# Gamified Adaptive Approach Bias Modification: a Pilot RCT in Individuals with Methamphetamine Use History

Liqun Zhang, BS[1], Yanru Liu, MS[1], Xiang Liu, PhD[1], Yuanhui Li, MS[1], Tianjiao Zhang, MS[1], Dai Li, BS[1], & Wei Hao, MD[2]

[1] Adai Technology Co., Ltd., Beijing, China

[2] National Clinical Research Center on Mental Disorders and Mental Health Institute of the Second Xiangya Hospital, Central South University, Changsha, China

Author note

The authors made the following contributions. Liqun Zhang, BS: Conceptualization, Writing - Original Draft Preparation, Investigation, Data curation, Software; Yanru Liu, MS: Writing - Original Draft Preparation, Writing - Review & Editing; Xiang Liu, PhD: Conceptualization, Formal analysis, Validation, Supervision; Yuanhui Li, MS: Conceptualization, Validation, Software; Tianjiao Zhang, MS: Data curation, Software; Dai Li, BS: Conceptualization, Project administration; Wei Hao, MD: Supervision, Writing - Review & Editing.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Wei Hao, MD, National Clinical Research Center on Mental Disorders and Mental Health Institute of the Second Xiangya Hospital, Central South University. Changsha, Hunan 410011, China. E-mail: weihao57@csu.edu.cn

Abstract

IMPORTANCE: Cognitive bias modification (CBM) programs have shown promise in treating psychiatric conditions, but they can be perceived as boring and repetitive. Incorporating gamified designs and adaptive algorithms in CBM training may address this issue and enhance engagement and effectiveness. OBJECTIVE: To assess the efficacy of an adaptive approach bias modification (A-ApBM) paradigm with gamified designs and dynamic difficulty adjustments in reducing cue-induced craving in individuals with methamphetamine use history. DESIGN: Randomized controlled trial with three study groups: Adaptive ApBM (A-ApBM), Static ApBM (S-ApBM), and control. SETTING: Twelve community-based rehabilitation centers in Sichuan, China. PARTICIPANTS: Individuals aged 18-50 with methamphetamine dependence were randomized. INTERVENTION: A-ApBM and S-ApBM groups engaged in ApBM training using a smartphone application for four weeks. A-ApBM used an adaptive algorithm to dynamically adjust the difficulty level based on individual performance, while S-ApBM had a static difficulty level. MAIN OUTCOMES AND MEASURES: Cue-induced craving scores assessed using a visual analog scale at baseline, post-intervention, and at week-16 follow-up. RESULTS: The A-ApBM group showed a significant reduction in cue-induced craving scores at post-intervention compared to baseline ($p = 0.02$). The reduction remained significant at the week-16 follow-up ($p = 0.01$). No significant changes were observed in the S-ApBM and control groups. CONCLUSION AND RELEVANCE: The adaptive ApBM paradigm with gamified designs and dynamic difficulty adjustments may be an effective intervention for reducing cue-induced craving in individuals with methamphetamine use history. This approach improves engagement and personalization, potentially enhancing the effectiveness of CBM programs. Further research is needed to validate these findings and explore the application of adaptive ApBM in other

psychiatric conditions. TRIAL REGISTRATION: Registered at clinicaltrials.gov (ID NCT05794438).

*Keywords:* Digital Therapeutics, Methamphetamine, Approach Bias Modification, Gamification

*Word count:* 2974

Gamified Adaptive Approach Bias Modification: a Pilot RCT in Individuals with Methamphetamine Use History

## Introduction

Cognitive biases, such as attention bias, approach bias, and interpretation bias, are related to the psychopathologies of anxiety, depression, post-traumatic disorders, addiction, and other psychiatric conditions. Several cognitive bias assessment tasks, such as the dot-probe task, the approach/avoidance task, and the word-sentence association paradigm, have been developed to assess these cognitive biases. Compared with healthy controls, individuals with a psychiatric disorder tend to exhibit a cognitive bias (which is often measured by the response type and differences in response time) towards a certain type of stimuli. In light of this, researchers have developed a number of cognitive bias modification (CBM) training schemes aimed to shift the bias away from negative stimuli and toward positive stimuli. A number of review articles show CBM's effectiveness in treating addiction, anxiety, and depression.[2]

Although effective, CBM has been scrutinized as tedious and boring.[3] Several studies have reported the issue of boredom with CBM training.[6] Qualitative interviews with patients have revealed that participants often found CBM to be "boring," "repetitive," "tedious," and that they "just tried to get through it as quickly as possible." This may be attributed to the nature of cognitive bias modification design, where each session typically consists of numerous trials, and the rules and instructions remain the same throughout the intervention program. Consequently, the tedium and boredom associated with CBM training may result in a loss of attention and interest in the program, thereby hindering its efficacy. However, given the evidence of the effectiveness of CBM in treating various psychopathologies, it is crucial to address the issue of

boredom and make the training more engaging and fun for participants to further enhance efficacy.

Efforts have been made to make CBM more fun and engaging by gamification. One review article[7] identified four studies that used gamified animations, sounds, feedback, and point-scoring systems to improve the efficacy of CBM, two of which reported positive outcomes. As digital therapeutics continue to gain popularity, researchers are increasingly employing gamification to enhance CBM and other behavioral interventions.[10] Outside of the psychiatry/psychology literature, researchers in analytical domains such as computer science and operations research have developed quantitative models to facilitate game design.[12] Specifically, Li et al[12] proposed a model that captures the accomplishment process, the stress process, and the memory loss process in a agame. They formulated the game design problem, specifically the design of the difficulty levels in the game, as a mathematical optimization problem to maximize the remembered utility. The study analyzed the theoretical properties of the mathematical model and provided heuristics and insights for designing the difficulty level curve. These research efforts suggest that gamification can be leveraged to make CBM programs more engaging and enhance their efficacy in treating various psychopathologies.

In this study, we propose an adaptive approach bias modification (A-ApBM) scheme with the aim of addressing the issue of monotony, repetition, lack of novelty, and lack of complexity that can lead to boredom and disengagement.[13] The adaptive ApBM scheme incorporates gamified designs (animations, sounds, feedback, and point-scoring systems). Moreover, we introduce an adaptive algorithm that adjusts the difficulty level of the training based on individual performance, so that the program remains challenging and stimulating. Efforts have been made to adaptively modify the difficulty of CBM[15]. However, existing studies' modeling of the difficulty

of CBM is rather qualitative and arbitrary. In this study, we propose a more analytical and quantitative way of modeling and adjusting the difficulty based on performance.

To assess the efficacy of the proposed A-ApBM scheme, we conducted a randomized controlled trial with three groups: the Adaptive ApBM (A-ApBM) group, the Static ApBM (S-ApBM) group, and the control group. We use individuals with illicit methamphetamine use history as the testbed. Methamphetamine illicit usage has become a major public health challenge globally.[19] Pertaining to MUD, recent studies have showed that approach (avoidance) bias modification and attention bias modification had promising results in treating MUD.[27] A total of 139 individuals with methamphetamine use history were randomized for the trial.

The study found that participants in the A-ApBM group experienced a significant reduction in drug craving scores at post-intervention compared to baseline, while the S-ApBM and the control group did not. Additionally, at the week-16 follow-up, cue-induced craving remained lower in the A-ApBM group compared to baseline. This suggests that the A-ApBM scheme may be an effective intervention for reducing methamphetamine craving. The study also found that the performance index and difficulty index were related, supporting the hypothesis that the difficulty level of ApBM training influences performance. This relationship can be leveraged by an adaptive algorithm to ultimately enhance the efficacy of the ApBM training. These findings highlight the potential of gamified and adaptive interventions in enhancing cognitive bias modification programs for substance use disorders.

# Methods

## Study Design

This study was a three-armed randomized controlled trial. Participants were randomly assigned to one of three groups: 1. A-ApBM group; 2. the S-ApBM group; and 3. the control group. The study was approved by the participating community rehabilitation centers in Sichuan, China and was in accordance with the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki. The trial was registered at clinicaltrials.gov (NCT05794438).

## Participants

Participants undergoing community-based rehabilitation with a history of methamphetamine use were recruited from 12 community-based rehabilitation centers in Sichuan, China. Inclusion criteria include age between 18 and 50 years and having a history of methamphetamine use of at least one year. Participants who could not fluently operate a smartphone were excluded. Participants who had mental health conditions other than MUD were excluded. Eligible participants were randomly assigned into the A-ApBM group ($n = 48$), the S-ApBM group ($n = 47$), or the control group ($n = 44$). All participants signed informed consent.

## Intervention: ApBM Training

Participants in the A-ApBM and the S-ApBM groups installed a smartphone application (Wonderlab Harbour, Adai Technology (Beijing) Co. Ltd.) and engaged in ApBM training for four weeks. Further detailed descriptions of the smartphone application design can be found in Zhang et al.[24]

The ApBM training follows the design of previous studies on treating substance use disorder.[24] In ApBM, participants were instructed to swipe upward when they encountered images in portrait format and swipe downward when they encountered images in landscape format. Following an upward swipe, a shrinking animation was displayed to simulate the visual effect of moving away (avoidance), while a growing animation was displayed after a downward swipe to simulate the visual effect of moving towards (approach). Two types of images were used during the training session: drug-related and non-drug-related. The drug-related images encompassed visuals of methamphetamine, including crystals, powders, and associated paraphernalia. The non-drug-related images depicted healthy lifestyles, such as wealth, sports, gourmet food, and family activities.

**Congruent Trials and Intended Training Ratio.** In ApBM, a trial is said to be congruent if it displays a non-drug-related image in landscape orientation (in which case the user is instructed to swipe down and approach), or a drug-related image in portrait orientation (in which case the user is instructed to swipe up and avoid). We adopt the definition of Intended Training Ratio (ITR) from Kruijt et al.[29] ITR is calculated by dividing the number of congruent trials by the total number of trials in a session. The ITR represents the proportion of trials that align with the intended training direction, which involves avoiding drug cues and approaching non-drug-related cues.

Note that the definition of ITR slightly differs from Kruijt et al.[29] Instead of using the ratio of incongruent trials to congruent trials, we use the ratio of congruent trials to the total number of trials. This modification was made for two reasons. First, it prevents the denominator from being zero (although having zero congruent trials is unlikely, we allow for it to maintain mathematical

generality). Second, it ensures that the higher the ITR, the more intensive the training and the stronger the training contingency, which aligns with our intuitive understanding.

**Static ApBM.** In the S-ApBM group, the ITR remains constant throughout the entire intervention program. Each S-ApBM session comprises 78 drug trials and 78 non-drug trials. Within each set of drug or non-drug trials, there are 72 congruent and 6 incongruent trials. Consequently, the ITR for the S-ApBM group is a constant value of 92.3%.

**Adaptive ApBM.** In the A-ApBM group, the ITR is dynamically adjusted by an algorithm that continuously monitors the performance of the user, uses the performance to estimate the difficulty index, and adjusts the ITR accordingly to follow the trajectory of a preset difficulty curve. In what follows, we describe the performance measure, the difficulty measure, the relationship between the two, and the algorithm for the adaptive adjustment.

***Performance Index.*** The performance of an ApBM session is calculated using the median log response time and the correct response rate. Swifter and more correct responses indicate that the user is performing well. The performance index of session $t$ is calculated as $p_t = \frac{CorrectResponseRate}{median\{log(RTs)\}}$, where $CorrectResponseRate$ is the number of correctly responded trials divided by the total number of trials in session $t$, and $median\{log(RTs\}$ is the median of the log response times (logarithm transforms the response time for better normality).

***Difficulty Index.*** We posit that the user's perceived difficulty level of an ApBM session is influenced by the following two factors. First, the difficulty is directly influenced by the ITR. If the ITR is 100%, meaning all trials are congruent, then it is natural for the user to establish an automatic association between stimulus type and format. As the user observes and learns all drug trials are in portrait format and all non-drug trials are in landscape format.

Conversely, when the ITR is 0%, the user would also establish an automatic association. We hypothesize that the ApBM becomes more difficult when the ITR is 50%, meaning that a random half of the trials are congruent and the rest are not. In this case, it is challenging to identify a pattern because the correlation between stimulus type and format is virtually zero due to the 50/50 randomization. Therefore, we expect the difficulty level to have an inverted U-shape in relation to the ITR. Second, the variation in the ITR of past sessions also impacts the perceived difficulty. For instance, if all sessions have a constant ITR of 0.7, it is easier for the user to learn the pattern and establish an automatic association. However, if the ITR varies randomly from session to session, it becomes more challenging. Hence, we posit that the variation of the past $k$ ITRs is positively correlated with the difficulty.

To incorporate the two factors discussed above, we propose a linear model for the difficulty of session $t$: $d_t = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 ITR_t^2 + \alpha_2 SD\left(ITR_{max(1,t-(k-1))}, ITR_{max(1,t-(k-2))}, \ldots, ITR_t\right)$, where $\alpha_0, \alpha_1$, and $\alpha_2$ are parameters to be estimated dynamically as the user furthers into the intervention program. $ITR_t$ represents the ITR of session $t$, and $SD\left(con_{max(1,t-(k-1)),max(1,t-(k-2))}, \ldots, con_t\right)$ represents the standard deviation of the ITRs of the past $k$ ApBM sessions. Note that $ITR_t$ is squared to account for the inverted U-shape relationship between the ITR and the difficulty.

***Relationship between Performance and Difficulty.*** We employ a linear model to model the relationship between performance $p_t$ and the difficulty index $d_t$ in session $t$. Specifically, for each user $i$, we model the relationship using the equation $p_{it} = \beta_{i0} + \beta_1 d_t + \beta_2 t + \beta_3 t^2 + \epsilon_t$. The terms $\beta_2 t$ and $\beta_3 t^2$ account for the nonlinear (quadratic) learning curve as the user furthers into the intervention program and becomes more familiar with the ApBM

training. The term $\epsilon_t$ represents the idiosyncratic error or residual error, which captures the random shocks that can affect performance.

***The Algorithm for Adaptive ApBM.*** The algorithm begins with three warmup periods, i.e., for the first three sessions, no adjustments are made. Performance and difficulty indices are dynamically calculated after each session concludes. Starting from the fourth session, a linear regression was fitted to each user's cumulative data to estimate the parameters ($\alpha$s and $\beta$s). Subsequently, the algorithm adjusts the difficulty level to attain a preset difficulty curve.

***Difficulty Curve Design.*** The analysis in Li et al[12] shows that four general shapes of difficulty curve are of interests: U shape, inverted U shape, N shape, and inverted U shape. We use an inverted U-shaped difficulty curve as it is the optimal shape for long-duration game with general reward structure. A proprietary algorithm is developed to make sure the user's difficulty level is maintained close to the invereted U-shaped curve.

## Outcome Measures

**Primary Outcome: Cue-induced Craving Score.** Cue-induced craving scores were utilized as the primary outcome measure. Participants were asked to review images that depicts methamphetamine crystals, powders, and paraphernalia, and rate their cravings using a 0-10 visual analog scale. To improve the accuracy and reliability of participants' self-reported cravings, they were instructed to rate the images twice upon enrollment: first on a smartphone and then again, one day later, on a printed paper. The average score of these two assessments was used as the baseline measure.

### Statistical Analysis

To assess the changes in craving, we used a nonparametric paired Wilcoxon tests since the craving scores were not normally distributed. A bootstrap sample size of 2,000 was used to get the 95% confidence interval and p-values.

To validate that the performance and the difficulty indices were related as posited, we examine their relationship retrospectively with data generated by the A-ApBM group. The performance index was calculated for the ApBM sessions in the A-ApBM group. To calculate the standard deviation of the past three ITRs, we use a rolling window length of three and omit the first three sessions (since these sessions had constant ITRs). We fitted a linear mixed model (using the lme4 R package (ver 1.1-32)[30]) to predict the performance index with ITR and ITR squared, t and t squared, and Past3ITRSD. The model included subject as random effect.

## Results

### Participants

Table 1 presents the participant characteristics by group. Kruskal-Wallis rank sum tests were conducted on the continuous variables. No significant differences between groups were found at baseline. However, the post-intervention craving scores were found to be significantly different between groups ($p = 0.048$). Fisher's exact tests were used to examine the discrete variables, and no significant differences were found between groups, except for the binary variable "drinker" ($p = 0.062$).

*Table 1: Participant Characteristics*

| **Variable** | **Control Group**, N = 40[1] | **A-ApBM Group**, N = 48[1] | **S-ApBM Group**, N = 47[1] | **p-value** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Age** | 31.71 (8.34) | 34.51 (6.20) | 33.66 (5.31) | 0.14[2] |
| **Sex** | | | | 0.5[3] |
| Female | 10 / 40 (25%) | 8 / 48 (17%) | 12 / 47 (26%) | |
| Male | 30 / 40 (75%) | 40 / 48 (83%) | 35 / 47 (74%) | |
| **Marital Status** | | | | 0.7[3] |
| Divorced | 10 / 40 (25%) | 14 / 48 (29%) | 12 / 47 (26%) | |
| Married | 15 / 40 (38%) | 13 / 48 (27%) | 19 / 47 (40%) | |
| Unmarried | 15 / 40 (38%) | 21 / 48 (44%) | 16 / 47 (34%) | |
| **Education** | | | | 0.10[3] |
| College or Above | 3 / 40 (7.5%) | 4 / 48 (8.3%) | 0 / 47 (0%) | |
| Elementary School | 3 / 40 (7.5%) | 3 / 48 (6.3%) | 4 / 47 (8.5%) | |
| Junior High School | 22 / 40 (55%) | 32 / 48 (67%) | 23 / 47 (49%) | |
| Senior High School | 12 / 40 (30%) | 9 / 48 (19%) | 20 / 47 (43%) | |
| **Dominant Hand** | | | | 0.7[3] |
| Left | 4 / 40 (10%) | 8 / 48 (17%) | 5 / 47 (11%) | |
| Right | 36 / 40 (90%) | 40 / 48 (83%) | 42 / 47 (89%) | |
| **Smoker** | 32 / 40 (80%) | 43 / 48 (90%) | 41 / 47 (87%) | 0.4[3] |
| **Drinker** | 24 / 40 (60%) | 37 / 48 (77%) | 26 / 47 (55%) | 0.062[3] |
| **Meth Use History (yrs)** | 2.80 (2.40) | 3.17 (2.87) | 2.45 (2.27) | 0.4[2] |
| **Heroin History** | 1 / 40 (2.5%) | 2 / 48 (4.2%) | 1 / 47 (2.1%) | >0.9[3] |
| **Ketamine History** | 0 / 40 (0%) | 0 / 48 (0%) | 1 / 47 (2.1%) | 0.6[3] |

| Variable | Control Group, N = 40[1] | A-ApBM Group, N = 48[1] | S-ApBM Group, N = 47[1] | p-value |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Craving (baseline)** | 7.66 (11.79) | 8.65 (13.44) | 6.45 (9.35) | 0.8[2] |
| **Craving (post-intervention)** | 13.31 (16.86) | 5.00 (12.08) | 6.42 (10.28) | 0.048[2] |
| **Craving (week-16 followup)** | 11.50 (15.40) | 4.23 (8.56) | 7.30 (16.60) | 0.3[2] |
| (Missing) | 2 | 3 | 1 | |
| **No. of ApBM Sessions Completed** | 0.00 (0.00) | 9.81 (2.64) | 9.89 (2.76) | <0.001[2] |

[1]Mean (SD); n / N (%)

[2]Kruskal-Wallis rank sum test

[3]Fisher's exact test

Figure 1 displays the CONSORT flow diagram illustrating the participants' progression throughout the study.




Figure 1: CONSORT Flow Diagram

**Changes in Cue-induced Craving**

Table 2 presents the estimated effect sizes, 95% confidence intervals, and p-values for the bootstrapped Wilcoxon tests. The A-ApBM group demonstrated a significant reduction in drug craving scores at post-intervention compared to the baseline measure ($r = -0.33, p = 0.02$, 95% bootstrap CI = $[-0.56, -0.07]$). There were no significant changes observed in the control and S-ApBM groups. Similarly, at week-16, the follow-up cue-induced craving was lower in the A-ApBM group compared to the baseline ($r = -0.39, p = 0.01$, , 95% bootstrap CI = $[-0.56, -0.06]$), while the control and S-ApBM groups did not show significant changes.

*Table 2: Wilconxon Effect Size Estimates*

| Group | Post-Intervention | | | Week-16 Follow-up | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Wilcoxon Effect Size | 95%CI | p-value | Wilcoxon Effect Size | 95%CI | p-value |
| S-ApBM Group | -0.09 | [-0.36, 0.20] | 0.55 | -0.01 | [-0.36, 0.20] | 0.99 |
| Control Group | 0.20 | [-0.12, 0.49] | 0.20 | 0.10 | [-0.12, 0.49] | 0.56 |
| A-ApBM Group | -0.33** | [-0.56, -0.07] | 0.01 | -0.39*** | [-0.56, -0.07] | 0.00 |

**Relationship between Performance and Difficulty Indices**

Table 3 tabulates the estimates of the fixed effects of the linear mixed-effects model. The effects of ITR and t are statistically significant and positive, and the effects of Past3ITRSD $\text{ITR}^2$ are statistically significant and negative. The explanatory power is substantial (conditional $R^2 = 0.82$). The 95% Confidence Intervals and p-values were computed using a Wald t-distribution approximation.

*Table 3: Mixed Effect Regression Results*

| Characteristic | Beta | 95% CI[1] | p-value |
|---|---|---|---|
| ITR | | | |
| ITR | 0.02** | 0.00, 0.04 | 0.025 |
| ITR² | -0.02*** | -0.04, -0.01 | <0.001 |
| t | | | |
| t | 0.03*** | 0.02, 0.04 | <0.001 |
| t² | 0.00 | -0.01, 0.01 | 0.8 |
| Past3ITRSD | -0.09** | -0.16, -0.02 | 0.018 |

[1]CI = Confidence Interval

## Discussion

### Efficacy of the Adaptive Approach Bias Modification

The findings of this randomized controlled trial suggest that adaptive approach bias modification intervention may be an effective method for reducing cue-induced craving in individuals with methamphetamine use history. The results demonstrated a statistically significant reduction in cue-induced craving in the adaptive ApBM group compared to the control group and the static ApBM group. The week-16 post-intervention craving scores were significantly reduced (Wilcoxon $r = -0.34, p = 0.02$), and the week-16 follow-up craving scores were also significantly lower than the baseline craving (Wilcoxon $r = -0.37, p = 0.01$). These findings are consistent with previous research suggesting that approach bias modification interventions can effectively modify the automatic, unconscious tendencies that drive addictive behaviors.

**Leveraging Performance and Difficulty to Improve Efficacy of ApBM**

Pertaining to the theory of boredom, researchers have found that monotony, repetition, lack of novelty, and lack of complexity cause boredom.[13] Boredom can negatively impact engagement, attention, and interest, which can ultimately reduce the effectiveness of CBM programs. To address this issue and make the ApBM training more effective and engaging, we leverage the concepts of ITR, performance index, and difficulty index. The mixed-effect linear regression results indicate that the posited relationship between perceived difficulty and the factors were evident. The ITR has an inverted U-shape effect on the performance, and the standard deviation of the past ITRs is negatively correlated with the performance. Levering this, the algorithm we implemented make the ApBM training more engaging, effective, and personalized for individuals with substance use disorder. This adaptive approach to bias modification has the potential to improve treatment outcomes and contribute to the field of clinical psychology and addiction treatment.

## Conclusion

In conclusion, this study demonstrates the potential of incorporating gamified and adaptive approaches in cognitive bias modification interventions. The findings suggest that the adaptive approach bias modification scheme, which includes dynamic difficulty adjustments based on individual performance, can effectively reduce cue-induced craving in individuals with a history of methamphetamine use. The results highlight the importance of addressing the issue of boredom and disengagement in cognitive bias modification programs, as these factors can impact the effectiveness of the intervention. By making the training program more engaging and personalized, the adaptive approach bias modification has the potential to enhance treatment outcomes.

We acknowledge the following limitations of the study. First, the sample size was relatively small and homogenous in race and ethnicity, which may limit the generalizability. Larger studies with diverse populations are needed to validate the effectiveness of the ApBM scheme in different contexts. Second, the duration of the intervention program was relatively short at four weeks. Longer follow-up periods are necessary to assess the durability of the intervention and any potential relapse. Third, the lack of an active control group. Further research is needed to validate and refine this adaptive scheme and explore its application in other psychiatric conditions.

**Acknowledgement**

The authors thank the social workers at the participating community-based rehablitation centers.

1. Cristea IA, Kok RN, Cuijpers P. The effectiveness of cognitive bias modification interventions for substance addictions: A meta-analysis. *PloS one*. 2016;11(9):e0162226.

2. Jones EB, Sharpe L. Cognitive bias modification: A review of meta-analyses. *Journal of affective disorders*. 2017;223:175-183.

3. Boendermaker WJ, Maceiras SS, Boffo M, Wiers RW. Attentional bias modification with serious game elements: Evaluating the shots game. *JMIR serious games*. 2016;4(2):e6464.

4. Lisk SC, Pile V, Haller SP, Kumari V, Lau JY. Multisession cognitive bias modification targeting multiple biases in adolescents with elevated social anxiety. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*. 2018;42:581-597.

5. Blackwell SE, Holmes EA. Modifying interpretation and imagination in clinical depression: A single case series using cognitive bias modification. *Applied Cognitive Psychology: The Official Journal of the Society for Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*. 2010;24(3):338-350.

6. Beard C, Weisberg RB, Primack J. Socially anxious primary care patients' attitudes toward cognitive bias modification (CBM): A qualitative study. *Behavioural and cognitive psychotherapy*. 2012;40(5):618-633.

7. Zhang M, Ying J, Wing T, Song G, Fung DS, Smith H. A systematic review of attention biases in opioid, cannabis, stimulant use disorders. *International journal of environmental research and public health*. 2018;15(6):1138.

8. Zhang M, Heng S, Song G, Fung DS, Smith HE, et al. Co-designing a mobile gamified attention bias modification intervention for substance use disorders: Participatory research study. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth*. 2019;7(10):e15871.

9. Vermeir JF, White MJ, Johnson D, Crombez G, Van Ryckeghem DM. Gamified web-delivered attentional bias modification training for adults with chronic pain: Protocol for a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *JMIR Research Protocols*. 2022;11(1):e32359.

10. Schmidt-Kraepelin M, Thiebes S, Stepanovic S, Mettler T, Sunyaev A. Gamification in health behavior change support systems-a synthesis of unintended side effects. In: *Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Wirtschaftsinformatik*.; 2019:1032-1046.

11. Cowley B, Charles D, Black M, Hickey R. Toward an understanding of flow in video games. *Computers in Entertainment (CIE)*. 2008;6(2):1-27.

12. Li Y, Ryan CT, Sheng L. Optimal sequencing in single-player games. *Management Science*. Published online 2023.

13. Smith RP. Boredom: A review. *Human factors*. 1981;23(3):329-340.

14. Amir N, Kuckertz JM, Strege MV. A pilot study of an adaptive, idiographic, and multi-component attention bias modification program for social anxiety disorder. *Cognitive therapy and research*. 2016;40(5):661-671.

15. Amir N, Holbrook A, Kallen A, et al. Multiple adaptive attention-bias-modification programs to alter normative increase in the error-related negativity in adolescents. *Clinical Psychological Science*. Published online 2022:21677026231170563.

16. Piper BJ, Ogden CL, Simoyan OM, et al. Trends in use of prescription stimulants in the united states and territories, 2006 to 2016. *PloS one*. 2018;13(11):e0206100.

17. Hedegaard H, Bastian BA, Trinidad JP, Spencer M, Warner M. Drugs most frequently involved in drug overdose deaths: United states, 2011–2016. Published online 2018.

18. Office of China National Narcotics Control Commission. Drug situation in china (2019). *China Anti-drug Network*. Published online 2020.

19. Wang X, Li Y, Li J, Hao W. Emerging patterns of substance abuse and related treatment in china. *Current opinion in psychiatry*. 2023;36(4):277-282.

20. Ghaffari A, Mousavi-Nasab S, Fazilat-Pour M. Comparison of the effectiveness of attentional bias modification, approach bias modification and their combination on cognitive bias and relapse in methamphetamine abusers. *International Journal of Behavioral Sciences*. 2021;14(4):217-224.

21. Manning V, Garfield JB, Mroz K, et al. Feasibility and acceptability of approach bias modification during methamphetamine withdrawal and related methamphetamine use outcomes. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*. 2019;106:12-18.

22. Garfield JB, Piercy H, Arunogiri S, et al. Protocol for the methamphetamine approach-avoidance training (MAAT) trial, a randomised controlled trial of personalised approach bias modification for methamphetamine use disorder. *Trials*. 2021;22(1):1-13.

23. Zhu Y, Jiang H, Su H, et al. A newly designed mobile-based computerized cognitive addiction therapy app for the improvement of cognition impairments and risk decision making in methamphetamine use disorder: Randomized controlled trial. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth*. 2018;6(6):e10292.

24. Zhang L, Li N, Li Y, et al. Preliminary efficacy of a digital therapeutics smartphone application for methamphetamine use disorder: An experimental study. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*. 2022;13:1027695.

25. Manning V, Garfield JBB, Staiger PK, Lubman DI, García AV. Effect of cognitive bias modification on early relapse among adults undergoing inpatient alcohol withdrawal treatment. *JAMA PSYCHIAT*. 2020;78(2).

26. Brown HD, Defulio A. Contingency management for the treatment of methamphetamine use disorder: A systematic review. *DRUG ALCOHOL DEPEN*. 2020;216:108307.

27. Asharani PV, Hombali A, Seow E, Wei J, Subramaniam M. Non-pharmacological interventions for methamphetamine use disorder: A systematic review. *DRUG ALCOHOL DEPEN*. 2020;212:108060.

28. Manning V, Piercy H, Garfield JBB, Lubman DI. Personalized approach bias modification smartphone app ("SWIPE") to reduce alcohol use among people drinking at hazardous or harmful levels: Protocol for an open-label feasibility study. *JMIR Res Protoc*. 2020;9(8):e21278.

29. Kruijt AW, Carlbring P. Mechanics of contingency-based cognitive bias modification: Pre-existing bias affects potency of active training but not placebo conditions. Published online 2018.

30. Bates D, Mächler M, Bolker B, Walker S. Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software*. 2015;67(1):1-48. doi:10.18637/jss.v067.i01