, a secondary route was also discovered, namely, that the degree of gaming disorder symptoms in children was shown to be impacted by parental marital conflict, leading to negative outcomes such as a poor father–child connection and reduced self-esteem after a period of one year.

The results of the review indicate that implementing parental monitoring and management of gaming activity may be useful in preventing gaming disorder (Bussone et al., 2020). Parents who exercise control over their children's gaming habits are also more inclined to assist them in discovering and engaging in other recreational pursuits. This aspect is of utmost importance in preserving a well-rounded lifestyle and is advocated as a preventive measure (Király et al., 2020).

Childhood maltreatment, such as emotional, sexual, or physical abuse, as well as physical or emotional neglect, have been identified as additional risk factors contributing to the development and persistence of gaming disorder. When children are subjected to maltreatment, their parents or carers may neglect to fulfil their fundamental physical and psychological requirements, such as providing nurturing and a sense of belonging. This can result in significant and enduring adverse outcomes, including emotions of guilt and shame, low self-esteem, impaired psychological well-being, and compromised social interactions. Young individuals may engage in playing video games as a means of addressing their unfulfilled needs, such as the desire for success or social connection. Additionally, they may use video game playing as a strategy to manage psychological symptoms, such as despair or anxiety.

Subsequent research has shown that a healthy parent–child relationship was protective against gaming disorder while non-supervision, non-discipline, and violent discipline were positively associated with it (Cuong et al., 2021). Another study documented that the associations between attachment styles, namely anxious and avoidant styles, and gaming disorder were completely mediated by the presence of stressful experiences (Sung et al., 2020). Moreover, some studies have also acknowledged the significance of the father–child relationship as a potential protective factor against problematic gaming (Schneider et al., 2017; Su et al., 2018; Throuvala et al., 2019).

3.7. Aetiology

The aetiology of gambling disorder is complex. The interplaying factors include:

(i) Gambling-related factors, which pertain to the structural aspects of the gambling experience (see Section 1.7).

(ii) Biological mechanisms with certain genetic and neurobiological factors putting individuals at risk of online gambling (Potenza et al., 2019). For example, a national community-based Australian twin study (N= 4,764 participants) found that genetic factors that contributed to variations in personality characteristics within the normal range accounted for more than 40% of the genetic susceptibility to gambling disorder, with a greater impact seen in females compared to males (Slutske et al., 2013). Another study analysing familial influences on gambling behaviour of N=3359 twin pairs found that inherited factors explained from 34% to 54% of the liability for individual gambling disorder symptoms (Eisen et al., 1998).

Gene association studies primarily reported the involvement of the dopaminergic and serotonergic systems in the aetiology of gambling disorder (Gyollai et al., 2014). Several studies offered genes and their polymorphisms as possible candidates for gambling disorder, including dopamine D1 and D2 receptor genes (DRD1, DRD2) (Sabbatini da Silva Lobo et al., 2007), TaqIA polymorphism of the ANKK1 gene (Gyollai et al., 2014), the transporter-gene promoter region (5-HTTLPR) in men (Perez de Castro et al., 2002), C allele and C/C genotype of 5HT-2A T102C polymorphism (Wilson et al., 2013). However, to this date none of the genome-wide association studies have confirmed these associations as reaching genome-wide significance (Lang et al., 2016; Lind et al., 2013);

(iii) Psychological factors including impulsivity (Mestre-Bach et al., 2020), reward and punishment sensitivity (Fauth-Bühler & Mann, 2017), escape and coping (as a way to escape negative emotions and cope with already existing emotions, such as depression, anxiety, etc.) (Neophytou et al., 2023), competitiveness (Pace et al., 2021) and novelty seeking are other factors that are considered as having a role in the aetiology of gambling disorder;

(iv) Social/environmental factors including peer influence (Kim et al., 2017), online gambling communities (Sirola et al., 2018), cultural characteristics (see sections 1.3/1.4), as well as availability and advertising strategies (Parke et al., 2014).

The aetiology of gaming disorder is a significant area of study within the discipline. Like other forms of addiction, gaming disorder is characterised by the interplay of various factors, which may contribute to its development in some individuals. The components under consideration are as follows:

(i) Gaming-related factors, which pertain to the structural aspects of the gaming experience (see Section 1.7).

(ii) Individual factors, which refer to the person-based qualities that influence gaming behaviour. These factors could be dissected into:

- a. biological factors with certain neurobiological and genetic factors predisposing individuals to addictive behaviours;
- b. psychological factors, such as reward mechanisms, impulsivity, perfectionism and competitiveness, as well as motives for gaming (e.g., escapism – playing games to avoid everyday problems and difficulties);
- c. mental health comorbidities whereby individuals with depression, anxiety, attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder may be at higher risk of developing gaming disorder.

(iii) Environmental factors, which include the characteristics an individual might be exposed to, such as peer influence, accessibility, family dynamics, cultural norms (see Section 1.3), online communities, etc. Individually, none of these factors has the capability to induce a disordered state. Rather, certain combinations of these factors may lead to such a condition. For example, individuals who possess low self-esteem may engage in the pursuit of in-game achievements and elevated social standing as a means of enhancing their self-worth, potentially resulting in the development of disordered gaming behaviours (Cudo et al., 2019). Similarly, players who struggle with impulse control issues may exhibit heightened vulnerability to the gambling-like features embedded within video games, leading to substantial expenditures on microtransactions (Spicer et al., 2022).

3.8. Structural characteristics of gambling and gaming

The term 'structural characteristics' pertains to the attributes of online gambling and gaming that potentially support the initiation, progression, and continuity of the activity. First and foremost, studies and surveys confirm online gambling to be more addictive than land-based gambling, with some of the respondents admitting that it is easier to spend money online than in a land-based gambling environment. In general, gambling possesses certain characteristics that may pose a risk of addiction for vulnerable individuals. Among the most well-known are the possibility to choose from a large variety of betting options, including different games, bets, and wager sizes, or the near-miss phenomenon, when the individual falsely believes that they are about to win, but ultimately, they lose. This encourages them to play more.

Some forms of gambling might offer promotions, bonuses, and loyalty programmes to attract and retain players. Furthermore, online gambling has certain characteristics that may further increase the risk of gambling disorder:

- i. Internet access (Fineberg et al., 2018) in the sense that online gambling is accessible from anywhere – for example, from the comfort of the individual's own home;
- ii. 24/7 availability giving an opportunity to individuals who gamble to immerse themselves into the experience whenever they like, as usually the gambling platforms online never close;
- iii. a large variety of online forms of gambling activities, including virtual slot machines, table games (e.g., poker, blackjack, roulette), sports betting, bingo, and more;
- iv. the availability to engage in video streams with live dealers, thus giving the individual a social-immersiveness illusion
- v. the opportunity to gamble from the individual's mobile phone;
- vi. in-play live betting;
- vii. the possibility to pay for the gambling experience in various formats – for example, credit cards, e-wallets etc., thus, easing the financial transaction;
- viii. anonymity; and
- ix. cross-platform play, meaning the ability of players using different platforms (e.g., personal computers, smartphones) to play with each other simultaneously (e.g., poker).

Online video gaming activities include various structural attributes that render them very captivating to those individuals who play online. These attributes encompass specific elements such as the:

- i. persistent nature of the game world;
- ii. presence of advancement and reinforcement systems; and
- iii. inclusion of social interaction aspects (Billieux et al., 2015; King et al., 2010; Rehbein et al., 2021).

Massively multiplayer online role-playing games (MMORPGs) have demonstrated a notable proficiency in facilitating operant conditioning through the utilisation of intermittent reinforcement. This form of reinforcement entails the inconsistent administration of rewards. More precisely, players receive insignificant virtual items repeatedly before eventually being granted a substantial reward at an unpredictable time. The virtual incentives have been shown to stimulate the release of dopamine in the brain, leading to a sense of euphoria among players. Additionally, the implementation of variable-ratio reinforcement schedules has been seen to effectively motivate players to continue engaging with the game in anticipation of experiencing similar states and emotions. The efficacy of including and encouraging social interactions between players is also noteworthy in numerous game genres. For example, in the realm of MMORPGs, participants engage in collective endeavours by affiliating themselves with expansive collectives known as 'guilds'. Concurrently, these affiliations foster profound and significant interpersonal connections among players throughout their immersive gameplay experiences. It should be noted that MMORPGs were most popular in the 2000s. Since then, their popularity decreased compared to other (newly emerging) genres, such as battle royale games, but still remained a beloved and frequently played type of game across different age groups and genders.

In first-person shooter games, it is common for players to engage in persistent team-based gameplay, whereby they actively collaborate with other players to enhance their individual abilities as well as their collective performance. In addition, character modifications in video games offer individuals the opportunity to generate distinct virtual avatars that may be seen as extensions of their own identities. By means of identification, these avatars can be used to mitigate the incongruity between one's actual and desired self. The compensating mechanism serves as a means for individuals who experience greater levels of body dissatisfaction to enhance their self-esteem and meet their social requirements, all while mitigating the potential onset of social anxiety in the context of video games (Szolin et al., 2022). The aforementioned structural qualities have the potential

to enhance engagement and may also facilitate the development of gaming disorder among those who are psychologically vulnerable.

It is important to acknowledge that certain game genres, such as the multiplayer online battle arena (i.e., 'MOBA') and the 'Battle Royale' genres, have gained significant popularity in recent times. Some of these games apply 'cartoon design' and portray violence in a less realistic way to be appropriate for younger audiences too (e.g., Fortnite can be played from the age of 13 in contrast with PUBG, which has more realistic graphics and thus, it is recommended only from the age of 16). While there is limited research on these genres, it is highly probable that they possess a considerable addictive potential. This can be attributed to the effective integration of various structural elements within these genres (Dreier et al., 2017; Daniel L King et al., 2019).

The video game industry has seen significant expansion since its inception, evolving into a billion-dollar global market. Numerous technologies have contributed to this expansion. One significant development was the incorporation of Internet technology in video games, leading to the emergence of multiplayer online games. These games enable a substantial number of users from various locations worldwide to engage in simultaneous gameplay inside a shared virtual environment.

Two additional significant advancements from an economic perspective are the proliferation of smartphone utilisation and their emergence as the most readily available gaming platform, with the advent of digital purchasing options inside the video games. The business model of free-to-play gaming has rapidly gained significant popularity, emerging as one of the most prevalent approaches (Dreier et al., 2017). This model generates money via microtransactions, the acquisition of virtual things such as textures/skins, weapons, or levels as extra game content. Certain monetisation practises (strategies and methods used to generate revenue or financial gain from a certain product, service, or platform) commonly employed in the free-to-play business model can be characterised as 'predatory' due to their utilisation of in-game purchasing systems that obscure or withhold the actual long-term expenses of the activity until players have already made substantial financial and psychological investments (King & Delfabbro, 2018).

The 'loot box' has emerged as a monetisation method that is widely discussed and disputed in contemporary discourse. This refers to a reward system within video games, whereby players have the option to acquire virtual objects that can be consumed. Typically presented as boxes or crates, these items can be obtained by exchanging real-world currency via microtransactions. Upon opening items, players are bestowed with randomised prizes whose precise worth is uncertain.

The psychological process that underlies microtransactions is associated with the phenomenon known as the 'sunk-cost effect'. The concept of sunk costs pertains to the inclination to persist in a certain behaviour due to prior expenditures of financial resources, physical exertion, or time. Consequently, in cases when individuals have previously spent money on loot boxes without obtaining their intended outcomes, they are inclined to engage in more transactions to get the specific item(s) they want. 'Intermittent reinforcement', in the case of loot boxes, refers to the occasional acquisition of unusual and high-quality gifts.

This phenomenon serves as a powerful incentive for gamers to persist in purchasing loot boxes with the expectation of obtaining further desirable rewards. In addition, it is common practice for game developers to provide complimentary loot boxes to players at the beginning of gameplay to facilitate their acclimation to the gaming environment. Furthermore, studies have shown that the release of dopamine occurs throughout the anticipation of a reward, in addition to its release upon actual receipt. In the context of loot boxes, it is often hypothesised that the brain experiences an influx of 'joy hormones' upon the act of opening a loot box, regardless of its actual content (Brady & Prentice, 2021).

The presence of notable parallels between loot boxes and slot machines has elicited significant apprehension, mostly due to the fact that, unlike the majority of slot machines, loot boxes are accessible to individuals in younger age groups, including children and adolescents. This accessibility raises worries that loot boxes may serve as a potential catalyst for engaging in gambling activities. Several works reported a correlation between microtransaction spending and the degree of problematic gambling (Castrén et al., 2021). However, the results on the connection between spending on loot boxes and problematic gambling, as well as excessive gaming, are more consistently aligned.

It may be inferred that players who exhibit high expenditure on loot boxes, often referred to as 'whales', are not necessarily affluent gamers, but rather tend to be associated with problematic use patterns (Close et al., 2021). As a result, it appears that gaming companies, whether intentionally or unintentionally, are generating a disproportionate amount of profit from individuals who are vulnerable, specifically problem gamblers, rather

than from customers with higher incomes. This observation carries significant implications for discussions surrounding harm reduction and policy considerations related to the implementation of loot boxes and other methods of monetisation in video games. Furthermore, some websites promote the use of virtual skins (graphical downloads that alter the visual attributes of in-game objects [i.e., weapons] or characters) for gambling/betting, therefore intensifying the potential hazards associated with problematic gambling.

Another noteworthy monetisation strategy that might be classified as predatory is the practice of personalising offers and pricing. Companies use in-game behaviour monitoring techniques to gather data pertaining to gamers, encompassing their gameplay patterns as well as their expenditure tendencies (Daniel L. King et al., 2019). Based on the provided data, behavioural and psychological profiling is conducted, and these profiles are used to customise offers and perhaps adjust prices to particular players. This implies that players are offered to purchase the same virtual object, which incurs little manufacturing costs, for varying prices. In addition, it is worth noting that games have the potential to use coercive strategies to incentivise monetary expenditures.

One approach that is often used is the utilisation of 'limited time offers. This strategy aims to sway gamers into making purchases by creating a sense of artificial scarcity and fostering the belief that the chance will not be accessible in the future. Another 'predatory' marketing strategy game designers may apply is when the system recognises a specific in-game item (e.g., a weapon or armour) that holds potential significance for a novice player and subsequently, it identifies an experienced player who possesses the said item and proceeds to pair the two players together in a match. The intention behind this pairing is to allow the novice player to observe the effectiveness and efficiency of the aforementioned item, thereby motivating them to make a purchase in order to enhance their prospects of achieving victory in subsequent matches. When combined with other aspects, such as specific environmental and individual factors, these structural characteristics may lead to the onset, progression, and maintenance of gaming disorder.

Many of the listed structural characteristics and game mechanics can be viewed as persuasive design elements or so-called 'dark patterns. Persuasive design elements or 'dark patterns' refer to design practices commonly found in online user interfaces, including online gambling and gaming that lead individuals to make choices that often are not in their best interests, but generally serve the commercial interests of the provider (e.g., individuals spending more money on gambling or on microtransactions than originally intended) (5Rights Foundation, 2023). According to the OECD Committee on Consumer Policy "Dark commercial patterns are business practices employing elements of digital choice architecture, in particular in online user interfaces, that subvert or impair consumer autonomy, decision-making or choice. They often deceive, coerce or manipulate consumers and are likely to cause direct or indirect consumer detriment in various ways, though it may be difficult or impossible to measure such detriment in many instances" (OECD, 2022, p. 5).

4. Risks and harms related to online gambling and gaming

4.1. Consequences on physical health

The evident immersive quality of online gambling is further substantiated by findings indicating that individuals who engage in online gambling, especially those encountering difficulties, are more prone to reporting disturbances in their physical health compared to those who participate in gambling activities at a physical establishment (Gainsbury et al., 2013; Hing et al., 2014; Siemens & Kopp, 2011). Sleep quality, a sedentary lifestyle, poor nutrition, physical neglect, as well as neglecting chronic health conditions are reported consequences of problem online gambling. A study conducted in Australia surveyed a total of 3760 individuals to investigate the relationship between at-risk gambling, alcohol misuse, and sleep patterns. The findings revealed that at-risk gambling was significantly connected with alcohol misuse, which in turn was linked to insomnia. On the other hand, gambling problems alone were shown to be more closely associated with worse sleep quality (Thorne et al., 2021).

While gaming is a leisure activity or a personal interest for many individuals, there is a subset of gamers who encounter adverse symptoms that have detrimental effects on their mental and physical well-being, leading to impairments in their daily functioning. Prolonged engagement with screens and digital media can have a direct strenuous impact on the visual system, (possibly related to the necessity for prolonged near-term adaptation, but also related to mechanical consequences of prolonged attention to the screen e.g., dry-eye syndrome). In addition to this, poor posture and prolonged physical immobility (Mylona et al., 2020), obesity, as well as wrist, neck, back and elbow pain, skin blisters, calluses, weakness or numbness in the hands (peripheral neuropathy) and even blood clots can be the negative consequences of gaming disorder.

4.2. Mental health consequences and co-occurring disorders

Research has shown an elevated prevalence of physical and mental health problems, such as smoking, substance use, and mood disorders, among those who engage in online gambling in comparison to those who gamble in land-based facilities. Thus, gambling disorder is often found in conjunction with anxiety and mood disorders, posttraumatic stress disorder, as well as schizophrenia. Moreover, it is commonly observed that individuals with gambling disorder often exhibit personality disorders, such as antisocial, borderline, and narcissistic personality disorders (Shaffer & Korn, 2002). The identification of the exact causes of the co-occurring disorders may be challenging; however, genetic factors have been considered and it has been seen that other forms of psychopathology precede gambling disorder in 75% of instances (Kessler et al., 2008; Potenza et al., 2019).

Existing research indicates that, as with other forms of addiction, co-occurring disorders are often seen in individuals with gaming problems, rather than being an exceptional occurrence (Kuss et al., 2018). Depression, depressive symptoms, generalised anxiety disorder, and anxiety symptoms have consistently been associated with gaming disorder in several studies (Ji et al., 2022; Ostinelli et al., 2021). Individuals who are afflicted with symptoms of depression and anxiety may exhibit a tendency to seek solace in online games as a means of evading the challenges of daily life and difficult emotional states. In these instances, engaging in gaming functions as a means of temporary relief rather than a genuine resolution to difficulties that potentially results in disordered gaming. This, in turn, may exacerbate psychopathological symptoms owing to compromised cognitive abilities, diminished productivity, and reduced social interaction. In a similar vein, an additional significant worry pertaining to gaming disorder and the coexistence of depression is the increased susceptibility to experiencing thoughts of suicide (Sharman et al., 2022; Yu et al., 2020).

Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) is another co-occurring disorder that has been extensively researched (Koncz et al., 2023). There are several variables that might potentially lead to the development of gaming disorder in persons who exhibit signs of ADHD, including decreased social and emotional functioning as well as impulsivity. Moreover, individuals diagnosed with autism spectrum disorder who engage in video game playing had a higher propensity to display signs of gaming disorder, as shown by the varied impact sizes among studies (Murray et al., 2022). Indeed, both conditions exhibit impairments in impulse control and response inhibition, which have been associated with the potential development of gaming disorder (Mazurek & Engelhardt, 2013). The direction of these relationships remains uncertain due to the prevalent use of cross-sectional methodology. Longitudinal studies are urgently required in this field. However, it is quite probable that the link is reciprocal.

4.3. Substance use

Gambling disorder often co-occurs with behavioural and substance use disorders. Individuals diagnosed with gaming disorder tend to have higher rates of substance use throughout their lifetime, with alcohol use disorder (73%) and drug use disorder (38%) being especially common (Petry et al., 2005). The Health Survey for England and the Scottish Health Survey data sets included information on gambling in England and Scotland for the years 2012, 2015, and 2016, with the total sample reaching more than 40,000 respondents. This survey found a clear relationship between health habits and problematic online gambling, as seen by the association between smoking, drinking, and instances of problematic online gambling.

In general, research suggests a consistent positive association between online gaming and substance use disorders. Furthermore, there have been documented instances of co-occurring substance use in individuals with gaming disorder symptoms (Horváth et al., 2022). However, the association between online gaming and substance use is not always straightforward. For example, in a 2015 ESPAD study (Strizek et al., 2020) analysing differences in the relationship between gaming and substance use across 35 countries, patterns across European countries were inconsistent. In high-income countries, there was a tendency for the correlation to be negative. The observed negative correlation between online gaming and drug use may be justified based on the premise that computer game engagement often occurs inside the home environment, where parental supervision is more prevalent, whereas substance use tends to occur in settings with less parental oversight. Also, negative correlation between online gaming and substance use may be due to the fact that one compulsive activity is replaced by another. This correlation further substantiates the concept that the use of digital media might potentially be a contributing element to the decrease in drug use among teenagers in several Western European countries (Kraus et al., 2020). On the contrary, the ESPAD study revealed a significant correlation between problem gaming and drug use in nations characterised by a low GDP per capita (Strizek et al., 2020).

4.4. Interpersonal consequences: Families and social relationships

The detrimental effects, including both psychological and economic aspects, of gambling disorder on individuals' family members are often observable, and the participation of family members is often crucial in the process of recovering from gambling disorder (Hodgins et al., 2007). However, several studies have shown that significant others of the problem gambler often exhibit a limited knowledge or comprehension of their partner's gambling issue (Corney & Davis, 2010). Furthermore, a number of research studies have shown that spouses encounter various repercussions at the individual, familial, and societal levels in relation to problem gambling. One notable outcome often documented in many studies is the heightened amount of stress experienced by significant others of persons with gambling addiction; in addition to the impact on the broader familial structure is the occurrence of financial loss and subsequent economic ruin. The inclusion of a family member often yields favourable treatment results in individuals with gambling disorder, leading to a decrease in relapse and dropout rates (Jimenez-Murcia et al., 2017).

Based on a comprehensive analysis of 14 studies investigating family factors in adolescent problematic gaming (Schneider et al., 2017), it is evident that the primary emphasis has been placed on parent-child dynamics, specifically pertaining to aspects such as affection, discord, and maltreatment. These studies consistently indicate an inverse correlation between the relationship quality and the extent of problematic gaming behaviour. Positive family functioning, which encompasses effective parent-child communication, shared social activities, a sense of togetherness, acceptance, secure emotional bonds, warmth, and emotional expression, has been identified as a protective factor against problematic gaming. Conversely, poor family functioning, marked by conflicts, hostility, and the presence of demanding, authoritarian, neglectful, or permissive parenting styles, has been identified as a risk factor for problematic gaming (Nielsen et al., 2020). It is acknowledged that family conflicts may arise because individuals engage only in gaming activity, rather than fulfilling their duties in other areas of life including taking care of the needs of their families.

4.5. Society at large

There is a proposition suggesting that gambling problems and the associated damage they cause constitute a substantial worldwide public health concern. The quantification of gambling-related harm further strengthens the argument of addressing gambling as a matter of public health (Abbott, 2020b). The availability of gambling online fuels the problem even further – for example, approximately 50% of the games available on Facebook have elements of gambling (Jacques et al., 2016). Research suggests that the burden associated with gambling disorder surpasses the damage associated with substance use disorder and other prevalent chronic physical conditions (Browne et al., 2017; Browne et al., 2020). Thus, the adverse consequences associated with gambling disorder are significant and disproportionately affect marginalised and underprivileged populations (Abbott, 2020a).

To date, no estimation of the burden of problematic use of the internet (including online gaming) is available. However, addictive, hazardous, and harmful gaming can be linked to significant economical and societal costs (Rumpf et al., 2022). There is an urgent need to assess the costs arising from problematic internet use in terms of mental and physical health, social functioning, productivity loss, brain development, and unsafe use associated with accidents, along with the burden for the growing number of persons affected and economic costs for society (Fineberg & Potenza, 2023).

4.6. Legal issues

The legal considerations surrounding online gambling can be categorised into several key areas: (i) the acquisition of licences and adherence to regulatory frameworks, (ii) the implementation of age and geographical restrictions, (iii) the safeguarding of consumer rights and protection, (iv) compliance with Anti-Money Laundering and Know Your Customer Regulations, (v) the preservation of data privacy, (vi) the establishment of responsible gambling initiatives, and (vii) the ability to adapt to evolving regulations governing online gambling, particularly in diverse jurisdictions.

Individuals who gamble online have identified several disadvantages associated with online gambling. These include the ease of spending money online, the high level of convenience it offers, and concerns regarding the safety of their accounts. Additional concerns revolve around the potential impact of easy access to online gambling on the prevalence of gambling behaviour, particularly among technologically proficient young individuals. This heightened accessibility may contribute to an escalation in the occurrence and frequency of

disordered gambling (Gainsbury & Wood, 2011). These aforementioned issues have prompted suggestions to either outlaw or restrict Internet gambling as a means of implementing rules aimed at mitigating potential negative consequences (Gainsbury, 2015).

The high levels of involvement in gambling activities may be achieved by the integration of psychologically manipulative elements, such as the use of a variable ratio of reinforcement, the presentation of losses disguised as wins, and the cultivation of a feeling of control (see more in Section 1.7) (Fineberg et al., 2018). Additionally, the encouragement of the perception of 'near misses' has been identified as a contributing factor in maximising engagement in gambling activities (Murch & Clark, 2016). Hence, scholars in the field of gambling research have emphasised the importance of directing attention towards the interplay between the individual engaging in gambling activities and the gambling product itself, with a particular emphasis on its implications for public health (Murch & Clark, 2016).

The legal concerns regarding online gaming may be succinctly categorised as: (i) age limitations, (ii) virtual assets and in-game transactions, (iii) safeguarding privacy and data, (iv) cyberbullying and harassment, (v) regulation of gambling components, (vi) cross-border gameplay, and (vii) compliance with regulatory frameworks. Nevertheless, as with online gaming, apart from implementing regulatory measures, it is imperative to incorporate screening methods and public education programmes with the objective of reducing possible harm.

5. Current responses on online gambling and gaming

5.1. Regulatory approaches and policies

Models and frameworks that map the evolution of gambling legalisation and regulation describe a linear progression beginning with gambling as an immoral, illegal activity, followed by a middle stage where state-owned monopolies apply profits to good causes, and leading to gambling as a legitimate form of entertainment for private profit (Kingma, 2004a; Korn, 2000; McMillen & Wright, 2008; Munting, 1989; Sauer, 2001; Young & Markham, 2015; Zborowska et al., 2012). Some models articulate the stages of this progression and the implications at each stage for public policy, licensing and regulatory requirements (S. M. Gainsbury et al., 2019; Kaburakis & Rodenberg, 2012; Laffey et al., 2016; Miers, 2015; Rohsler, 2022), resource allocation, consumer responsibility (Alexis, 2017), and the role of gambling in the larger economy (Gandullia & Leporatti, 2019; Nickerson, 1995; Selin, 2016).

Throughout this progression, financial interests are in constant tension with efforts to address inherent consumption risks such as problem gambling and broader community harm, and social responsibility efforts are imposed or volunteered predominantly to legitimise the progression to more revenue and profit (Cosgrave, 2010; Fiedler et al., 2021; Marionneau et al., 2021; Planzer et al., 2014; van Schalkwyk et al., 2021, 2022). In this context, the industry's adoption of a social responsibility mandate may be understood as the quid pro quo for a government's shift from a restricted to a liberal market (Miers, 2015, 2016).

Existing models assume that jurisdictions move in one direction through the progressive stages over time. This assumption does not fit with recent events in jurisdictions such as Norway, United Kingdom, and Australia, where there have been significant shifts from competitive liberal markets to more restrictive regulatory approaches following extensive political and public attention to the negative effects of gambling on the society. This suggests the need for a more dynamic model that accounts for shifts in the societal discourse surrounding the regulation of gambling (Kingma, 2004b; Marionneau et al., 2021), for example, applying a flexible, learning perspective to improve regulatory governance arrangements (Wright, 2009).

Regulation of online environments continues to provoke issues of borders and sovereignty. In this global market, several countries and dependent territories established themselves as attractive hosts for online gambling companies through a combination of lower tax rates, lower licensing and registration fees, less prescriptive regulatory frameworks, and access to European or other markets (Zborowska et al., 2012). However, jurisdictions have increasingly asserted their right to enforce their own licensing and regulatory framework (Häberling, 2012; Kaburakis & Rodenberg, 2012; Laffey et al., 2016; Myllymaa, 2017), rather than accept that of an operator regulated at the point of supply. Whether online gambling is regulated at the state or national level, geofencing is established to delineate legally licensed versus *black market* offerings.

Regulation in online environments should offer unique advantages. All players are identified preventing anonymous play, and the data available includes play-by-play behaviour and source of wealth and income.

This combination of data was part of the promise of legalising online gambling, that operators would be able to analyse such data to identify risk before harm occurred. In reality, while many operators have invested heavily in player risk analytics, including the use of AI, there is no evidence demonstrating that such analytics have led to meaningful interactions with players and reduction in risk or harm. In response, some regulators have added a duty of care to their compliance regime and provided explicit guidance for customer interaction with program evaluation to demonstrate the effectiveness of their harm minimisation initiatives.

A content analysis of gambling literature reveals a lack of research on the regulatory and policy environment in comparison to other hospitality sectors, despite a steady increase in policy changes affecting the gambling industry (Repetti 2011). Overall, there is a lack of literature to guide public policy and regulatory approaches to gambling, including research that assesses the impact on public good of various regulatory frameworks (S. Gainsbury & Wood, 2011) or evidence regarding the effectiveness of specific compliance requirements. Rather, jurisdictions have tended to copy and paste from those regarded as leaders in this area.

More current literature includes a call for cooperation between regulators of financial and gambling markets to address similar and overlapping consumer risks (Weidner 2022). Two trends dominate the recent literature. First, there are longstanding and accelerating calls to apply a public health perspective to the regulation of gambling (Abbott, 2020; Bowden-Jones et al., 2019; Korn, 1999; Lacy-Nichols et al., 2023; van Schalkwyk et al., 2021; Wardle et al., 2021). Second, there is pressure to address the evidence regarding the uneven burden of gambling harm on those who are economically disadvantaged (Hahmann et al., 2021; Ortiz & Hernandez, 2019), with an emphasis on financial harm (Muggleton et al., 2021) and an affordability approach to harm reduction (Nower & Glynn, 2022), as adopted by regulators in the UK and Netherlands.

In general, it can be claimed that, in contrast with the highly regulated gambling industry, the video game industry is largely unregulated. A few exceptions exist, though. In some Asian countries like China and South Korea, gaming disorder was considered a public health threat long ago, and as a consequence of this recognition, several regulatory attempts have taken place in the last decade. One of the most prominent regulations is the so-called 'shutdown systems', when governments oblige game service providers to block access to their online games between specific times in the day for specific groups of users, usually minors.

China, in 2019, introduced a prescribed limitation of 1.5 hours of online games on weekdays and 3 hours on weekends, with no gaming allowed during the night (from 10 PM to 8 AM) for children and adolescents younger than 18 years. In 2021, the restrictions became even harsher: minors can only play online games for one hour between 8 PM and 9 PM on Fridays, Saturdays, Sundays, and public holidays. Similar but much less severe restrictions have also been applied in Thailand, Vietnam, and South Korea (Király et al., 2022). These regulations are based on the assumption that gaming time is the main problem, and by forcefully cutting down gaming time, gaming disorder can be prevented.

The China Game Industry Research Institute released a report named "2022 China Game Industry Progress Report on the Protection of Minors", which claimed that the problem of minors' addiction to online games has been largely solved due to these regulations (Global Times, 2022). However, according to a recent study by a group of independent international researchers, the policies may be ineffective at causing intended changes to behaviour. Namely, in practice, they may not reduce heavy gaming among minors as intended (Zendle et al., 2023) despite the claims of the Chinese research institute. If that is the case, assumptions and debates regarding the effectiveness of policies aiming to reduce time spent gaming (Colder Carras et al., 2021; Király et al., 2022) are completely pointless, as the policies do not fulfil their aim in the first place. Nevertheless, additional studies are necessary to explore the effectiveness of these measures.

Another regulatory attempt by the Chinese government in 2007 was the so-called "Fatigue system" or "anti-online game addiction system". Online game providers were obliged to monitor their users' playtime and discourage minors from playing for more than three hours by gradually decreasing in-game rewards (e.g., experience points) if played longer. To the best of our knowledge, no reliable efficiency studies have been conducted. Therefore, the impact of this measure is largely unknown. However, according to a study (Zhan & Chan, 2012), many stakeholders have argued that the regulation may fail on the practical level as nothing stops children from using their parents' or other adults' IDs. Also, children may switch accounts or switch among different online games in a day to bypass time limit restrictions. Consequently, such regulations also seem rather ineffective.

Another set of regulations concerns loot boxes. Loot boxes closely resemble gambling, and there is an intense debate about whether they should be considered gambling or not. In recent years, in the US and Canada, numerous class-action lawsuits were placed alleging that loot boxes constituted "unlawful gambling" and that

game developers, game publishers, and even platforms should be responsible for supposed harm caused by loot boxes in mobile or other electronic games. However, all these lawsuits failed on different grounds, for instance, that virtual items in the games won from the loot boxes were not "things of value" as they cannot be 'cashed out' to gain money (Eurogamer, 2023; JDSUPRA, 2022).

In contrast with North America, in Europe, the Belgian Gaming Commission declared that such mechanisms constitute gambling under existing law and 'banned' loot boxes. More specifically, non-compliant companies implementing paid loot boxes without a gambling license can be prosecuted. However, according to a recent empirical study examining the hundred highest-grossing iPhone games in Belgium, 82.0% continued to generate revenue from loot boxes, and the majority of these games were rated suitable for individuals aged 12+. Consequently, it seems that the Belgian 'ban' on loot boxes has not been effectively enforced.

Another loot box-related regulation concerns the loot box drop rates. In 2017, China's Ministry of Culture introduced a regulation that requires video game developers to reveal the odds of players receiving items from loot boxes. The law has led to numerous big companies revealing the drop rates for rare items in their loot boxes. Games releasing odds on treasure chests and loot boxes included e.g., Perfect World, Dote 2, League of Legends (The Verge, 2017). To the best of our knowledge, no studies have been conducted to test the degree of compliance of the companies to the law or the efficiency of this policy regarding the number of users having gambling problems.

The video game industry has two self-regulatory authorities responsible for assigning age and content ratings to video games in North America and Europe, namely the *Entertainment Software Rating Board* (ESRB) and the *Pan European Game Information* (PEGI). In 2020, the two authorities introduced the 'In-Game Purchases (Includes Random Items)' and the 'Includes Paid Random Items' labels, intended to ensure consumer protection by informing them more efficiently about the randomized nature of certain in-game purchases. The same label has also been adopted by the International Age Rating Coalition (IARC) and thereby assigned to games available on digital storefronts, e.g., the Google Play Store. However, it was argued that this measure is flawed and misleading because it provides insufficient information to the consumers (e.g., when these 'Random Items' become purchasable, how much they cost, whether they affect gameplay or are merely cosmetic, can they be exchanged for real-world currency or not) while pretending that consumer protection is improved and ensured.

The ESRB and PEGI deny the potential gambling-related harms of in-game random reward mechanisms and refuse to categorize them as gambling or simulated gambling, which would be the appropriate step to protect consumers, especially minors. The 'Random Items' label is an inferior substitute, much less capable of protecting children (Xiao, 2021). Relatedly, a recent empirical study found that the majority of popular games containing loot boxes on the Google Play Store (whose age rating system is regulated through IARC) did not display the label, while, to date, the Apple App Store does not even implement a loot box presence warning label (Xiao, 2023). This means that in the case of mobile games, where microtransactions and random reward mechanisms are most prevalent, consumers cannot even rely on these imperfect labels. Consequently, it is argued that existing age rating systems should be improved to achieve their purpose satisfactorily.

5.2. Treatment

Psychological interventions are considered to be evidence-based in the treatment of gambling disorder (Cowlshaw et al., 2012; Ribeiro et al., 2021). Treatment modality with the strongest evidence about its effectiveness is cognitive behavioural therapy (CBT). Behavioural and cognitive methods consist of trigger control, exposure in imagination and in vivo, problem-solving training, social competence training, activity planning, cognitive restructuring, and relapse prevention.

CBT is effective in reducing gambling severity, frequency, and intensity. However, its lasting effect on individuals after treatment is unclear (Bergeron et al., 2022; Pfund et al., 2023). CBT proved to be effective in reducing co-occurring anxiety and depression in gamblers and improves their quality of life (Higuera-Ahijado et al., 2023). There is not enough evidence about the superiority of individual over group settings in CBT. However, group treatment appears to have some potential benefits, as it utilizes group cohesion and social support, promotes observational learning, and is also time and cost-efficient (Ribeiro et al., 2021).

Another psychological approach showing positive results in the treatment of gambling disorder is motivational interviewing (MI) (Cowlshaw et al., 2012, Yakovenko et al., 2015). MI consist of reflective listening, summarizing, and promoting self-efficacy. The therapist seeks to reflect on the patient's ambivalence, and

together, they review the advantages and disadvantages of the change under consideration and, conversely, the advantages and disadvantages of staying with the current behaviour. MI is often successfully combined with CBT approaches (Ribeiro et al., 2021).

A further effective and brief intervention is personalized feedback interventions (PFIs) (Peter et al., 2019). PFI is a way of supporting the patient in reflecting on their situation and confronting the facts. On this basis, the patient is supported in deciding what he/she wants to do about the situation and, if desired, is given practical recommendations on how to achieve change. PFIs are primarily effective when combined with MI interventions (Peter et al., 2019). In treatment programs utilising CBT, MI, PFIs or their combination, there is a positive relationship between the number of sessions and treatment outcomes (Pfund et al., 2020).

Despite efforts to validate the application of the described interventions via the Internet, we have little high-quality evidence on the effectiveness of internet-based psychological interventions in the treatment of gambling disorder (Boumparis et al., 2022; Park, 2022), and the same counts for mobile applications (McCurdy et al., 2023).

There is no on-label pharmacological treatment indicated to treat gambling disorder. Due to the lack of good quality studies, the use of psychopharmaceuticals in the treatment of gambling disorder should be approached with caution. The use of opioid antagonists (Dowling et al., 2022) and atypical antipsychotics appear to be the most promising in reaching short-term improvements in gambling symptom severity. There is some evidence that mood stabilizers are effective (Goslar et al., 2019). However, the research so far has yielded inconclusive results.

There is growing evidence of the effectiveness of non-invasive brain stimulation (NiBS) methods on a reduction of craving for gambling (Del Mauro et al., 2023, Zucchella et al., 2020). Among NiBS, the two techniques mainly used are transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) and transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS). TMS is a neurostimulation technique using a strong and short magnetic pulse over the patient's head. The pulse induces neuronal firing by suprathreshold neuronal membrane depolarization.

Differently, tDCS is a neuromodulatory technique that delivers a weak constant current through two electrodes, an anode and a cathode, placed over the scalp. Unlike TMS, the intensity of tDCS is not strong enough to elicit action potentials but influences potential membrane excitability by depolarizing or hyperpolarizing it. The effect of these methods on actual gambling behaviour is unknown due to the lack of high-quality studies, and results related to craving reduction should also be taken with caution (Del Mauro et al., 2023).

Availability of treatment for gaming disorder largely varies from country to country. Few specified clinics or treatment centres are available in Western countries, e.g., in the US, UK, Germany, Belgium, Switzerland, Spain, Greece, while they are increasingly prevalent in East Asia, especially in China and South Korea, where gaming disorder is considered a public health crisis (Zajac et al., 2020) and a lot of effort is made on the governmental level to combat the disorder. In Western societies, besides the few specialized treatment facilities, those with gaming problems can turn to professionals working in general psychiatric or addiction treatment services.

The most frequent psychological treatment for gaming disorder is CBT, which may be complemented with strategies that alter/improve (i) maladaptive cognitions (e.g., attitudes, beliefs, biases) that initiate and maintain problematic gaming; (ii) coping strategies used to deal with unpleasant mood states (e.g., depression) and withdrawal symptoms when not gaming, and (iii) social skills. In addition, therapies aim to establish new behavioural routines, including physical and social activities, to replace gaming activities. For adolescents and emerging adults, it is recommended that caregivers or other family members also attend therapy (King et al., 2020).

Given that the co-occurrence of other mental disorders is the norm rather than the exception in the case of gaming disorder, it is always important to assess and treat co-occurring psychiatric issues. The most prevalent co-occurring psychiatric problems are depression, generalised anxiety disorder, ADHD, substance use, autism spectrum disorder, and social anxiety (Király et al., 2022). Besides psychotherapy, treatment sometimes involves pharmacotherapy (or a combination of these), especially for treating comorbid disorders.

The medications most typically used in these treatments are drugs treating either depression, anxiety, or ADHD (methylphenidate, atomoxetine). Although treatment is available in most of the countries where the problem exists, there is still a severe lack of effectiveness studies. Studies demonstrated high efficacy of CBT in shorter-term gaming disorder symptom and depression reductions and moderate efficacy in shorter-term anxiety

reduction. However, more studies with follow-up are needed to assess longer-term gains (Zajac et al., 2020). Another crucial question concerns the aim of the treatment as this varies between total abstinence to controlled gaming. Research suggests that abstinence may be more effective but more high-quality research is necessary to confirm this.

5.3. Self-help initiatives

The most historically anchored and well-known self-help initiative for people experiencing gambling problems is Gamblers Anonymous (GA). GA is an internationally widespread organisation founded in the 1950s. It is a mutual aid fellowship providing self-help groups based on the twelve-step model as a theoretical framework. Members are encouraged to follow a specific programme to resolve their problems (Cowlshaw et al., 2012). GA applied similar principles to their meetings as Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) (Bergeron et al., 2022). The emphasis on patience, the use of the Serenity Prayer as a way of achieving acceptance of financial problems and realities, and the absolute affirmation of the "compulsive gambler" identity were identified as important aspects of GA recovery (Pfund et al., 2023).

Despite having convincing evidence for the efficacy of AA in the treatment of alcohol use disorder (5), research addressing the efficacy of GA is limited, and the results of the studies are inconsistent (Pfund et al., 2023). Other fellowships based on and closely related to GA are Gam-Anon, which is a fellowship for family members and friends of gamblers, and Gam-A-Teen, which is a similar program for children of gamblers (Bergeron et al., 2022). Further research employing randomised controlled design with larger samples and controlling for the impact of attendance (the number of GA meetings attended) on GA outcomes is needed to thoroughly evaluate the effectiveness of this programme (Pfund et al., 2023).

There are also other than GA self-help initiatives organizing support groups for people suffering from problem gambling based on different principles. For example, Gambling Addiction Norway (GAN) which offers information regarding gambling-related issues and support conversations with members of the organization. GAN welcomes both problem gamblers and affected others. GAN does not endorse any specific set of beliefs (Pfund et al., 2023). However, there is no scientific evidence about the effectiveness of these self-help groups in reducing gambling disorder symptoms.

Other ways how problem gamblers can help themselves to reduce or stop gambling, in the literature most frequently reported self-management strategies, are self-exclusion programs, workbooks (usually based on CBT), and money or time-limiting strategies (Yakovenko et al., 2015). Self-exclusion programs, for example, seem to be effective in reducing gambling problems (Peter et al., 2019; Pfund et al., 2020). The problem, however, is the low uptake of these programs among gamblers (Boumparis et al., 2022). Also, limit-setting measures could be effective, however, this strategy suffers from several limitations (Park et al., 2022). Self-guided treatments, usually in the form of workbooks, as they have been applied so far, show no or a very small effect on gambling severity, financial loss, and frequency of gambling and are inferior to face-to-face treatment modalities (McCurdy et al., 2023).

Some self-help initiatives are available for individuals suffering from gaming disorder, as well as their family members. On-Line Gamers Anonymous® is one of the oldest initiatives available at <https://www.olganon.org/home> founded by the mother of a gamer suffering from gaming disorder who committed suicide. Another popular self-help initiative is the Game Quitters (<https://gamequitters.com/>) founded by a former gamer with addiction problems. Although numerous anecdotal success stories indicate the effectiveness of these self-help groups, they generally lack research-based evidential support (King et al., 2020).

5.4. Prevention

The prevention of online gambling harms requires a multifaceted approach. Educational and awareness programs, self-exclusion programs, cognitive-behavioural therapies, technological interventions, and social support networks have been identified as effective strategies. However, it is essential to tailor interventions to the specific needs and characteristics of individuals and to continue evaluating their long-term effectiveness (Ortega-Barón et al., 2021). Further research is warranted to explore innovative prevention strategies that harness technological advancements and target vulnerable populations.

Given the high vulnerability of the adolescent population, the most wide-spread prevention programs are those targeting this age group and being carried out in schools. To be successful, such school-based gambling addiction prevention programs should be psychoeducational, comprehensive, and theory-based, with a focus

on social support and sustained long-term effects. These programs should provide students with the knowledge and skills necessary to resist the temptation to gamble and help them develop a better understanding of the impact of gambling on their lives.

According to systematic reviews (Lozano & Rodrigues, 2022; Oh et al., 2017; Throuvala et al., 2019), the key components of gambling addiction prevention programs are the following.

1. Early education and awareness

- Providing age-appropriate information about the risks and consequences of gambling.
- Raising awareness about the signs of gambling addiction and problem gambling.
- Promoting responsible attitudes towards gambling and fostering critical thinking skills.

2. Life skills development

- Teaching skills such as decision-making, problem-solving, and impulse control.
- Enhancing the students' ability to manage emotions, cope with stress, and resist peer pressure.
- Providing tools for effective communication and assertiveness to prevent gambling-related harm.

3. Interactive and engaging activities

- Incorporating interactive activities, group discussions, and role-playing exercises to promote active engagement and understanding.
- Utilizing multimedia resources, videos, and real-life case studies to illustrate the consequences of gambling addiction.

4. Empathy and empowerment

- Encouraging empathy towards individuals struggling with gambling addiction.
- Empowering students to take an active role in preventing and addressing gambling-related issues in their communities.
- Promoting a supportive and non-judgmental environment where students feel comfortable seeking help and supporting their peers.

5. Parental involvement

- Engaging parents and caregivers in the prevention efforts through informational sessions or workshops.
- Providing resources and guidance for parents to monitor their children's online activities and set healthy boundaries.
- Collaborating with parents to reinforce consistent messages about responsible gambling behaviours at home and in school.

6. Partnerships and collaborations

- Collaborating with local community organizations, mental health professionals, and gambling addiction support services to provide comprehensive prevention programs.
- Establishing partnerships with relevant stakeholders to ensure the sustainability and effectiveness of prevention efforts.

By incorporating these key components, school-based gambling addiction prevention programs can effectively raise awareness, equip students with the necessary skills, and promote responsible attitudes towards gambling, ultimately reducing the risk of gambling-related harm among youth.

Prevention studies targeting video game playing have mainly involved school-based programs to train healthier internet and digital device use habits in adolescents. The efficacy of selective prevention is promising but warrants further empirical attention. On an international scale, the formal recognition of gaming disorder has provided a basis for developing structured prevention responses. For instance, the South Korean model is a good example of a coordinated response to a public health threat, with strong government initiatives and long-term strategic plans at all three levels of prevention (i.e., universal, selective, and indicated). In Western regions, on the other hand, prevention programs are mostly developed and led by non-profit organizations and private enterprises (King et al., 2018).

5.5. Harm reduction and harm minimisation in gambling and gaming

Harm minimisation refers to efforts to reduce harm related to consumption. Policymakers and regulators specify the target of harm minimisation as minors and other vulnerable populations, with *vulnerable* sometimes

defined narrowly as those with a gambling disorder but increasingly more broadly as anyone who experiences gambling-related harm.

Gambling operators are required to prevent any consumption by minors through rigorous age checks, buttressed by regulatory policies that ensure operators cannot benefit financially from failures to identify minors, favourable consideration for prompt self-report, zero-tolerance enforcement, and financial and/or license-related penalties.

Harm reduction tools for adults initially focused on two extremes, at one end to ensure informed consent through education of all gamblers, and at the other end, to react to those who developed a gambling disorder by offering self-exclusion programs, the effectiveness of which is well-supported in literature ((Harris & Griffiths, 2017; Hopfgartner, Auer, Griffiths, et al., 2023)).

The goals of harm minimization have evolved to address a continuum of risk (Harris & Griffiths, 2017). This evolution includes a shift to harm reduction that supports safer gambling for all (Langham et al., 2016; Quilty L. C.; Watson C.; Bagby M. R., 2015), the need to prioritize harms to affected others (Browne et al., 2017), the importance of prioritizing financial harms (Haeusler, 2016; Hilbrecht & Glynn, 2019), and a growing recognition that incentivizing ideal consumer behaviours (Giles et al., 2014; Lynagh et al., 2011; Mantzari et al., 2015; Sutherland et al., 2008) can increase effectiveness of harm reduction efforts.

Education & Awareness: Education and awareness are widely understood as fundamental to making gambling safer for all (Parke et al., 2015; Shaffer et al., 2019). Operator efforts have matured in this area, with branded programs designed to help players understand games, odds, myths, risks, and strategies for gambling more safely. Behaviour change, however, remains elusive across most player safeguards and prevention efforts (Gray et al., 2018, 2019)

Responsible Gambling (RG) Tools: Operators increasingly provide RG tools for gamblers to self-monitor and control their activity. Limit-setting tools (time and money) show great promise (Auer, Reiestad, & Griffiths, 2020; Auer, Reiestad, Griffiths, et al., 2020; Auer & Griffiths, 2013; Broda et al., 2008; Tabri et al., 2019b) but are not yet widely adopted (Nelson et al., 2008; Shaffer et al., 2019), and may be more effective if players are educated on their use and presented with tools upon registration or first deposit (Nower, L., Mills, D., Stanmyre, J.F., & Peters, 2020), and incentivised for ongoing use (Hollingshead & Wohl, 2022). Operators may use breaks in play to disrupt the gambling session and raise awareness of approaching time or spending limits; these are proven effective when combined with effective messaging, e.g., pop-ups, that require an active response by the player (Blaszczynski et al., 2016; Hopfgartner et al., 2022; Hopfgartner, Auer, Santos, et al., 2023; Tabri et al., 2019b, 2019a) Gambling operators frequently offer self-assessment tools despite little research on their use in gambling settings (Monaghan & Blaszczynski, 2010; Parke et al., 2015). However, evidence from other fields supports the value of this type of self-monitoring, suggesting the need for well-evidenced, standardized self-assessment tools.

Funding & Withdrawal Policies: Policies related to customers' financial behaviours overlap with anti-money laundering efforts that focus on identifying customers' sources of wealth and affordability (Nower & Glynn, 2022). Gambling on credit is clearly associated with risk (Muggleton et al., 2021). However, options for cash/credit access are increasingly difficult to trace, suggesting the need for state-level action on the use of personal credit and opaque payment methods to coordinate harm minimisation and anti-money laundering objectives. Financial institutions should be engaged to provide enhanced self-management tools for those who gamble, for example, hard limits on gambling spend, along with enhanced protections for joint account holders such as jointly agreed thresholds for spending alerts and limits – to reduce the spread of harm to affected others. Gambling operator policies may include deposit limits commensurate with affordability, rapid processing of withdrawals and no withdrawal reversals, automatic prompts to pay out the full amount of winnings rather than encouraging players to spend them, and the use of declined deposits as a sign that a customer may be experiencing financial difficulty.

Identifying Risk Behaviour: The shift to proactive measures to identify risk was part of the promise of legalizing online gambling, whereby operators could analyse play-by-play behaviour to spot potential for harm before it occurred. Player analytics can identify individual risk behaviours but also deepen understanding of player segments and trajectories (Finkenwirth et al., 2021; Perrot et al., 2018; Ukhov et al., 2021), so operators can customise responses to player needs. Player analytics are beginning to include non-play behaviours that offer clear signs of risk, such as those related to communication (Haefeli et al., 2015) and payment (Ghaharian et al., 2023; Haeusler, 2016).

Responding to Risk Behaviour: The area of least maturity in online gambling environments and the target of recent regulatory guidance is responding to players who exhibit risk to reduce harm. Automated methods, such as well-designed messages that include self-appraisal, normative, and personally relevant content, are effective, (Auer & Griffiths, 2022; Bjørseth et al., 2021; Caillon et al., 2021; Celio & Lisman, 2014; Gainsbury et al., 2015; Newall et al., 2023), but further evidence on the effectiveness of messages to change behaviours is needed. Personal customer interactions are increasingly used to complement automated messages, with several jurisdictions incorporating innovative strategies for players who exhibit repeated or escalating risk (Auer & Griffiths, 2022). However, this requires operators to have an RG case management process that monitors escalation of risk for individual customers, a process that is often lacking in the current online environment.

Broader stakeholder engagement: Evidence suggests that harm minimisation requires converging efforts from operators, regulators, and other stakeholders to reduce harm, with practical strategies that target all gamblers, gamblers who exhibit risk, and affected others. Further, the most efficient and effective method of accomplishing this is to focus on financial harm. This will require regulatory leadership, operator innovation, and broader stakeholder engagement beyond the traditional boundaries of responsible gambling.

Harm reduction has been a widely accepted intervention strategy in the case of substance use disorders for several decades (e.g., opioid agonist treatment or needle exchange programs, etc.), and as we have seen above, interventions aiming to provide a safer gambling environment and minimise gambling-related harm became also introduced by many service providers all over the world. In contrast, in the case of video gaming and gaming disorder, harm reduction practices are rare. The main reason is that the video gaming industry, in general, is largely unregulated (except in some Asian countries), and the industry itself tends to deny the fact that video games may cause any harm.

Nevertheless, several potential harm reduction practices appear in the scientific literature, and some are implemented on the regulatory levels in certain countries or in the case of specific video games. Two of these measures were discussed in chapter 5.1: (i) the introduction of the 'In-Game Purchases (Includes Random Items)' and the 'Includes Paid Random Items' labels by the two self-regulatory authorities, the ESRB and PEGI, and (ii) the regulation or initiative to reveal loot box drop rates. In the case of the latter, it is important to note that this can only be effective and trusted if monitored by independent bodies rather than solely stated by the game developers/publishers themselves, who could easily falsify the drop rates to maximise their profits by deceiving players. According to a letter to the editor (Xiao, 2021) in one popular addiction-focused journal, "The protection of consumers from the potential gambling-related harms of random reward mechanisms requires legal restrictions on their sale in the short term and the adoption of ethical game design by the industry in the long term." Unfortunately, it is plausible to assume that the gaming industry will not stop applying 'predatory' monetisation techniques or apply more ethical game design without being externally enforced via legal regulations.

Another potential harm reduction technique often discussed among scholars is the application of in-game warning messages pointing out the risks of excessive use. This could be done in several formats, for instance, as loading screen tips (e.g., as in World of Warcraft) or pop-up messages. Moreover, game developers could use data obtained through in-game behaviour tracking to identify players at risk of excessive game playing and choose to target only them with such pop-up messages. Based on the efficiency of cigarette warning labels, it may be assumed that such warning messages could be useful in raising awareness related to the possible detrimental consequences of excessive gaming (Király et al., 2017).

6. Conclusions

Technological advancements have substantially changed our lives in the past decades. Besides the countless benefits of these advancements, there are severe challenges and negative consequences. One of the latter is the risks of excessive and addictive use of specific online activities such as online gambling and video gaming. While the majority of individuals gamble and play video games as a recreational activity in a healthy manner, a minority experiences addiction-like symptoms. Based on decades of research, gambling disorder and gaming disorder are now recognised mental health conditions, according to the World Health Organization. Individuals suffering from these disorders experience functional impairment and considerable harm in multiple life segments (personal, social, educational/work-related), resulting in considerable costs both on the individual, familial, and societal levels.

As a result of technological advancement, gambling has changed both in quantitative and qualitative ways. In contrast with traditional land-based gambling (e.g., casinos and gambling arcades), online gambling activities are now easily accessible through mobile devices, attracting new population groups, such as youth and women. Furthermore, among other problems, regulations (e.g., age verification) are easier to evade in online gambling than in the case of land-based forms, attracting a large number of minors. One of the most striking phenomena is the convergence between gambling and gaming, namely that gambling activities increasingly incorporate video gaming features (the 'gamification of gambling'), and video games are more and more frequently integrating gambling elements in their gameplay (the 'gamblification of gaming'). The latter is especially problematic as minors are heavily targeted, and regulations to protect them are completely lacking at the moment.

Several prevention, treatment, and harm minimisation measures exist for problem gambling. Still, their effectiveness for online forms and new populations (e.g., minors, women) is not sufficiently studied, or they are often not effectively implemented. Similar measures for problem gaming are much less available, and efficacy studies are rare and often lack methodological rigour. Furthermore, video gaming is one of the most popular hobbies across all age groups and genders, with children, adolescents and young adults being overrepresented among frequent/engaged players. Even if video games, and especially online multiplayer games, have a high addictive potential, we have to emphasise that the majority of gamers play them in a healthy and balanced way without experiencing any harm or even experiencing benefits. The situation is similar to gambling in that gambling can also potentially become a serious addiction problem, however, in most cases, it remains a recreational activity.

It is of the utmost importance to avoid stigmatising these activities. Labelling their behaviour problematic would be difficult to justify for non-problematic recreational players. On the other hand, stigmatising these activities would have resulted in further negative consequences for players already having problems. In addition, it would work against seeking therapeutic help and generally lead to the problem becoming hidden. It would also reduce the chances of the industry's potential involvement in solving the problem.

There are several areas that require more research attention, especially in relation to inform the design of interventions. For example, although both gambling and video gaming are less popular among females than males, female users are similarly at risk of becoming addicted. However, we have insufficient knowledge of the specific characteristics and needs of female gamers and gamblers. It is also a question needing more research, whether abstinence is the only good therapeutic goal for gaming disorder or use in moderation can also be set in certain cases (e.g., in less severe cases such as those falling under the 'hazardous gaming' category according to the ICD-11). One of the most important challenges is the lack of data regarding effective measures on all levels, including prevention, treatment, and policy. More research with better quality is necessary, including longitudinal studies, studies with clinical samples and studies investigating minors and women.

Another important challenge is that while the gambling industry is regulated, and several measures are introduced to mitigate the potential harm caused by problem gambling, the video gaming industry does not acknowledge the potential risks associated with their products and denies their responsibility completely at the moment. Therefore, possible steps to mitigate harm through policy actions should be considered and thoroughly researched. Policy measures should target the gaming industry to make them admit their role in the development of the problem and to take responsibility at least as much as the gambling industry. Furthermore, even though evidence-based policies are preferred and needed in the long term, due to the clear harm video games can cause to vulnerable individuals, certain measures could be implemented even before their efficacy is fully proven to avoid delay in action.

Although addiction is the most emphasised problem regarding internet use and online activities, it is certainly not the only important danger. The internet and mobile technology, including online gambling and gaming, are platforms for a series of other potentially harmful phenomena like different types of toxic behaviours, cyberbullying, cybercrime, cybersecurity, etc., which should also be thoroughly investigated and addressed by research and policy making.

Due to rapid technological advancement, online gaming, gambling and related phenomena (e.g., skin betting) are continuously changing, posing constant novel challenges to individuals, families, and society as a whole. To address this permanent change and deal with possible negative consequences, monitoring systems should be established to detect new products, monetization models, and structural characteristics that may contribute to an increased potential for addiction at an early stage. Relatedly, increased research and monitoring of new forms of marketing targeting vulnerable groups are also much needed.

As mentioned earlier, it is of utmost importance to achieve cooperation with both industries. Besides the issues of regulation, the data collected by the industry should also be made available for research purposes and to inform prevention and harm reduction measures. By behaviour tracking (i.e., collecting data on their users' online behaviour), the industry owns data, which is the most suitable to identify players at risk and could be effectively used in harm reduction, prevention and intervention on all levels. Therefore, the industry should be made interested or even forced to share such data with researchers to help identify vulnerable players and/or create safer games and gambling tools.

To summarise the above, while we can see many aspects of the problem at the moment, further efforts are needed to understand it accurately and explore it in a complex way. Moreover, the development of the necessary responses is still at a very early stage. This, of course, requires taking into account the complexity of the phenomenon. According to research, there are significant differences in the problem behaviours and/or their perception along with several key factors such as age, gender or culture. For instance, children and adolescents are specifically vulnerable, and treating the problem in their cases more actively involves their parents and other family members than in the case of adults. Furthermore, different generations tend to perceive these activities very differently; what is common and natural to younger generations may feel very unnatural, scary, or upsetting for the elderly. Another example is that women may have qualitatively different experiences while playing online games or gambling online compared to men, which again asks for group-specific interventions. Culture is also a crucial factor which should be fully considered when addressing the problems. In sum, prevention, intervention, and regulatory/policy approaches and measures cannot be 'one size fits all'. Rather, they should be as specific and tailored to individual needs as possible, while the international harmonisation of such a global problem also calls attention.

* * *

References

List of references contained in the report on 'Risks and Harms associated with Online Gaming and Gambling' (document P-PG (2024) 2).

1.1. Aims and scope

American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders. 5th edition*. American Psychiatric Association.

World Health Organization. (2019). *ICD-11 for Mortality and Morbidity Statistics*. Retrieved 16 June from <https://icd.who.int/browse11/l-m/en>

1.2. Public health approach

Abbott, M. W. (2020). The changing epidemiology of gambling disorder and gambling-related harm: public health implications. *Public health, 184*, 41-45.

Browne, M, Langham, E, Rawat, V, Greer, N, Li, E, Rose, J, Rockloff, M, Donaldson, P, Thorne, H, Goodwin, B, Bryden, G & Best, T 2016. Assessing gambling-related harm in Victoria: a public health perspective, Victorian Responsible Gambling Foundation, Melbourne, Australia.

Childress, J. F., Faden, R. R., Gaare, R. D., Gostin, L. O., Kahn, J., Bonnie, R. J., ... & Nieburg, P. (2002). Public health ethics: mapping the terrain. *The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics, 30*(2), 170-178.

Donkin, A., Goldblatt, P., Allen, J., Nathanson, V., & Marmot, M. (2017). Global action on the social determinants of health. *BMJ Global Health, 3*(Suppl 1), e000603.

Delfabbro, P., & King, D. L. (2020). On the limits and challenges of public health approaches in addressing gambling-related problems. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction, 18*, 844-859.

Long, J., Bhad, R., Potenza, M. N., Orsolini, L., Phan, V., Kanabar, M., & Achab, S. (2022). Public health approaches and policy changes after the inclusion of gaming disorder in ICD-11: global needs. *BJPsych international, 19*(3), 63-66.

Sallnow L, Richardson H, Murray SA, Kellehear A. The impact of a new public health approach to end-of-life care: A systematic review. *Palliative Medicine. 2016;30*(3):200-211. doi:10.1177/0269216315599869

Savanthe AM, Savolu CS. Internet gaming disorder: A public health concern. *International Journal of Community Med Public Health 2019;6*:3532-8.

Shaffer, H. J., Blaszczynski, A., & Ladouceur, R. (2020). Considering the public health and Reno models: Strategic and tactical approaches for dealing with gambling-related harms. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction, 18*, 806-818.

Shaffer, H. J., & Korn, D. A. (2002). Gambling and related mental disorders: A public health analysis. *Annual review of public health, 23*(1), 171-212.

van Schalkwyk, M. C., Petticrew, M., Cassidy, R., Adams, P., McKee, M., Reynolds, J., & Orford, J. (2021). A public health approach to gambling regulation: countering powerful influences. *The Lancet Public Health, 6*(8), e614-e619.

Wardle, H., Reith, G., Langham, E., & Rogers, R. D. (2019). Gambling and public health: we need policy action to prevent harm. *BMJ, 365*, 11807.

2. Definition of the problems

2.3.1. Cyberbullying / toxic behaviour

Blackburn, J., & Kwak, H. (2014). STFU NOOB! predicting crowdsourced decisions on toxic behavior in online games. *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on World Wide Web, 877-888*.

- Engelhardt, C. R., & Bartholow, B. D. (2013). Effects of situational cues on aggressive behavior. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 7(10), 762-774. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12067>
- Kou, Y. (2020). Toxic behaviors in team-based competitive gaming: The case of League of Legends. *Proceedings of the Annual Symposium on Computer-Human Interaction in Play*, 81-92.
- Kordyaka, B. (2018). Digital poison—Approaching a theory of toxic behavior in MOBA games. *Thirty Ninth International Conference on Information Systems, San Francisco*.
- Kowert, R. (2020). Dark participation in games. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 2969. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.598947>
- Lemercier-Dugarin, M., Romo, L., Tijus, C., & Zerhouni, O. (2021). “Who are the Cyka Blyat?” How empathy, impulsivity, and motivations to play predict aggressive behaviors in multiplayer online games. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior and Social Networking*, 24(1), 63-69. <https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2020.0041>
- Monge, C. K., & O'Brien, T. C. (2022). Effects of individual toxic behavior on team performance in League of Legends. *Media Psychology*, 25(1), 82-105. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15213269.2020.1868322>
- TaeHyuk Keum, B., & Hearn, M. (2022). Online gaming and racism: Impact on psychological distress among Black, Asian, and Latinx emerging adults. *Games and Culture*, 17(3), 445-460. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15554120211039082>
- Türkay, S., Formosa, J., Adinolf, S., Cuthbert, R., & Altizer, R. (2020). See no evil, hear no evil, speak no evil: How collegiate players define, experience and cope with toxicity. *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1-13.
- Zsila, Á., Shabahang, R., Aruguete, M. S., & Orosz, G. (2022). Toxic behaviors in online multiplayer games: Prevalence, perception, risk factors of victimization, and psychological consequences. *Aggressive Behavior*, 48(3), 356-364. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.22023>

2.3.2. Cybersecurity

- Choi, K. S. (2008). Computer crime victimization and integrated theory: An empirical assessment. *International Journal of Cyber Criminology*, 2(1), 308-333.
- Choi, K. S., & Lee, J. R. (2017). Theoretical analysis of cyber-interpersonal violence victimization and offending using cyber-routine activities theory. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 73, 394-402. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.03.061>
- Choi, K. S., Cho, S., & Lee, J. R. (2019). Impacts of online risky behaviors and cybersecurity management on cyberbullying and traditional bullying victimization among Korean youth: Application of cyber-routine activities theory with latent class analysis. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 100, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2019.06.007>
- Craig, W., Boniel-Nissim, M., King, N., Walsh, S. D., Boer, M., Donnelly, P. D., ... & Pickett, W. (2020). Social media use and cyber-bullying: A cross-national analysis of young people in 42 countries. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 66(6), S100-S108. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2020.03.006>
- Kowert, R. (2020). Dark participation in games. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 2969. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.598947>

2.3.3. Social gaming and social casino games

- Gainsbury, S. M., King, D. L., Russell, A. M., Delfabbro, P., & Hing, N. (2017). Virtual addictions: An examination of problematic social casino game use among at-risk gamblers. *Addictive behaviors*, 64, 334-339.
- King, D. L., Russell, A., Gainsbury, S., Delfabbro, P. H., & Hing, N. (2016). The cost of virtual wins: An examination of gambling-related risks in youth who spend money on social casino games. *Journal of Behavioral Addictions*, 5(3), 401-409.
- Sapsted, T. (2013). *Social Casino Gaming: Opportunities for 2013 and Beyond*. London, England: FC Business Intelligence.

2.3.4. Streaming

- Chen, C. Y., & Chang, S. L. (2019). Moderating effects of information-oriented versus escapism-oriented motivations on the relationship between psychological well-being and problematic use of video game live-streaming services. *Journal of Behavioral Addictions*, 8(3), 564-573.

Koncz, P., Demetrovics, Z., Griffiths, M. D., & Király, O. (2023). The potential harm of gambling streams to minors. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaac.2023.01.020>

2.3.5. Esports, esports betting and skin gambling

Bányai, F., Griffiths, M. D., Demetrovics, Z., & Király, O. (2019). The mediating effect of motivations between psychiatric distress and gaming disorder among esports gamers and recreational gamers. *Comprehensive psychiatry*, *94*, 152117.

Czakó, A., Király, O., Koncz, P., Yu, S. M., Mangat, H. S., Glynn, J., Romero, P., Griffiths, M. D., Rumpf, H.-J., Demetrovics, Z., (2023). Safer esports for players, spectators, and bettors: Issues, challenges, and policy recommendations. *Journal of Behavioral Addictions*, *12*(1), 1-8.

Chung, T., Sum, S., Chan, M., Lai, E., & Cheng, N. (2019). Will esports result in a higher prevalence of problematic gaming? A review of the global situation. *Journal of behavioral addictions*, *8*(3), 384-394.

Gambling Commission. (2017). *Virtual currencies, eSports and social casino gaming—Position paper*. Birmingham: Gambling Commission. Available at <https://assets.ctfassets.net/j16ev64qyf6l/7jRMC5FrbFkFXKhmN2rajn/f77a0e6dd36f2e8157c4bbaf53dc2eb7/Virtual-currencies-eSports-and-social-casino-gaming.pdf>. Accessed 31 Aug 2023.

2.4. Other online behaviours not discussed in this report

2.5. Similarities and differences between gambling and gaming

2.6. Convergencies between gambling and gaming

Drummond, A., Hall, L. C., & Sauer, J. D. (2022). Surprisingly high prevalence rates of severe psychological distress among consumers who purchase loot boxes in video games. *Scientific reports*, *12*(1), 16128. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-022-20549-1>

Gainsbury, S. M. (2019). Gaming-gambling convergence: Research, regulation, and reactions. *Gaming Law Review*, *23*(2), 80-83.

Garea, S. S., Drummond, A., Sauer, J. D., Hall, L. C., & Williams, M. N. (2021). Meta-analysis of the relationship between problem gambling, excessive gaming and loot box spending. *International Gambling Studies*, *21*(3), 460-479. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14459795.2021.1914705>

Király, O., Zhang, J., Demetrovics, Z., & Browne, D. T. (2021). Gambling features and monetization in video Games Creates challenges for young people, families, and clinicians. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, *10*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaac.2021.12.003>

3. Overview of the problem: online gambling and gaming

3.1. Assessment

Dellis, A., Sharp, C., Hofmeyr, A., Schwardmann, P. M., Spurrett, D., Rousseau, J., & Ross, D. (2014). Criterion-related and construct validity of the Problem Gambling Severity Index in a sample of South African gamblers. *South African Journal of Psychology*, *44*(2), 243-257.

Goodie, A. S., MacKillop, J., Miller, J. D., Fortune, E. E., Maples, J., Lance, C. E., & Campbell, W. K. (2013). Evaluating the South Oaks Gambling Screen with DSM-IV and DSM-5 criteria: Results from a diverse community sample of gamblers. *Assessment*, *20*(5), 523-531.

King, D. L., Chamberlain, S. R., Carragher, N., Billieux, J., Stein, D., Mueller, K., Potenza, M. N., Rumpf, H. J., Saunders, J., & Starcevic, V. (2020). Screening and assessment tools for gaming disorder: A comprehensive systematic review. *Clin Psychol Rev*, *77*, 101831.

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.

Maraz, A., Király, O., & Demetrovics, Z. (2015). The diagnostic pitfalls of surveys: if you score positive on a test of addiction, you still have a good chance not to be addicted. A response to Billieux et al. 2015. *Journal of Behavioral Addictions*, *4*(3), 151-154. <https://doi.org/10.1556/2006.4.2015.026>

Lemmens, J. S., Valkenburg, P. M., & Gentile, D. A. (2015). The internet gaming disorder scale. *Psychological assessment*, *27*(2), 567.

Park, H. S., & Jung, S. Y. (2012). Development of a gambling addictive behavior scale for adolescents in Korea. *Journal of Korean Academy of Nursing*, *42*(7), 957-964.

- 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.
- Room, R., Turner, N. E., & Ialomiteanu, A. (1999). Community effects of the opening of the Niagara casino. *Addiction*, 94(10), 1449-1466.
- Tremblay, J., Stinchfield, R., Wiebe, J., & Wynne, H. (2010). Canadian adolescent gambling inventory (CAGI): Phase III final report. Canadian Centre on Substance Abuse Ottawa.
- Weinstock, J., Whelan, J. P., Meyers, A. W., & McCausland, C. (2007). The performance of two pathological gambling screens in college students. *Assessment*, 14(4), 399-407.
- Winters, K. C., Stinchfield, R. D., & Fulkerson, J. (1993). Toward the development of an adolescent gambling problem severity scale. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 9, 63-84.
- 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. *J Addict Res Ther*, 6, 003.

3.2. Epidemiological overview

- Chia, D. X., Ng, C. W., Kandasami, G., Seow, M. Y., Choo, C. C., Chew, P. K., Lee, C., & Zhang, M. W. (2020). Prevalence of internet addiction and gaming disorders in Southeast Asia: A meta-analysis. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(7), 2582.
- Kim, H. S., Son, G., Roh, E.-B., Ahn, W.-Y., Kim, J., Shin, S.-H., Chey, J., & Choi, K.-H. (2022). Prevalence of gaming disorder: A meta-analysis. *Addict Behav*, 126, 107183.
- Király, O., Nagygyörgy, K., Koronczai, B., Griffiths, M. D., & Demetrovics, Z. (2015). Assessment of problematic internet use and online video gaming. *Mental health in the digital age: Grave dangers, great promise*, 46-68.
- Király, O., Potenza, M. N., & Demetrovics, Z. (2022). Gaming disorder: current research directions. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 47, 101204.
- Montiel, I., Ortega-Barón, J., Basterra-González, A., González-Cabrera, J., & Machimbarrena, J. M. (2021). Problematic online gambling among adolescents: A systematic review about prevalence and related measurement issues. *J Behav Addict*, 10(3), 566-586.
- Mora-Salgueiro, J., García-Estela, A., Hogg, B., Angarita-Osorio, N., Amann, B. L., Carlbring, P., Jiménez-Murcia, S., Pérez-Sola, V., & Colom, F. (2021). The prevalence and clinical and sociodemographic factors of problem online gambling: A systematic review. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 37(3), 899-926.
- 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.
- Stevens, M. W., Dorstyn, D., Delfabbro, P. H., & King, D. L. (2021). Global prevalence of gaming disorder: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 55(6), 553-568.

3.3. Demographic issues

- Király, O., Koncz, P., Griffiths, M. D., & Demetrovics, Z. (2023). Gaming disorder: A summary of its characteristics and aetiology. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, 122, 152376.
- Stevens, M. W., Dorstyn, D., Delfabbro, P. H., & King, D. L. (2021). Global prevalence of gaming disorder: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 55(6), 553-568.

3.4. Cultural differences

- Calado, F., & Griffiths, M. D. (2016). Problem gambling worldwide: An update and systematic review of empirical research (2000–2015). *J Behav Addict*, 5(4), 592-613.
- Cheng, C., Cheung, M. W.-L., & Wang, H.-y. (2018). Multinational comparison of internet gaming disorder and psychosocial problems versus well-being: Meta-analysis of 20 countries. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 88, 153-167.
- Kiraly, O. (2018). Intense gaming is not essentially problematic: A cross-cultural analysis. *J Behav Addict*.
- Kiraly, O., Choi, S.-W., Ramos-Diaz, J., Guevara-Cordero, C., Rahimi-Movaghar, A., Lukavska, K., Hrabec, O., Miovisky, M., Billieux, J., & Deleuze, J. (2018). Do gaming motives mediate between psychiatric symptoms and problematic online gaming? A cross-cultural study. *J Behav Addict*,

Stevens, M. W., Dorstyn, D., Delfabbro, P. H., & King, D. L. (2021). Global prevalence of gaming disorder: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 55(6), 553-568.

3.5. Minority groups

- Carson, N., B, L. C., Chen, C. N., & Alegria, M. (2012). Racial/ethnic differences in video game and Internet use among US adolescents with mental health and educational difficulties. *J Child Media*, 6(4), 450-468. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17482798.2012.724592>
- Devault-Tousignant, C., Lavoie, N., Audette-Chapdelaine, S., Auger, A.-M., Côté, M., Cotton, J.-C., & Brodeur, M. (2023). Gambling among LGBTQIA2S+ populations: a scoping review. *Addiction Research & Theory*, 31(1), 60-68.
- Gáspár-Szilágyi, S., & Pearson, A. (2022). Facebook with money: the rise of online brokerage platforms and vulnerable groups. *Legal Studies*, 42(3), 377-395.
- Okuda, M., Liu, W., Cisewski, J. A., Segura, L., Storr, C. L., & Martins, S. S. (2016). Gambling disorder and minority populations: Prevalence and risk factors. *Current Addiction Reports*, 3, 280-292.
- Stanmyre, J., Nower, L., Malkin, M., & DiMeglio, R. (2023). Problem gambling severity and LGBTQ+ status: Evaluating influence of age and comorbid mental health and substance use problems.
- TaeHyuk Keum, B., & Hearn, M. (2022). Online gaming and racism: Impact on psychological distress among Black, Asian, and Latinx emerging adults. *Games and Culture*, 17(3), 445-460.

3.6. Children and adolescents

- Bussone, S., Trentini, C., Tambelli, R., & Carola, V. (2020). Early-life interpersonal and affective risk factors for pathological gaming. *Front Psychiatry*, 11, 423.
- Cuong, V. M., Assanangkornchai, S., Wichaidit, W., Minh Hanh, V. T., & My Hanh, H. T. (2021). Associations between gaming disorder, parent-child relationship, parental supervision, and discipline styles: Findings from a school-based survey during the COVID-19 pandemic in Vietnam. *J Behav Addict*, 10(3), 722-730.
- ESPAD (2019) <https://data.espad.org/gambling-and-online-gambling/>
- Jeong, H., Yim, H. W., Lee, S.-Y., Lee, H. K., Potenza, M. N., Jo, S.-J., & Son, H. J. (2020). A partial mediation effect of father-child attachment and self-esteem between parental marital conflict and subsequent features of internet gaming disorder in children: a 12-month follow-up study. *BMC Public Health*, 20(1), 1-10.
- King, D. L., Russell, A., & Hing, N. (2020). Adolescent land-based and internet gambling: Australian and international prevalence rates and measurement issues. *Current Addiction Reports*, 7, 137-148.
- Király, O., Billieux, J., King, D. L., Urbán, R., Koncz, P., Polgár, E., & Demetrovics, Z. (2022). A comprehensive model to understand and assess the motivational background of video game use: The Gaming Motivation Inventory (GMI). *J Behav Addict*, 11(3), 796-819.
- Király, O., Potenza, M. N., Stein, D. J., King, D. L., Hodgins, D. C., Saunders, J. B., Griffiths, M. D., Gjonneska, B., Billieux, J., & Brand, M. (2020). Preventing problematic internet use during the COVID-19 pandemic: Consensus guidance. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, 152180.
- Rehbein, F., & Baier, D. (2013). Family-, media-, and school-related risk factors of video game addiction. *Journal of Media Psychology*.
- Schneider, L. A., King, D. L., & Delfabbro, P. H. (2017). Family factors in adolescent problematic Internet gaming: A systematic review. *J Behav Addict*, 6(3), 321-333. <https://doi.org/10.1556/2006.6.2017.035>
- Stevens, M. W., Dorstyn, D., Delfabbro, P. H., & King, D. L. (2021). Global prevalence of gaming disorder: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 55(6), 553-568.
- Su, B., Yu, C., Zhang, W., Su, Q., Zhu, J., & Jiang, Y. (2018). Father-child longitudinal relationship: Parental monitoring and Internet gaming disorder in Chinese adolescents. *Front Psychol*, 9, 95.
- Sung, Y., Nam, T.-H., & Hwang, M. H. (2020). Attachment style, stressful events, and Internet gaming addiction in Korean university students. *Personality and individual differences*, 154, 109724.
- 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. *J Behav Addict*, 8(1), 48-62. <https://doi.org/10.1556/2006.8.2019.05>

3.7. Aetiology

- Cudo, A., Kopsiś, N., & Zabielska-Mendyk, E. (2019). Personal distress as a mediator between self-esteem, self-efficacy, loneliness and problematic video gaming in female and male emerging adult gamers. *PLoS One*, 14(12), e0226213.
- Eisen, S. A., Lin, N., Lyons, M. J., & Scherrer, J. F. (1998). Familial influences on gambling behavior: an analysis of 3359 twin pairs. *Addiction*, 93(9), 1375.
- Fauth-Bühler, M., & Mann, K. (2017). Neurobiological correlates of internet gaming disorder: Similarities to pathological gambling. *Addict Behav*, 64, 349-356.
- Gyollai, Á., D Griffiths, M., Barta, C., Vereczkei, A., Urbán, R., Kun, B., Kokonyei, G., Székely, A., Sasvári-Székely, M., & Blum, K. (2014). The genetics of problem and pathological gambling: a systematic review. *Current pharmaceutical design*, 20(25), 3993-3999.
- Kim, H. S., Wohl, M. J., Gupta, R., & Derevensky, J. L. (2017). Why do young adults gamble online? A qualitative study of motivations to transition from social casino games to online gambling. *Asian journal of gambling issues and public health*, 7, 1-11.
- Lang, M., Leménager, T., Streit, F., Fauth-Bühler, M., Frank, J., Juraeva, D., Witt, S., Degenhardt, F., Hofmann, A., & Heilmann-Heimbach, S. (2016). Genome-wide association study of pathological gambling. *European Psychiatry*, 36, 38-46.
- Lind, P. A., Zhu, G., Montgomery, G. W., Madden, P. A., Heath, A. C., Martin, N. G., & Slutske, W. S. (2013). Genome-wide association study of a quantitative disordered gambling trait. *Addiction biology*, 18(3), 511-522.
- Mestre-Bach, G., Steward, T., Granero, R., Fernández-Aranda, F., Mena-Moreno, T., Vintró-Alcaraz, C., Lozano-Madrid, M., Menchón, J. M., Potenza, M. N., & Jiménez-Murcia, S. (2020). Dimensions of impulsivity in gambling disorder. *Sci Rep*, 10(1), 397.
- Neophytou, K., Theodorou, M., Artemi, T.-F., Theodorou, C., & Panayiotou, G. (2023). Gambling to escape: A systematic review of the relationship between avoidant emotion regulation/coping strategies and gambling severity. *Journal of Contextual Behavioral Science*.
- Pace, U., D'Urso, G., Ruggieri, S., Schimmenti, A., & Passanisi, A. (2021). The role of narcissism, hyper-competitiveness and maladaptive coping strategies on male adolescent regular gamblers: Two mediation models. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 37, 571-582.
- Parke, A., Harris, A., Parke, J., Rigbye, J., & Blaszczynski, A. (2014). Responsible marketing and advertising in gambling: A critical review. *The journal of gambling business and economics*, 8(3), 21-35.
- Perez de Castro, I., Ibanez, A., Saiz-Ruiz, J., & Fernandez-Piqueras, J. (2002). Concurrent positive association between pathological gambling and functional DNA polymorphisms at the MAO-A and the 5-HT transporter genes. *Molecular psychiatry*, 7(9), 927-928.
- Potenza, M. N., Balodis, I. M., Derevensky, J., Grant, J. E., Petry, N. M., Verdejo-Garcia, A., & Yip, S. W. (2019). Gambling disorder. *Nature reviews Disease primers*, 5(1), 51.
- Sabbatini da Silva Lobo, D., Vallada, H. P., Knight, J., Martins, S. S., Tavares, H., Gentil, V., & Kennedy, J. L. (2007). Dopamine genes and pathological gambling in discordant sib-pairs. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 23, 421-433.
- Sirola, A., Kaakinen, M., & Oksanen, A. (2018). Excessive gambling and online gambling communities. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 34(4), 1313-1325.
- Slutske, W. S., Cho, S. B., Piasecki, T. M., & Martin, N. G. (2013). Genetic overlap between personality and risk for disordered gambling: evidence from a national community-based Australian twin study. *J Abnorm Psychol*, 122(1), 250.
- Spicer, S. G., Fullwood, C., Close, J., Nicklin, L. L., Lloyd, J., & Lloyd, H. (2022). Loot boxes and problem gambling: Investigating the "gateway hypothesis". *Addict Behav*, 131, 107327.
- Wilson, D., da Silva Lobo, D. S., Tavares, H., Gentil, V., & Vallada, H. (2013). Family-based association analysis of serotonin genes in pathological gambling disorder: evidence of vulnerability risk in the 5HT-2A receptor gene. *Journal of Molecular Neuroscience*, 49, 550-553.

3.8. Structural characteristics of gambling and gaming

- Billieux, J., Deleuze, J., Griffiths, M. D., & Kuss, D. J. (2015). Internet gaming addiction: The case of massively multiplayer online roleplaying games. *Textbook of addiction treatment: International perspectives*, 1515-1525.
- Brady, A., & Prentice, G. (2021). Are Loot Boxes Addictive? Analyzing Participant's Physiological Arousal While Opening a Loot Box. *Games and Culture*, 16(4), 419-433.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1555412019895359>

- Castrén, S., Järvinen-Tassopoulos, J., & Raitasalo, K. (2021). Money used in gaming is associated with problem gambling: Results of the ESPAD 2019 Finland. *J Behav Addict*, 10(4), 932-940. <https://doi.org/10.1556/2006.2021.00076>
- Close, J., Spicer, S. G., Nicklin, L. L., Uther, M., Lloyd, J., & Lloyd, H. (2021). Secondary analysis of loot box data: Are high-spending "whales" wealthy gamers or problem gamblers? *Addict Behav*, 117, 106851. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2021.106851>
- Dreier, M., Wöfling, K., Duven, E., Giralt, S., Beutel, M. E., & Müller, K. W. (2017). Free-to-play: About addicted Whales, at risk Dolphins and healthy Minnows. *Monetization design and Internet Gaming Disorder. Addict Behav*, 64, 328-333.
- Fineberg, N. A., Demetrovics, Z., Stein, D. J., Ioannidis, K., Potenza, M. N., Grünblatt, E., Brand, M., Billieux, J., Carmi, L., King, D. L., Grant, J. E., Yücel, M., Dell'Osso, B., Rumpf, H. J., Hall, N., Hollander, E., Goudriaan, A., Menchon, J., Zohar, J., . . . Chamberlain, S. R. (2018). Manifesto for a European research network into Problematic Usage of the Internet. *European Neuropsychopharmacology*. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euroneuro.2018.08.004>
- King, D., Delfabbro, P., & Griffiths, M. (2010). Video game structural characteristics: A new psychological taxonomy. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*, 8, 90-106.
- King, D. L., & Delfabbro, P. H. (2018). Predatory monetization schemes in video games (eg 'loot boxes') and internet gaming disorder.
- King, D. L., Delfabbro, P. H., Gainsbury, S. M., Dreier, M., Greer, N., & Billieux, J. (2019). Unfair play? Video games as exploitative monetized services: An examination of game patents from a consumer protection perspective. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 101, 131-143. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2019.07.017>
- King, D. L., Delfabbro, P. H., Perales, J. C., Deleuze, J., Király, O., Krossbakken, E., & Billieux, J. (2019). Maladaptive player-game relationships in problematic gaming and gaming disorder: A systematic review. *Clin Psychol Rev*, 73, 101777.
- OECD, Dark commercial patterns, OECD Digital Economy Papers, No. 336, OECD Publishing (2022)
- Rehbein, F., King, D. L., Staudt, A., Hayer, T., & Rumpf, H.-J. (2021). Contribution of game genre and structural game characteristics to the risk of problem gaming and gaming disorder: A systematic review. *Current Addiction Reports*, 8(2), 263-281.
- 5Rights Foundation. (2023). *Disrupted childhood: The cost of persuasive design*. <https://5rightsfoundation.com/uploads/Disrupted-Childhood-2023-v2.pdf>
- Szolin, K., Kuss, D., Nuyens, F., & Griffiths, M. (2022). Gaming Disorder: A systematic review exploring the user-avatar relationship in videogames. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 128, 107124.

4. Risks and harms related to online gambling and gaming

4.1. Consequences on physical health

- Gainsbury, S., Parke, J., & Suhonen, N. (2013). Consumer attitudes towards Internet gambling: Perceptions of responsible gambling policies, consumer protection, and regulation of online gambling sites. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29(1), 235-245.
- Hing, N., Gainsbury, S., Blaszczynski, A., Wood, R., Lubman, D., & Russell, A. (2014). Interactive gambling. *Gambling Research Australia by the Office of Liquor, Gaming and Racing*
- Mylona, I., Deres, E. S., Dere, G.-D. S., Tsinopoulos, I., & Glynatsis, M. (2020). The Impact of Internet and Videogaming Addiction on Adolescent Vision: A Review of the Literature [Mini Review]. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2020.00063>
- Siemens, J. C., & Kopp, S. W. (2011). The Influence of Online Gambling Environments on Self-Control. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 30(2), 279-293. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jppm.30.2.279>
- Thorne, H. B., Rockloff, M. J., Ferguson, S. A., Vincent, G. E., & Browne, M. (2021). Gambling Problems Are Associated with Alcohol Misuse and Insomnia: Results from a Representative National Telephone Survey. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*, 18(13). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18136683>

4.2. Mental health consequences (co-occurring disorders)

- Ji, Y., Yin, M. X. C., Zhang, A. Y., & Wong, D. F. K. (2022). Risk and protective factors of Internet gaming disorder among Chinese people: A meta-analysis. *Aust N Z J Psychiatry*, 56(4), 332-346. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00048674211025703>
- Kessler, R. C., Hwang, I., LaBrie, R., Petukhova, M., Sampson, N. A., Winters, K. C., & Shaffer, H. J. (2008). DSM-IV pathological gambling in the National Comorbidity Survey Replication. *Psychological medicine*, 38(9), 1351-1360.
- Koncz, P., Demetrovics, Z., Takács, Z. K., Griffiths, M. D., Tamás, N., & Király, O. (2023). The emerging evidence on the association between symptoms of ADHD and gaming disorder: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 102343.
- Kuss, D. J., Pontes, H. M., & Griffiths, M. D. (2018). Neurobiological Correlates in Internet Gaming Disorder: A Systematic Literature Review [Review]. *Front Psychiatry*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2018.00166>
- Mazurek, M. O., & Engelhardt, C. R. (2013). Video game use in boys with autism spectrum disorder, ADHD, or typical development. *Pediatrics*, 132(2), 260-266. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2012-3956>
- Murray, A., Koronczai, B., Király, O., Griffiths, M. D., Mannion, A., Leader, G., & Demetrovics, Z. (2022). Autism, Problematic Internet Use and Gaming Disorder: A Systematic Review. *Review Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 9(1), 120-140. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40489-021-00243-0>
- Ostinelli, E. G., Zangani, C., Giordano, B., Maestri, D., Gambini, O., D'Agostino, A., Furukawa, T. 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. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2021.02.014>
- Potenza, M. N., Balodis, I. M., Derevensky, J., Grant, J. E., Petry, N. M., Verdejo-Garcia, A., & Yip, S. W. (2019). Gambling disorder. *Nature reviews Disease primers*, 5(1), 51.
- Shaffer, H. J., & Korn, D. A. (2002). Gambling and related mental disorders: a public health analysis. *Annu Rev Public Health*, 23, 171-212. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.publhealth.23.100901.140532>
- Sharman, S., Roberts, A., Harris, B., Lockwood, R., & Bowden-Jones, H. (2022). The National Centre for Gaming Disorders (UK) - Who is accessing this service? *J Behav Addict*, 11(2), 147-149. <https://doi.org/10.1556/2006.2022.00010>
- Yu, Y., Yang, X., Wang, S., Wang, H., Chang, R., Tsamlag, L., Zhang, S., Xu, C., Yu, X., Cai, Y., & Lau, J. T. F. (2020). Serial multiple mediation of the association between internet gaming disorder and suicidal ideation by insomnia and depression in adolescents in Shanghai, China. *BMC psychiatry*, 20(1), 460. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-020-02870-z>

4.3. Substance use

- Horváth, Z., Király, O., Demetrovics, Z., Németh, Á., Várnai, D., & Urbán, R. (2022). Polysubstance Use Is Positively Associated with Gaming Disorder Symptom Severity: A Latent Class Analytical Study. *Eur Addict Res*, 28(1), 12-22. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000517042>
- Kraus, L., Room, R., Livingston, M., Pennay, A., Holmes, J., & Törrönen, J. (2020). Long waves of consumption or a unique social generation? Exploring recent declines in youth drinking. *Addiction Research & Theory*, 28(3), 183-193. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16066359.2019.1629426>
- Petry, N. M., Stinson, F. S., & Grant, B. F. (2005). Comorbidity of DSM-IV pathological gambling and other psychiatric disorders: results from the National Epidemiologic Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions. *J Clin Psychiatry*, 66(5), 564-574. <https://doi.org/10.4088/jcp.v66n0504>
- Strizek, J., Atzendorf, J., Kraus, L., Monshouwer, K., Puhm, A., & Uhl, A. (2020). Perceived problems with adolescent online gaming: National differences and correlations with substance use. *J Behav Addict*, 9(3), 629-641. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1556/2006.2020.00061>

4.4. Interpersonal consequences: Families and social relationships

- Corney, R., & Davis, J. (2010). Female frequent internet gamblers: A qualitative study investigating the role of family, social situation and work. *Community, Work & Family*, 13(3), 291-309.
- Hodgins, D. C., Shead, N. W., & Makarchuk, K. (2007). Relationship satisfaction and psychological distress among concerned significant others of pathological gamblers. *J Nerv Ment Dis*, 195(1), 65-71.

- Jimenez-Murcia, S., Tremblay, J., Stinchfield, R., Granero, R., Fernandez-Aranda, F., Mestre-Bach, G., Steward, T., del Pino-Gutierrez, A., Bano, M., & Moragas, L. (2017). The involvement of a concerned significant other in gambling disorder treatment outcome. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 33, 937-953.
- Nielsen, P., Favez, N., & Rigter, H. (2020). Parental and family factors associated with problematic gaming and problematic internet use in adolescents: A systematic literature review. *Current Addiction Reports*, 7, 365-386.
- Schneider, L. A., King, D. L., & Delfabbro, P. H. (2017). Family factors in adolescent problematic Internet gaming: A systematic review. *J Behav Addict*, 6(3), 321-333. <https://doi.org/10.1556/2006.6.2017.035>

4.5. Society at large

- Abbott, M. W. (2020a). The changing epidemiology of gambling disorder and gambling-related harm: public health implications. *Public Health*, 184, 41-45. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhe.2020.04.003>
- Abbott, M. W. (2020b). Gambling and gambling-related harm: recent World Health Organization initiatives. *Public Health*, 184, 56-59. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhe.2020.04.001>
- Browne, M., Bellringer, M., Greer, N., Kolandai-Matchett, K., Langham, E., Rockloff, M., Du Preez, K., & Abbott, M. (2017). Measuring the burden of gambling harm in New Zealand.
- Browne, M., Langham, E., Rawat, V., Greer, N., Li, E., Rose, J., Rockloff, M., Donaldson, P., Thorne, H., & Goodwin, B. (2020). Assessing gambling-related harm in Victoria: a public health perspective. Victorian Responsible Gambling Foundation, 2016. Melbourne. In.
- Fineberg, N. A., & Potenza, M. N. (2023). Addressing problematic use of the Internet and related compulsive and addictive behaviors. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 51, 101279. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2023.101279>
- Jacques, C., Fortin-Guichard, D., Bergeron, P.-Y., Boudreault, C., Lévesque, D., & Giroux, I. (2016). Gambling content in Facebook games: A common phenomenon? *Computers in Human Behavior*, 57, 48-53.
- Rumpf, H.-J., Effertz, T., & Montag, C. (2022). The cost burden of problematic internet usage. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 44, 101107. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2022.101107>

4.6. Legal issues

- Fineberg, N. A., Demetrovics, Z., Stein, D. J., Ioannidis, K., Potenza, M. N., Grünblatt, E., Brand, M., Billieux, J., Carmi, L., King, D. L., Grant, J. E., Yücel, M., Dell'Osso, B., Rumpf, H. J., Hall, N., Hollander, E., Goudriaan, A., Menchon, J., Zohar, J., . . . Chamberlain, S. R. (2018). Manifesto for a European research network into Problematic Usage of the Internet. *European Neuropsychopharmacology*. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euroneuro.2018.08.004>
- Gainsbury, S., & Wood, R. (2011). Internet gambling policy in critical comparative perspective: The effectiveness of existing regulatory frameworks. *International Gambling Studies*, 11(3), 309-323.
- Gainsbury, S. M. (2015). Online Gambling Addiction: the Relationship Between Internet Gambling and Disordered Gambling. *Current Addiction Reports*, 2(2), 185-193. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40429-015-0057-8>
- Murch, W. S., & Clark, L. (2016). Games in the Brain: Neural Substrates of Gambling Addiction. *Neuroscientist*, 22(5), 534-545. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073858415591474>

5. Current responses on online gambling and gaming

5.1. Regulatory approaches and policies

- Abbott, M. W. (2020). Gambling and gambling-related harm: recent World Health Organization initiatives. *Public Health*, 184, 56–59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.PUHE.2020.04.001>
- Bowden-Jones, H., Dickson, C., Dunand, C., & Simon, O. (2019). *Harm Reduction for Gambling: A Public Health Approach* (O. Bowden-Jones, H., Dickson, C., Dunand, C., & Simon, Ed.; 1st editio). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429490750>
- Cosgrave, J. F. (2010). Embedded Addiction: The social production of gambling knowledge and the development of gambling markets. In © *Canadian Journal of Sociology* (Vol. 35, Issue 1).

- Fiedler, I., Kairouz, S., & Reynolds, J. (2021). Corporate social responsibility vs. financial interests: the case of responsible gambling programs. *Journal of Public Health (Germany)*, 29(4), 993–1000. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10389-020-01219-W>
- Gainsbury, S. M., Angus, D. J., & Blaszczynski, A. (2019). Isolating the impact of specific gambling activities and modes on problem gambling and psychological distress in internet gamblers. *BMC Public Health*, 19(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-019-7738-5>
- Gainsbury, S., & Wood, R. (2011). Internet gambling policy in critical comparative perspective: the effectiveness of existing regulatory frameworks. *International Gambling Studies*, 11(3), 309–323. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14459795.2011.619553>
- Gandullia, L., & Leporatti, L. (2019). Distributional effects of gambling taxes: empirical evidence from Italy. *Journal of Economic Inequality*, 17(4), 565–590. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10888-019-09423-9>
- Häberling, G. (2012). Internet gambling policy in Europe. In *Routledge International Handbook of Internet Gambling* (pp. 284–299). Taylor and Francis. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203814574-27>
- Hahmann, T., Hamilton-Wright, S., Ziegler, C., & Matheson, F. I. (2021). Problem gambling within the context of poverty: a scoping review. *International Gambling Studies*, 21(2), 183–219. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14459795.2020.1819365>
- Kaburakis, A., & Rodenberg, R. M. (2012). Odds: Gambling, Law and Strategy in the European Union. *Business Law International*, 13(1), 2-3,63-96.
- Kingma, S. (2004a). Gambling and the risk society: the liberalisation and legitimisation crisis of gambling in the Netherlands. *International Gambling Studies*, 4(1), 47–67. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1445979042000224403>
- Kingma, S. (2004b). Gambling and the risk society: the liberalisation and legitimisation crisis of gambling in the Netherlands. *International Gambling Studies*, 4(1), 47–67. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1445979042000224403>
- Korn, D. A. (1999). Gambling and the health of the public: adopting a public health perspective. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 15(4), 289–365. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1023005115932>
- Korn, D. A. (2000). Expansion of gambling in Canada: implications for health and social policy. *Canadian Medical Association Journal*, 163(1), 61 LP – 64. <http://www.cmaj.ca/content/163/1/61.abstract>
- Lacy-nichols, J., Nandi, S., Mialon, M., Mccambridge, J., Lee, K., Jones, A., Gilmore, A. B., Galea, S., de Lacy Vawdon, C., Maranha Paes de Carvalho, C., Baum, F., & Moodie, R. (2023). Commercial Determinants of Health 2 Conceptualising commercial entities in public health : beyond unhealthy commodities and transnational corporations. *The Lancet*, 401(10383), 1214–1228. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(23\)00012-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(23)00012-0)
- Laffey, D., Della Sala, V., & Laffey, K. (2016). Patriot games: the regulation of online gambling in the European Union. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 23(10), 1425–1441. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2015.1105281>
- Marionneau, V., Egerer, M., & Nikkinen, J. (2021). How Do State Gambling Monopolies Affect Levels of Gambling Harm? *Current Addiction Reports*, 8(2), 225–234. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S40429-021-00370-Y>
- McMillen, J., & Wright, J. S. F. (2008). Re-regulating the Gambling Industry: Regulatory Reform in Victoria and New South Wales, 1999–2006. *Australian Journal of Political Science*, 43(2), 277–300. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10361140802035788>
- Miers, D. (2015). Regulation and the management of risk in commercial gambling in Great Britain. *International Gambling Studies*, 15(3), 422–434. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14459795.2015.1068352>
- Miers, D. (2016). Social Responsibility and Harm Minimization in Commercial Gambling in Great Britain. *Gaming Law Review and Economics*, 20(2), 164–176. <https://doi.org/10.1089/glr.2016.2024>
- Muggleton, N., Parpart, P., Newall, P., Leake, D., Gathergood, J., & Stewart, N. (2021). The association between gambling and financial, social and health outcomes in big financial data. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 5(3), 319–326. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-020-01045-w>
- Abbott, M. W. (2020). Gambling and gambling-related harm: recent World Health Organization initiatives. *Public Health*, 184, 56–59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.PUHE.2020.04.001>
- Bowden-Jones, H., Dickson, C., Dunand, C., & Simon, O. (2019). *Harm Reduction for Gambling: A Public Health Approach* (O. Bowden-Jones, H., Dickson, C., Dunand, C., & Simon, Ed.; 1st editio). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429490750>
- Cosgrave, J. F. (2010). Embedded Addiction: The social production of gambling knowledge and the development of gambling markets. In © *Canadian Journal of SoCiology* (Vol. 35, Issue 1).
- Fiedler, I., Kairouz, S., & Reynolds, J. (2021). Corporate social responsibility vs. financial interests: the case of responsible gambling programs. *Journal of Public Health (Germany)*, 29(4), 993–1000. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10389-020-01219-W>

- Gainsbury, S. M., Angus, D. J., & Blaszczynski, A. (2019). Isolating the impact of specific gambling activities and modes on problem gambling and psychological distress in internet gamblers. *BMC Public Health*, *19*(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-019-7738-5>
- Gainsbury, S., & Wood, R. (2011). Internet gambling policy in critical comparative perspective: the effectiveness of existing regulatory frameworks. *International Gambling Studies*, *11*(3), 309–323. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14459795.2011.619553>
- Gandullia, L., & Leporatti, L. (2019). Distributional effects of gambling taxes: empirical evidence from Italy. *Journal of Economic Inequality*, *17*(4), 565–590. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10888-019-09423-9>
- Häberling, G. (2012). Internet gambling policy in Europe. In *Routledge International Handbook of Internet Gambling* (pp. 284–299). Taylor and Francis. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203814574-27>
- Hahmann, T., Hamilton-Wright, S., Ziegler, C., & Matheson, F. I. (2021). Problem gambling within the context of poverty: a scoping review. *International Gambling Studies*, *21*(2), 183–219. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14459795.2020.1819365>
- Kaburakis, A., & Rodenberg, R. M. (2012). Odds: Gambling, Law and Strategy in the European Union. *Business Law International*, *13*(1), 2-3,63-96.
- Kingma, S. (2004a). Gambling and the risk society: the liberalisation and legitimisation crisis of gambling in the Netherlands. *International Gambling Studies*, *4*(1), 47–67. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1445979042000224403>
- Kingma, S. (2004b). Gambling and the risk society: the liberalisation and legitimisation crisis of gambling in the Netherlands. *International Gambling Studies*, *4*(1), 47–67. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1445979042000224403>
- Korn, D. A. (1999). Gambling and the health of the public: adopting a public health perspective. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, *15*(4), 289–365. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1023005115932>
- Korn, D. A. (2000). Expansion of gambling in Canada: implications for health and social policy. *Canadian Medical Association Journal*, *163*(1), 61 LP – 64. <http://www.cmaj.ca/content/163/1/61.abstract>
- Lacy-nichols, J., Nandi, S., Mialon, M., Mccambridge, J., Lee, K., Jones, A., Gilmore, A. B., Galea, S., de Lacy Vawdon, C., Maranha Paes de Carvalho, C., Baum, F., & Moodie, R. (2023). Commercial Determinants of Health 2 Conceptualising commercial entities in public health : beyond unhealthy commodities and transnational corporations. *The Lancet*, *401*(10383), 1214–1228. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(23\)00012-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(23)00012-0)
- Laffey, D., Della Sala, V., & Laffey, K. (2016). Patriot games: the regulation of online gambling in the European Union. *Journal of European Public Policy*, *23*(10), 1425–1441. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2015.1105281>
- Marionneau, V., Egerer, M., & Nikkinen, J. (2021). How Do State Gambling Monopolies Affect Levels of Gambling Harm? *Current Addiction Reports*, *8*(2), 225–234. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S40429-021-00370-Y>
- McMillen, J., & Wright, J. S. F. (2008). Re-regulating the Gambling Industry: Regulatory Reform in Victoria and New South Wales, 1999–2006. *Australian Journal of Political Science*, *43*(2), 277–300. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10361140802035788>
- Miers, D. (2015). Regulation and the management of risk in commercial gambling in Great Britain. *International Gambling Studies*, *15*(3), 422–434. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14459795.2015.1068352>
- Miers, D. (2016). Social Responsibility and Harm Minimization in Commercial Gambling in Great Britain. *Gaming Law Review and Economics*, *20*(2), 164–176. <https://doi.org/10.1089/glr.2016.2024>
- Muggleton, N., Parpart, P., Newall, P., Leake, D., Gathergood, J., & Stewart, N. (2021). The association between gambling and financial, social and health outcomes in big financial data. *Nature Human Behaviour*, *5*(3), 319–326. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-020-01045-w>
- Munting, R. (1989). Betting and Business; The Commercialisation of Gambling in Britain. *Business History*, *31*(4), 67–85. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00076798900000085>
- Myllymaa, A. (2017). *The Political Economy of Online Gambling in the European Union* [University of Hlesinki]. urn:ISBN:978-951-51-2987-1
- Nickerson, N. P. (1995). Tourism and gambling content analysis. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *22*(1), 53–66. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383\(94\)00027-P](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(94)00027-P)
- Nower, L., & Glynn, J. (2022). Adopting An Affordability Approach to Responsible Gambling and Harm Reduction: Considerations for Implementation in a North American Context. *Gaming Law Review*, *26*(9), 466–476. <https://doi.org/10.1089/glr.2022.0020>
- Ortiz, V., & Hernandez, H. (2019). Responsible Gambling: Public Health and Social Justice Considerations to Inform Research, Policy, and Practice. In H. J. Shaffer, A. Blaszczynski, R. Ladouceur, D. Fong, & P. Collins (Eds.), *Responsible Gambling: Primary Stakeholder Perspectives*

- (1st ed., pp. 111-C5.P81). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/med-psych/9780190074562.001.0001>
- Planzer, S., Gray, H. M., & Shaffer, H. J. (2014). Associations between national gambling policies and disordered gambling prevalence rates within Europe. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 37(2), 217–229. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IJLP.2013.11.002>
- Rohsler, C. (2022). The Gambling Law Review: United Kingdom. In C. Rohsler (Ed.), *The Gambling Law Review Edition 7* (7th ed., Issue May, pp. 1–16). Memery Crystal LLP. <https://thelawreviews.co.uk/title/the-gambling-law-review/united-kingdom>
- Sauer, R. D. (2001). The political economy of gambling regulation. *Managerial and Decision Economics*, 22(1–3), 5–15. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/mde.996>
- Selin, J. (2016). From self-regulation to regulation – An analysis of gambling policy reform in Finland. *Addiction Research & Theory*, 24(3), 199–208. <https://doi.org/10.3109/16066359.2015.1102894>
- van Schalkwyk, M. C. I., Blythe, J., McKee, M., & Petticrew, M. (2022). Gambling Act review. *The BMJ*, 376. <https://doi.org/10.1136/BMJ.O248>
- van Schalkwyk, M. C. I., Petticrew, M., Cassidy, R., Adams, P., McKee, M., Reynolds, J., & Orford, J. (2021). A public health approach to gambling regulation: countering powerful influences. *The Lancet Public Health*, 6(8), e614–e619. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667\(21\)00098-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(21)00098-0)
- Wardle, H., Degenhardt, L., Ceschia, A., & Saxena, S. (2021). The Lancet Public Health Commission on gambling. *The Lancet Public Health*, 6(1), e2–e3. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667\(20\)30289-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30289-9)
- Young, M., & Markham, F. (2015). Beyond disclosure: gambling research, political economy, and incremental reform. *International Gambling Studies*, 15(1), 6–9. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14459795.2014.995201>
- Zborowska, N., Kingma, S. F., & Brear, P. (2012). Regulation and reputation: The Gibraltar approach. In *Routledge International Handbook of Internet Gambling* (pp. 84–100). Taylor and Francis. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203814574-12>
- Colder Carras, M., Stavropoulos, V., Motti-Stefanidi, F., Labrique, A., & Griffiths, M. D. (2021). Draconian policy measures are unlikely to prevent disordered gaming. *Journal of Behavioral Addictions*. <https://doi.org/10.1556/2006.2021.00075>
- Eurogamer. (2023). *EA loot box lawsuit fails in bid to brand games as gambling*. Retrieved 11 September from <https://www.eurogamer.net/ea-loot-box-lawsuit-fails-in-bid-to-brand-games-as-gambling>
- Global Times. (2022). *Chinese minors' addiction to online games has been largely solved: industry study*. Retrieved 9 September from <https://www.globaltimes.cn/page/202211/1280323.shtml>
- JDSUPRA. (2022). *Recent Rulings Suggest Defendant Wins in Loot Box Cases Are Common, Appeals All Pending*. Retrieved 11 September from <https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/recent-rulings-suggest-defendant-wins-7269685/>
- Király, O., Browne, D. T., & Demetrovics, Z. (2022). Developmental and Family Implications of State-Controlled Video Game Play in China. *JAMA pediatrics*, 176(6), 543-544. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2022.0322>
- The Verge. (2017). *China's new law forces Dota, League of Legends, and other games to reveal odds of scoring good loot*. Retrieved 13 September from <https://www.theverge.com/2017/5/2/15517962/china-new-law-dota-league-of-legends-odds-loot-box-random>
- Xiao, L. Y. (2021). ESRB's and PEGI's self-regulatory 'includes random items' labels fail to ensure consumer protection. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*, 19(6), 2358-2361. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-020-00329-6>
- Xiao, L. Y. (2023). Beneath the label: unsatisfactory compliance with ESRB, PEGI and IARC industry self-regulation requiring loot box presence warning labels by video game companies. *Royal Society Open Science*, 10(3), 230270. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.230270>
- Zendle, D., Flick, C., Gordon-Petrovskaya, E., Ballou, N., Xiao, L. Y., & Drachen, A. (2023). No evidence that Chinese playtime mandates reduced heavy gaming in one segment of the video games industry. *Nature human behaviour*, 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-023-01669-8>
- Zhan, J. D., & Chan, H. C. (2012). Government regulation of online game addiction. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, 30, Article 13. <https://doi.org/10.17705/1CAIS.03013>

5.2. Treatment

- Cowlshaw S, Merkouris S, Dowling N, Anderson C, Jackson A, Thomas S. Psychological therapies for pathological and problem gambling. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* [Internet]. 2012;(11). Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD008937.pub2>

- Ribeiro EO, Afonso NH, Morgado P. Non-pharmacological treatment of gambling disorder: a systematic review of randomized controlled trials. *BMC Psychiatry*. 2021 Dec;21(1):105.
- Bergeron PY, Giroux I, Chrétien M, Bouchard S. Exposure Therapy for Gambling Disorder: Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Curr Addict Rep*. 2022 Sep 8;9(3):179–94.
- Pfund RA, Forman DP, Whalen SK, Zech JM, Ginley MK, Peter SC, et al. Effect of cognitive-behavioral techniques for problem gambling and gambling disorder: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Addiction*. 2023 Sep;118(9):1661–74.
- Higuera-Ahijado M, López-Espuela F, Caro-Alonso PÁ, Novo A, Rodríguez-Martín B. Efficacy of cognitive-behavioral therapy in improving the quality of life of people with compulsive gambling, a systematic review. *Arch Psychiatr Nurs*. 2023 Apr;43:127–42.
- Pfund RA, King SA, Forman DP, Zech JM, Ginley MK, Peter SC, et al. Effects of cognitive behavioral techniques for gambling on recovery defined by gambling, psychological functioning, and quality of life: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Psychol Addict Behav* [Internet]. 2023 Feb 23 [cited 2023 Aug 22]; Available from: <http://doi.apa.org/getdoi.cfm?doi=10.1037/adb0000910>
- Yakovenko I, Quigley L, Hemmelgarn BR, Hodgins DC, Ronksley P. The efficacy of motivational interviewing for disordered gambling: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Addict Behav*. 2015 Apr;43:72–82.
- Peter SC, Brett EI, Suda MT, Leavens ELS, Miller MB, Leffingwell TR, et al. A Meta-analysis of Brief Personalized Feedback Interventions for Problematic Gambling. *J Gambl Stud*. 2019 Jun;35(2):447–64.
- Pfund RA, Peter SC, Whelan JP, Meyers AW, Ginley MK, Relyea G. Is more better? A meta-analysis of dose and efficacy in face-to-face psychological treatments for problem and disordered gambling. *Psychol Addict Behav*. 2020 Aug;34(5):557–68.
- Boumparis N, Haug S, Abend S, Billieux J, Riper H, Schaub MP. Internet-based interventions for behavioral addictions: A systematic review. *J Behav Addict*. 2022 Sep 26;11(3):620–42.
- Park JJ, King DL, Wilkinson-Meyers L, Rodda SN. Content and Effectiveness of Web-Based Treatments for Online Behavioral Addictions: Systematic Review. *JMIR Ment Health*. 2022 Sep 9;9(9):e36662.
- McCurdy LY, Loya JM, Hart-Derrick VR, Young GC, Kiluk BD, Potenza MN. Smartphone Apps for Problem Gambling: a Review of Content and Quality. *Curr Addict Rep*. 2023 May 2;10(2):178–86.
- Dowling N, Merkouris S, Lubman D, Thomas S, Bowden-Jones H, Cowlishaw S. Pharmacological interventions for the treatment of disordered and problem gambling. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* [Internet]. 2022;(9). Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD008936.pub2>
- Goslar M, Leibetseder M, Muench HM, Hofmann SG, Laireiter AR. Pharmacological Treatments for Disordered Gambling: A Meta-analysis. *J Gambl Stud*. 2019 Jun;35(2):415–45.
- Del Mauro L, Vergallito A, Gattavara G, Juris L, Gallucci A, Vedani A, et al. Betting on Non-Invasive Brain Stimulation to Treat Gambling Disorder: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Brain Sci*. 2023 Apr 21;13(4):698.
- Zucchella C, Mantovani E, Federico A, Lugoboni F, Tamburin S. Non-invasive Brain Stimulation for Gambling Disorder: A Systematic Review. *Front Neurosci*. 2020 Aug 18;14:729.
- King, D. L., Wölfling, K., & Potenza, M. N. (2020). Taking gaming disorder treatment to the next level. *Jama Psychiatry*, 77(8), 869-870. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2020.1270>
- Király, O., Koncz, P., Griffiths, M. D., & Demetrovics, Z. (2023). Gaming disorder: A summary of its characteristics and aetiology. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, 122, 152376.
- Zajac, K., Ginley, M. K., & Chang, R. (2020). Treatments of internet gaming disorder: a systematic review of the evidence. *Expert Review of Neurotherapeutics*, 20(1), 85-93. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14737175.2020.1671824>

5.3. Self-help initiatives

- Browne BR. Really not god: Secularization and pragmatism in Gamblers Anonymous. *J Gambl Stud*. 1994 Sep 1;10(3):247–60.
- Ferentzy P, Skinner W, Antze P. Rediscovering the Twelve Steps. *J Groups Addict Recovery*. 2006 Nov 27;1(3–4):59–74.
- Shaji A, George S, Rathakrishnan B, Amanullah S. Editorial: An overview of gamblers anonymous. *Internet J Med Update - EJOURNAL*. 2021 Aug 3;14(2):1–5.
- Schuler A, Ferentzy P, Turner NE, Skinner W, McIsaac KE, Ziegler CP, et al. Gamblers Anonymous as a Recovery Pathway: A Scoping Review. *J Gambl Stud*. 2016 Dec;32(4):1261–78.
- Kelly J, Humphreys K, Ferri M. Alcoholics Anonymous and other 12-step programs for alcohol use disorder. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* [Internet]. 2020;(3). Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD012880.pub2>

- Syvertsen A, Erevik EK, Mentzoni RA, Pallesen S. Gambling Addiction Norway – experiences among members of a Norwegian self-help group for problem gambling. *Int Gamb Stud*. 2020 May 3;20(2):246–61.
- Matheson FI, Hamilton-Wright S, Kryszajtys DT, Wiese JL, Cadel L, Ziegler C, et al. The use of self-management strategies for problem gambling: a scoping review. *BMC Public Health*. 2019 Dec;19(1):445.
- Gainsbury SM. Review of Self-exclusion from Gambling Venues as an Intervention for Problem Gambling. *J Gamb Stud*. 2014 Jun;30(2):229–51.
- Kotter R, Kräplin A, Pittig A, Bühringer G. A Systematic Review of Land-Based Self-Exclusion Programs: Demographics, Gambling Behavior, Gambling Problems, Mental Symptoms, and Mental Health. *J Gamb Stud*. 2019 Jun;35(2):367–94.
- Ladouceur R, Shaffer P, Blaszczynski A, Shaffer HJ. Responsible gambling: a synthesis of the empirical evidence. *Addict Res Theory*. 2017 May 4;25(3):225–35.
- Harris A, Griffiths MD. A Critical Review of the Harm-Minimisation Tools Available for Electronic Gambling. *J Gamb Stud*. 2017 Mar;33(1):187–221.
- Goslar M, Leibetseder M, Muench HM, Hofmann SG, Laireiter AR. Efficacy of face-to-face versus self-guided treatments for disordered gambling: A meta-analysis. *J Behav Addict*. 2017 Jun;6(2):142–62.
- King, D. L., Wölfling, K., & Potenza, M. N. (2020). Taking gaming disorder treatment to the next level. *Jama Psychiatry*, 77(8), 869-870. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2020.1270>

5.4. Prevention

- Calado, F., Alexandre, J., Rosenfeld, L., Pereira, R. C., & Griffiths, M. D. (2020). The Efficacy of a Gambling Prevention Program Among High-School Students. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 36(2), 573–595. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10899-019-09908-2>
- Hundrić, D. D., Mandić, S., & Ricijaš, N. (2021). Short-Term Effectiveness of the Youth Gambling Prevention Program “Who Really Wins?”—Results from the First National Implementation. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(19), 10100. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph181910100>
- Lozano, J. A., & Rodríguez, F. (2022). Systematic Review: Preventive Intervention to Curb the Youth Online Gambling Problem. *Sustainability*, 14(11), 6402. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14116402>
- Oh, B. K., Ong, Y. K., & Loo, J. M. Y. (2017). A review of educational-based gambling prevention programs for adolescents. *Asian Journal of Gambling Issues and Public Health*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40405-017-0024-5>
- Ortega-Barón, J., González-Cabrera, J., Machimbarrena, J. M., & Montiel, I. (2021). Safety.Net: A Pilot Study on a Multi-Risk Internet Prevention Program. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(8), 4249. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18084249>
- Taylor, L. M. (2009). Gambling Awareness for Youth: An Analysis of the "Don't Gamble Away Our Future" Program". *Faculty Research & Creative Activity until 2018 (FCS)*. 4. https://thekeep.eiu.edu/fcs_fac/4
- Throuvala, M. A., Griffiths, M. D., Rennoldson, M., & Kuss, D. J. (2019). School-based Prevention for Adolescent Internet Addiction: Prevention is the Key. A Systematic Literature Review. *Current Neuropsychology*, 17(6), 507–525. <https://doi.org/10.2174/1570159x16666180813153806>
- King, D. L., Delfabbro, P. H., Doh, Y. Y., Wu, A. M. S., Kuss, D. J., Mentzoni, R., . . . Sakuma, H. (2018). Policy and prevention approaches for disordered and hazardous gaming and Internet use: An international perspective. *Prevention Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11121-017-0813-1>

5.5. Harm minimisation in gambling and gaming

- Auer, M., & Griffiths, M. D. (2013). Voluntary limit setting and player choice in most intense online gamblers: an empirical study of gambling behaviour. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 29(4), 647. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10899-012-9332-y>
- Auer, M., & Griffiths, M. D. (2022). The Impact of Personalized Feedback Interventions by a Gambling Operator on Subsequent Gambling Expenditure in a Sample of Dutch Online Gamblers. *Journal of Gambling Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10899-022-10162-2>
- Auer, M., Reiestad, S. H., & Griffiths, M. D. (2020). Global Limit Setting as a Responsible Gambling Tool: What Do Players Think? *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*, 18(1), 14–26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-018-9892-x>

- Auer, M., Reiestad, S. H., Griffiths, M. D., Reiestad, H., S., G., & D., M. (2020). Global Limit Setting as a Responsible Gambling Tool: What Do Players Think? *International Journal of Mental Health & Addiction*, 18(1), 14. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-018-9892-x>
- Bjørseth, B., Simensen, J. O., Bjørnethun, A., Griffiths, M. D., Erevik, E. K., Leino, T., & Pallesen, S. (2021). The Effects of Responsible Gambling Pop-Up Messages on Gambling Behaviors and Cognitions: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 11(January). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2020.601800>
- Broda, A., LaPlante, D. A., Nelson, S. E., LaBrie, R. A., Bosworth, L. B., & Shaffer, H. J. (2008). Virtual harm reduction efforts for Internet gambling: effects of deposit limits on actual Internet sports gambling behavior. *Harm Reduction Journal*, 5, 27. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1477-7517-5-27>
- Browne, M., Rawat, V., Greer, N., Langham, E., Rockloff, M., & Hanley, C. (2017). What is the harm? Applying a public health methodology to measure the impact of gambling problems and harm on quality of life. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 36, 28.
- Caillon, J., Grall-Bronnec, M., Saillard, A., Leboucher, J., Péré, M., & Challet-Bouju, G. (2021). Impact of Warning Pop-Up Messages on the Gambling Behavior, Craving, and Cognitions of Online Gamblers: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 12(July). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2021.711431>
- Celio, M. A., & Lisman, S. A. (2014). Examining the efficacy of a personalized normative feedback intervention to reduce college student gambling. In *Journal of American College Health* (Vol. 62, pp. 154–164). Taylor & Francis. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07448481.2013.865626>
- Finkenwirth, S., MacDonald, K., Deng, X., Lesch, T., & Clark, L. (2021). Using machine learning to predict self-exclusion status in online gamblers on the PlayNow.com platform in British Columbia. *International Gambling Studies*, 21(2), 220–237. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14459795.2020.1832132>
- Gainsbury, S. M., Aro, D., Ball, D., Tobar, C., & Russell, A. (2015). Optimal content for warning messages to enhance consumer decision making and reduce problem gambling. *Journal of Business Research*, 68(10), 2093–2101. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2015.03.007>
- Gaharian, K., Abarbanel, B., Kraus, S. W., Singh, A., & Bernhard, B. (2023). Players Gonna Pay : Characterizing gamblers and gambling-related harm with payments transaction data. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 143(January), 107717. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2023.107717>
- Giles, E., Robalino, S., McColl, E., Sniehotta, F., & Adams, J. (2014). Systematic review, meta-analysis and meta-regression of the effectiveness of financial incentives for encouraging healthy behaviours. *Plos One*, 9, 3.
- Gray, H. M., Keating, L., Shaffer, H. J., & LaPlante, D. A. (2019). Observations of the first GameSense-branded responsible gambling centre in a US casino. *Health Education Journal*, 79, 1. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0017896919863121>
- Gray, H. M., Shaffer, H. J., & LaPlante, D. A. (2018). *Comprehensive Evaluation of the Plainridge Park Casino GameSense Program: 2015-2018 Compendium*. Division on Addiction.
- Haefeli, J., Lischer, S., & Haeusler, J. (2015). Communications-based early detection of gambling-related problems in online gambling. *International Gambling Studies*, 15(1), 23–38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14459795.2014.980297>
- Haeusler, J. (2016). Follow the money: using payment behaviour as predictor for future self-exclusion. In *International Gambling Studies* (Vol. 16, Issue 2). International Gambling Studies. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14459795.2016.1158306>
- Harris, A., & Griffiths, M. D. (2017). A Critical Review of the Harm-Minimisation Tools Available for Electronic Gambling. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 33(1), 187–221. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10899-016-9624-8>
- Hilbrecht, M., & Glynn, J. (2019). Gambling-related harms: Developing priorities for policy-setting. *Paper Presented to UNLV Gambling & Risk Taking Conference, Las Vegas, NV, (, 2019, 28.*
- Hollingshead, S. J., & Wohl, M. J. A. (2022). Loyalty Program Rewards Increases Willingness to Use Responsible Gambling Tools and Attitudinal Loyalty. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-022-00905-y>
- Langham, E., Thorne, H., Browne, M., Donaldson, P., Rose, J., & Rockloff, M. (2016). Understanding gambling related harm: A proposed definition, conceptual framework, and taxonomy of harms. *BMC Public Health*, 16(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-016-2747-0>
- Lynagh, M., Sanson-Fisher, R., & Bonevski, B. (2011). What's Good for the Goose is Good for the Gander. Guiding Principles for the Use of Financial Incentives in Health Behaviour Change. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 20(10), 9202–9205.
- Mantzari, E., Vogt, F., Shemilt, I., Wei, Y., Higgins, J. P., & Marteau, T. M. (2015). Personal financial incentives for changing habitual health-related behaviors: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Prev Med*, 75, 75.

- Monaghan, S., & Blaszczynski, A. (2010). Electronic gaming machine warning messages: Information versus self-evaluation. *The Journal of Psychology*, 144(1), 83–96. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980903356081>
- Muggleton, N., Parpart, P., Newall, P., Leake, D., Gathergood, J., & Stewart, N. (2021). The association between gambling and financial, social and health outcomes in big financial data. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 5(3), 319–326. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-020-01045-w>
- Nelson, S. E., LaPlante, D. A., Peller, A. J., Schumann, A., LaBrie, R. A., & Shaffer, H. J. (2008). Real limits in the virtual world: self-limiting behavior of Internet gamblers. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 24(4), 4. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10899-008-9106-8>
- Newall, P. W. S., Hayes, T., Singmann, H., Weiss-cohen, L., Ludvig, E. A., & Walasek, L. (2023). Evaluation of the 'take time to think' safer gambling message: a randomised, online experimental study. *Behavioural Public Policy*, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1017/bpp.2023.2>
- Nower, L., & Glynn, J. (2022). Adopting An Affordability Approach to Responsible Gambling and Harm Reduction: Considerations for Implementation in a North American Context. *Gaming Law Review*, 26(9), 466–476. <https://doi.org/10.1089/glr2.2022.0020>
- Nower, L., Mills, D., Stanmyre, J.F., & Peters, E. (2020). *Internet Gaming in New Jersey: Calendar Year 2018 Report to the Division of Gaming Enforcement*.
- Parke, A., Harris, A., Parke, J., Rigbye, J., & Blaszczynski, A. (2015). Facilitating Awareness and Informed Choice in Gambling. *The Journal of Gambling Business and Economics*, 8(3), 6–20. <https://doi.org/10.5750/jgbe.v8i3.971>
- Perrot, B., Hardouin, J. B., Grall-Bronnec, M., & Challet-Bouju, G. (2018). Typology of online lotteries and scratch games gamblers' behaviours: A multilevel latent class cluster analysis applied to player account-based gambling data. *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research*, 27(4), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mpr.1746>
- Quilty L. C.; Watson C.; Bagby M. R. (2015). CPGI-Population Harm: A supplement to the Canadian Problem Gambling Index. *Canadian Journal of Addiction*, 6.
- Shaffer, H. J., Blaszczynski, A., Ladouceur, R., Fong, D., & Collins, P. (2019). *Responsible Gambling: Primary Stakeholder Perspectives* (H. J. Shaffer, A. Blaszczynski, R. Ladouceur, D. Fong, & P. Collins, Eds.; 1st ed., Issue 2002). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/med-psych/9780190074562.001.0001>
- Sutherland, K., Christianson, J. B., & Leatherman, S. (2008). Impact of targeted financial incentives on personal health behavior: a review of literature. *Med Care Res Rev*, 65(6 supplement), 36–78. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077558708324235>
- Tabri, N., Hollingshead, S. J., & Wohl, M. A. J. A. (2019). A limit approaching pop-up message reduces gambling expenditures, except among players with a financially focused self-concept. *International Gambling Studies*, 19(2), 2. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14459795.2019.1567806>
- Ukhov, I., Bjurgert, J., Auer, M., & Griffiths, M. D. (2021). Online Problem Gambling: A Comparison of Casino Players and Sports Bettors via Predictive Modeling Using Behavioral Tracking Data. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 37(3), 877–897. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10899-020-09964-z>
- Harris, A., & Griffiths, M. D. (2017). A Critical Review of the Harm-Minimisation Tools Available for Electronic Gambling. *Journal of gambling studies*, 33(1), 187–221. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10899-016-9624-8>
- Hopfgartner, N., Auer, M., Helic, D., & Griffiths, M. D. (2023). The Efficacy of Voluntary Self-Exclusions in Reducing Gambling Among a Real-World Sample of British Online Casino Players. *Journal of Gambling Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10899-023-10198-y>
- Velasco, V., Scattola, P., Gavazzeni, L., Marchesi, L., Nita, I. E., & Giudici, G. (2021). Prevention and Harm Reduction Interventions for Adult Gambling at the Local Level: An Umbrella Review of Empirical Evidence. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 18(18), 9484. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18189484>
- Király, O., Griffiths, M. D., King, D., Lee, H.-K., Lee, S.-Y., Bányai, F., . . . Demetrovics, Z. (2018). Policy responses to problematic video game use: A systematic review of current measures and future possibilities. *Journal of Behavioral Addictions*, 7(3), 503–517. <https://doi.org/10.1556/2006.6.2017.050>
- Xiao, L. Y. (2021). ESRB's and PEGI's self-regulatory 'includes random items' labels fail to ensure consumer protection. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*, 19(6), 2358–2361. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-020-00329-6>