

Sam Chamberlain, Naomi Fineberg, Anne Goudriaan, Lior Carmi.

Subprojects for WP1 – Cost Action on PUI – 5.12.2017

- *Each subproject has a lead and several co-leads, chosen by the WP1 leads and Chair based on expertise and experience.*
- *Any queries about a subproject should be directed to the subproject lead.*
- *WP1 Members wishing to be involved with a given project are asked to send a brief biosketch (outlining relevant skills, experience, and reasons for interest in the subproject) to the **subproject lead** directly via email. It is recommended for WP1 members to be involved with up to 1-2 subprojects at a time.*
- *The subproject lead and co-leads shall decide on membership for each subproject, balancing the need to maintain focus against the skills of different members and the need to avoid excess expertise overlap. Membership on a subproject also requires that the person be a member of the COST Action, or be a member of the same host institution as one of the co-leads*
- *The subproject lead shall be responsible for keeping the WP1 lead updated on progress via email, approximately every 6 months.*
- *The subproject lead and co-leads can adjust the precise scope and title of their subproject, provided the broad theme is adhered to. For example, the co-leads together may decide to focus on particular types of internet-related pathologies (e.g. IGD versus others) in their paper, or may prefer to use the broader umbrella of PUI/PIU.*
- *The subproject leads and co-leads will direct the content of each paper and manage other members' involvement. They shall make decisions about manuscript submissions, authorships, and acknowledgements. They will ensure that coauthorships are given only when the required criteria are met (Substantial contributions to conception and design or analysis and interpretation of data; AND Substantial contributions to drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content; AND Final approval of the version to be published). Less substantive (but still significant) input shall be recognized by including 'Cost Action Consortium' as a paper author with individual members listed as members of the Consortium (such as in footer or acknowledgements).*
- *It is hoped that these initial subprojects will serve as a springboard for further subprojects. We welcome ideas about other potential subprojects, which should be directed to the WP1 lead (including brief summary of intended content, suggested key people, and brief summary of relevant experience/skills of suggested key people). These would then be discussed by the Chair and WP1 co-leads.*

Subproject title, scope, lead, and co-leads.

1. Manifesto for a European Research Framework on PIU. Aim for similar to template: Fineberg et al., Eur Neuropsychopharm, 2013; other relevant papers El-Guebaly et al., Addiction, 2011; Chamberlain et al., Eur Neuropsychopharm, 2016. Raise profile of network and describe it; consider key questions that COST hopes to address; concise; to set the scene. **Naomi Fineberg** (naomi.fineberg@btinternet.com), Jose Menchon, Bernardo Dell'Osso, Eric Hollander, Stefano Pallanti, Joseph Zohar, Zsolt Demetrovics.
2. Impact of technology on brain development and mental-well being in young people. **TBC**. Christine Lochner, Edna Gruenblatt. Awaiting confirmation from proposed lead (in the interim please contact WP1 Lead with any queries).
3. Theoretical mechanisms underlying addictions and obsessive-compulsive spectrum disorders. Scope not restricted to PIU but highlights the Cost Action. Focus may include RDoC, theoretical mechanisms that might differentiate and overlap between the two (addiction vs OCD) then going on in a more focused manner to consider gambling/gaming/sex/others. Springboard for future papers. **Valerie Voon** (voonval@gmail.com), Dan Stein, Eric Hollander, Zsolt Demetrovics.
4. Review of diagnostic criteria and scales for PIU. This to consider available scales and overview of different aspects of validity. Could include table summarising different aspects e.g. test re-test, construct, discriminant validity, and relative quality of each for each scale. Aim to arrive at consensus recommendations – choice of the most suitable scale(s); and/or how the existing scales could be further developed and validated. **Joel Billieux** (Joel.Billieux@uni.lu), Zsolt Demetrovics, Murat Yucel, Lior Carmi, Hans-Jurgen Rumpf.
5. Systematic review and meta-analysis of structural and functional neuroimaging findings for PIU. To include recommendations about types of structural/functional scans, pipelines, fMRI tests, suitable for future multi-site research on PIU; issues to consider for multi-site studies. **Anneke Goudriaan** (agoudriaan@gmail.com), Pieter Hoekstra, Dan Stein, Murat Yucel, Marc Potenza.
6. Narrative review of cognition. Review of existing cognitive findings in PIU and consensus statement on key cognitive domains for international studies plus recommendations for such studies (e.g. confounds to consider). To include (where available) psychometric properties of tests and consideration of suitability for large-scale studies. **Matthias Brand** (matthias.brand@uni-due.de), Hans-Jurgen Rumpf, Lior Carmi, Valerie Voon, Sam Chamberlain.
7. Meta-analysis of cognitive findings in PIU. **Konstantinos Ioannidis** (konstantinosioannidis8@gmail.com), Sam Chamberlain, Naomi Fineberg, Jon Grant.

8. Critical review of existing psychological and pharmacological treatments for PIU. **Jon Grant** (jgrant4@bsd.uchicago.edu), Henrietta Bowden Jones, Naomi Fineberg, Sam Chamberlain, Konstantinos Ioannidis.

Other project ideas (please contact WP1 lead if interested):

- Can we estimate the societal and public health impact of PIU?
- Transcultural aspects of PIU
- Article on cyberbullying, 'trolling', etc.