Title:

Integrating Screening and Clinical Interviews: Advancing the Assessment of Exercise Addiction in Athletes

Running Title:

Mixed-Methods Assessment of Exercise Addiction

Authors: Maria Geisler[1*], Alexandra Arnold[1], Oliver Stoll[2], Birgitta Schiller[3], Eva Wimmer[3], Marco Herbsleb[1,4], Feliberto de la Cruz[1], Andy Schumann[1], Karl-Jürgen Bär[1]

Affiliations:

[1] Department of Psychosomatic Medicine and Psychotherapy, University Hospital Jena, Krautgasse 8, D-07743 Jena, Germany

[2] Martin-Luther-University Halle-Wittenberg, Institute of Sports Science. Von-Seckendorff-Platz 2, D-06120 Halle (Saale).

[3] Institute for Qualitative Psychotherapy Research, Faculty of Psychotherapy Sciences, Sigmund Freud Private University Vienna, Vienna, Austria

[4] Department of Sports Medicine and Health Promotion, Friedrich-Schiller-University Jena, Wöllnitzer Straße 42, D-07749 Jena, Germany

***Correspondence:** Maria Geisler, Department of Psychosomatic Medicine and Psychotherapy, University Hospital Jena, Krautgasse 8, D-07743 Jena, Germany, Mail: maria.geisler@uni-jena.de, Phone: +493641/9390438.

Abstract:

Background and aims: Questionnaire-based tools such as the Exercise Dependence Scale (EDS) are widely used to identify individuals "at risk" for exercise addiction (EA), but it remains unclear how accurately these classifications reflect clinically diagnosable cases. This study combined quantitative screening with structured clinical interviews to (1) determine the proportion of false-positive classifications, (2) characterize psychological and motivational differences between clinically addicted and non-addicted athletes, and (3) identify the most discriminative predictors of EA.

Methods: A total of 342 endurance athletes (126 female, 153 male) completed an online survey including the EDS, life satisfaction, and motivational factors. Athletes exceeding the EDS cut-off (>77; n = 63) were invited to structured interviews based on ICD-11 criteria for disorders due to addictive behaviors and additionally completed the SCL-90-R. Group comparisons used t-tests or Mann–Whitney U-tests, and significant variables entered a LASSO logistic regression.

Results: Of the 34 interviewed athletes, 24 (70.6%) met ICD-11 criteria for EA, while 10 (29.4%) did not, indicating a notable false-positive rate of EDS-based screening. Interrater reliability for diagnostic classification was 97%. Compared to non-addicted athletes, those with EA were older, reported lower life satisfaction, higher weight-related exercise motivation, more withdrawal symptoms, greater interpersonal sensitivity, and more comorbidities. In the LASSO model, withdrawal symptoms, past comorbidities, and interview-based anamnesis emerged as strongest predictors of EA (AUC = 0.97).

Conclusions: Combining self-report and clinical assessment revealed that questionnaire-based screening overestimates EA prevalence. Findings underscore the importance of withdrawal-related and comorbidity features for differential diagnosis and support a multi-method approach to distinguish high involvement from true addictive exercise.

Keywords: exercise addiction, athletes, ICD-11, Exercise Dependence Scale, LASSO regression, comorbidity

1. Introduction

Exercise addiction (EA) is a dysfunctional behavior characterized by excessive exercise, withdrawal symptoms, loss of control, and negative consequences such as injuries or social isolation (Hausenblas & Downs, 2002; Weinstein & Szabo, 2023). Despite these features, EA is not yet recognized as an independent diagnostic category in international classification systems such as the DSM-5 or ICD-11 (American Psychiatric Association, 2013).Nevertheless, it has attracted increasing scientific and clinical attention in recent years due to its potential overlap with established psychiatric conditions, including depression, anxiety, eating disorders, and obsessive-compulsive traits. Although the behavioral and psychological features of EA have been described in the literature, a number of critical gaps remain regarding its valid assessment and classification.

To date, most research has relied on self-report questionnaires, such as the Exercise Dependence Scale (EDS) (Hausenblas & Downs, 2002; Müller et al., 2013) or Exercise Addiction Inventory (Griffiths et al., 2005). While these instruments have proven useful for screening, they are limited by their inability to distinguish between clinically relevant addiction and high, but non-pathological, levels of exercise (Müller et al., 2014; Weinstein & Szabo, 2023). This is particularly problematic in athletic populations, where high training volumes and sacrifices in other life domains may reflect professional dedication rather than psychopathology. As a result, the prevalence of EA may be systematically overestimated, and individuals may be falsely classified as “addicted” despite engaging in adaptive training behavior. The only study so far to directly compare EDS-based classifications with interview diagnoses was conducted by Müller et al. (2014). Their results indicated only fair to moderate agreement, suggesting that questionnaire screening may substantially overestimate the prevalence of EA. However, their investigation was limited to estimating concordance, without further exploring systematic differences between athletes classified as addicted versus non-addicted.

The present study aimed to replicate and extend the two-step assessment approach introduced by Müller et al. (2014). While their work demonstrated that EDS-based screening may yield false-positive classifications, our study went further by exploring in detail how athletes who met interview-based criteria for EA differ from those who screened “at risk” on the EDS but did not fulfill clinical criteria. In doing so, we moved beyond prevalence estimation to identify psychological, motivational, and health-related characteristics that most strongly distinguish truly addicted from non-addicted athletes. Specifically, we expected (1) to examine to what extent athletes identified as “at risk” by the EDS also meet clinical criteria for EA in structured interviews, thereby allowing an estimation of the false-positive rate of questionnaire-based screening. Furthermore, we aimed (2) to examine how athletes diagnosed as exercise addicted differ from their non-addicted counterparts with respect to biographical data, life satisfaction, exercise dependence subscales, comorbid symptoms, and motivational factors; and (3) to determine which of these characteristics provide the greatest discriminative value, assuming that specific clinical features rather than general training behavior would be most informative.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Participants

Participants were recruited through social media platforms (e.g., Facebook groups for runners and triathletes), online sports forums, and other digital platforms, with a particular focus on addressing endurance athletes. Inclusion criteria for the online study were a minimum age of 16 years and engagement in at least four hours of sports per week. A total of 342 athletes completed the online questionnaire. To compensate participation, we raffled ten vouchers (50 € each) for a local running store.

For the interview study, all participants who scored above the established cut-off of EDS > 77 in the screening (N = 63) and who had provided consent to be re-contacted were invited. Ultimately, 34 athletes participated in the structured diagnostic interviews, see Fig. 1.

All participants provided informed consent. The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the University Hospital Jena (2024-3259_1-BO).

2.2 Study Design

The study consisted of two consecutive phases: an online screening and subsequent structured interviews.

Online screening. The web-based survey lasted approximately 10–15 minutes and included sociodemographic and training-related questions (e.g., weekly hours of endurance sport, number of workouts per week, years of practice), the Exercise Dependence Scale (EDS, including all subscales), life satisfaction, and sport-related motivational factors. Based on the EDS cut-off (>77), participants were categorized as at risk or no risk. Descriptive statistics of both groups are reported in Table 1.

Structured interviews. All athletes who (a) scored above the cut-off, and (b) consented to be contacted were invited for a follow-up clinical interview. A total of 34 interviews were

conducted, each lasting 30–60 minutes. The interviews followed a semi-structured guide covering: (i) exercise addiction symptoms according to ICD-11 criteria (tolerance, withdrawal, impaired control, reduction of other activities, persistence despite injury/illness, secrecy); (ii) onset and triggers of problematic exercise behavior; (iii) potential comorbid conditions (eating disorders, obsessive–compulsive symptoms, substance use, others); and (iv) psychosocial background and psychiatric history. Before the interview, participants also completed the Symptom Checklist-90 (SCL-90) online.



Fig. 1. Study design. Following an initial online screening, athletes who scored above 77 on the EDS were invited to undergo a diagnostic clinical interview and complete the SCL-90. EDS = Exercise Dependence Scale; SCL-90 = Symptom Checklist-90.

2.3 Coding and Classification

Two independent raters (MG, AA) analyzed the interview transcripts using MAXQDA Analytics Pro (24.0.0). For the classification of athletes into exercise-addicted versus non-

addicted, we applied the ICD-11 guidelines for "Disorders due to addictive behaviours" (6C5Y). Specifically, athletes were classified as meeting criteria for EA if they fulfilled the essential ICD-11 features of impaired control over exercise behavior, increasing priority given to exercise, and continuation despite negative consequences, persisting for at least 12 months and associated with significant distress or impairment. Beyond this classification, additional codes were applied to capture relevant clinical features, including withdrawal symptoms, tolerance, current and past psychiatric comorbidities. Intercoder reliability was assessed based on the independent coding of both raters.

2.4 Statistical analyses

All statistical analyses were performed using R version 3.4.1 (Team, 2017). Significance levels were set to $p \leq 0.05$.

In a first step, data from the online screening were analyzed descriptively, stratified by participants categorized as *at risk* (EDS > 77) versus *no risk*. Group differences between these two categories were examined using independent-samples *t*-tests or, when assumptions of normality were violated, Mann–Whitney *U*-tests.

In a second step, data from the structured clinical interviews were analyzed. Athletes classified as exercise addicted were compared with those classified as non-addicted (despite being categorized as *at risk* in the screening). Again, *t*-tests or Mann–Whitney *U*-tests were applied depending on distributional properties.

Finally, all variables that showed significant differences between addicted and non-addicted athletes in the interview-based classification were entered into a Least Absolute Shrinkage and Selection Operator (LASSO) logistic regression model. LASSO is a penalized regression technique that simultaneously performs variable selection and regularization by shrinking less relevant coefficients toward zero (Tibshirani, 2018). This approach is particularly suited for

situations with many correlated predictors and relatively small sample sizes, as it reduces the risk of overfitting and multicollinearity.

We applied cross-validated LASSO logistic regression (10-fold cross-validation, $\alpha = 1$) using the *glmnet* package in R. The penalty parameter λ was selected based on the "one-standard-error" rule (λ.1se), favoring a more parsimonious model. For variables retained in the final model (non-zero coefficients), we report standardized coefficients as well as odds ratios recalculated on the original scale of measurement to facilitate interpretability. Model performance was evaluated using classification accuracy and the area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUC).

3. Results

3.1 Screening-Based and Interview-Based Classification

A total of 342 athletes completed the online screening, of whom 63 (18.4%) exceeded the EDS cut-off score (> 77) and were therefore classified as at-risk for exercise addiction (see Fig. 2). Descriptive characteristics of at risk-athletes and no-risk athletes are shown in Table 1.

Of these at-risk classified athletes, 34 athletes agreed to participate in the follow-up clinical interview. Based on the ICD-11 criteria for "Disorders due to addictive behaviours," 24 participants met the diagnostic criteria for exercise addiction, whereas 10 did not. This corresponds to a false-positive rate of 29.4%, indicating that nearly one in three athletes classified as "at risk" by the questionnaire did not meet clinical criteria in the interview. Interrater reliability was 97% (agreement in 33 of 34 cases), confirming a high level of diagnostic consistency across both raters.

Table 1. Characteristics of subjects based on online survey

	At risk - athletes		**No risk - athletes**		
	M	***SD***	***M***	***SD***	***p-value***
Age (years)	35.0	13.7	34.4	12.9	0.953
BMI (kg/m²)	22.8	2.6	22.4	2.3	0.608
Exercise amount (h/week)	9.7	4.2	9.6	5.4	0.359
Exercise duration (years)	15.9	13.0	13.0	9.2	0.284
Exercise workouts (N/week)	6.0	2.0	6.1	2.7	0.551
EDS-Total Sum	89.4	10.4	54.6	13.1	**<0.001**
EDS-Withdrawal	4.3	1.1	2.6	1.1	**<0.001**
EDS-Continuation	4.2	1.1	2.3	1.0	**<0.001**
EDS-Tolerance	4.2	0.9	2.6	1.0	**<0.001**
EDS-Lack of Control	4.2	1.0	2.3	1.0	**<0.001**
EDS-Reduction in other activities	3.7	0.8	2.3	1.0	**<0.001**

EDS-Time	5.2	0.7	3.8	1.1	**<0.001**
EDS-Intention effect	4.0	1.0	2.3	0.9	**<0.001**
Life satisfaction	5.6	1.1	5.3	1.2	0.201
Motivation_health	4.6	0.7	4.4	0.8	0.137
Motivation_weight	3.7	1.3	3.4	1.4	0.119
Motivation_performance	4.4	0.9	4.4	0.8	0.933
Motivation_pleasure	4.7	0.6	4.4	0.9	**0.014**
Motivation_social	3.3	1.4	3.1	1.4	0.252

Group-specific mean (M) and standard deviation (SD) of demographic variables in at-risk athletes and no-risk athletes. Group differences were assessed using independent-samples *t*-tests as all data were normally distributed. Significant p-values (< 0.05) are highlighted in bold. BMI = Body Mass Index, EDS = Exercise-Dependence Scale.



Figure 2. Screening-based classification of exercise addiction risk. Distribution of total scores on the Exercise Dependence Scale (EDS) across all participants (N = 342). Grey bars represent athletes classified as no risk (n = 279; 126 female, 153 male), and light red bars indicate those classified as at-risk (n = 63; 33 female, 30 male), based on the applied cut-off score of EDS > 77.

3.2 Group Differences: Exercise Addicted vs. Non-Addicted

All descriptive and inferential statistics comparing athletes classified as exercise addicted versus non-addicted are summarized in Table 2 and 3. Regarding demographic characteristics, the two groups did not differ in BMI (t(23.58) = −0.07, p = .947, d = −0.02), total exercise hours (W = 86.5, p = .208, r = .22), duration of athletic involvement (W = 97, p = .394, r = .15), or

weekly number of workouts (W = 122, p = .954, r = .01). However, addicted athletes were significantly older than non-addicted athletes (W = 178.5, p = .028, r = .38). In terms of psychological and motivational variables, addicted athletes reported lower overall life satisfaction (W = 66, p = .037, r = .36), higher motivation related to weight control (W = 184.5, p = .012, r = .43), and lower performance-oriented motivation (W = 75, p = .029, r = .38). The two groups did not differ in social motivation (W = 82.5, p = .141, r = .26), fun-related motivation (W = 93, p = .297, r = .18), or health-related motivation (W = 110, p = .694, r = .07).

Table 2. Characteristics of interviewed at-risk athletes

	Exercise Addicted		**Exercise non-addicted**		
	M	***SD***	***M***	***SD***	***p-value***
Age (years)	34.3	12.4	22.6	4.6	**0.028**§
BMI (kg/m²)	21.3	2.8	21.4	2.0	0.953
Exercise amount (h/week)	12.4	7.7	12.4	2.6	0.208§
Exercise duration (years)	11.8	9.9	12.0	4.9	0.394§
Exercise workouts (N/week)	8.1	3.8	7.4	2.1	0.954§
EDS-Total Sum	91.7	9.5	84.9	6.4	0.053§
EDS-Total Average	4.4	0.5	4.0	0.3	0.053§
EDS-Withdrawal	4.7	0.8	3.7	1.2	**0.036**
EDS-Continuation	4.4	1.2	3.6	0.9	**0.046**
EDS-Tolerance	4.2	0.8	4.5	0.6	0.350
EDS-Lack of Control	4.4	0.9	3.7	1.0	0.107
EDS-Reduction in other activities	3.8	0.8	3.3	0.7	0.114
EDS-Time	5.1	0.7	5.4	0.5	0.287§
EDS-Intention effect	4.1	0.9	4.1	1.0	0.976
Life satisfaction	4.6	1.2	5.6	1.1	**0.037§**
Motivation_health	4.2	1.0	4.2	1.3	0.694§
Motivation_weight	3.9	1.5	2.7	0.9	**0.012§**
Motivation_performance	4.5	0.8	5.0	0	**0.029§**

Motivation_pleasure	3.7	1.1	4.1	1.0	0.297§
Motivation_social	2.2	1.5	3.0	1.3	0.141§
Current comorbidity	0.7	0.9	0	0	**0.012§**
Past comorbidity	1.1	0.9	0.1	0.3	**<0.001**§
Withdrawal sum	3.2	1.0	1.7	1.3	**0.005**§

Group-specific mean (M) and standard deviation (SD) of variables in addicted athletes and non-addicted athletes. Independent-samples *t*-tests or, when assumptions of normality were violated, Mann–Whitney *U*-tests (§) were used to test group differences. Significant p-values (< 0.05) are highlighted in bold. BMI = Body Mass Index, EDS = Exercise-Dependence Scale.

Table 3. Symptom Checklist 90 characteristics of interviewed at-risk athletes

	Exercise addicted		**Exercise non-addicted**		
	M	***SD***	***M***	***SD***	***p-value***
Somatization	55.3	12.7	52.2	6.5	0.364
Obsessive-compulsive	57.8	14.7	51.3	10.1	0.155
Interpersonal sensibility	62.5	13.1	50.1	9.8	**0.006**
Depression	60.5	13.8	54.1	7.0	0.081
Anxiety	58.6	12.2	53.1	4.2	0.061
Anger-hostility	53.4	10.6	49.0	9.6	0.252
Phobic-anxiety	57.4	13.2	55.0	10.0	0.879§
Paranoid ideation	56.0	11.9	52.4	10.3	0.385
Psychoticism	59.7	10.5	53.6	10.4	0.140
Global Severity Index	61.4	14.2	53.8	6.9	**0.046**
Positive Symptom Distress Index	60.1	9.8	53.5	5.4	**0.017**
Positive Symptom Total	60.5	10.1	53.4	6.3	**0.019**

Group-specific mean (M) and standard deviation (SD) Symptom Checklist 90 (SCL90) variables in addicted athletes and non-addicted athletes. Independent-samples *t*-tests or, when assumptions of normality were violated, Mann–Whitney *U*-tests (§) were used to test group differences. Significant p-values (< 0.05) are highlighted in bold. Global Severity Index designed to measure overall psychological distress, Positive Symptom Distress Index designed to measure the intensity of symptoms, Positive Symptom Total reports number of self-reported symptom.

Concerning exercise dependence, group differences were observed for the withdrawal ($t(12.75) = 2.34$, $p = .036$, $d = 1.02$) and continuation subscales ($t(22.98) = 2.11$, $p = .046$, $d = 0.70$), indicating higher scores among addicted athletes. No significant differences emerged for tolerance ($t(22.55) = -0.95$, $p = .350$, $d = -0.32$), lack of control ($t(16.24) = 1.70$, $p = .107$, $d = 0.65$), reduction in other activities ($t(17.80) = 1.66$, $p = .114$, $d = 0.61$), time ($W = 92$, $p = .287$, $r = .19$), intention effects ($t(15.60) = -0.03$, $p = .976$, $d = -0.01$), and the total EDS ($W = 171.5$, $p = .053$, $r = .34$), (see Figure 3). Regarding psychopathological symptoms assessed with the SCL-90, addicted athletes showed significantly higher scores on interpersonal sensitivity ($t(22.43) = 3.01$, $p = .006$, $d = 1.01$), on the Positive Symptom Total (PST) ($t(26.55) = 2.49$, $p = .019$, $d = 0.78$), the Global Severity Index (GSI) ($t(30.98) = 2.08$, $p = .046$, $d = 0.60$) and the Positive Symptom Distress Index (PSDI) ($t(29.01) = 2.52$, $p = .017$, $d = 0.76$) compared to non-addicted athletes.

All other subscales showed no significant group differences, including somatization ($t(30.33) = 0.92$, $p = .364$, $d = 0.27$), obsessive–compulsive symptoms ($t(24.35) = 1.47$, $p = .155$, $d = 0.48$), depression ($t(30.48) = 1.80$, $p = .081$, $d = 0.53$), anxiety ($t(31.41) = 1.95$, $p = .061$, $d = 0.52$), aggressiveness/hostility ($t(18.52) = 1.18$, $p = .252$, $d = 0.43$), phobic anxiety ($W = 124.5$, $p = .879$, $r = .03$), paranoid ideation ($t(19.54) = 0.89$, $p = .385$, $d = 0.31$), and psychoticism ($t(17.01) = 1.55$, $p = .140$, $d = 0.58$).



Figure 3. Exercise Dependence Scale (EDS) subscale scores (mean ± SE) for exercise-addicted (red) and non-addicted (grey) athletes. Significant group differences emerged for the total EDS and withdrawal subscale.



Figure 4. Mean T-scores (± SE) on the SCL-90 subscales for athletes classified as exercise addicted (red) and non-addicted (grey). Addicted athletes showed significantly higher scores on Interpersonal Sensitivity and the Positive Symptom Total (PST) compared to non-addicted athletes. T-scores are standardized values with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10 (values ≥ 60 indicate clinically relevant symptom levels). SOM = Somatization; O-C = Obsessive–Compulsive; I-S = Interpersonal Sensitivity; DEP = Depression; ANX = Anxiety; HOS = Hostility; PHOB = Phobic Anxiety; PAR = Paranoid Ideation; PSY = Psychoticism; GSI = Global Severity Index; PSDI = Positive Symptom Distress Index; PST = Positive Symptom Total.

Finally, analyses of interview-based data revealed that, beyond the ICD-11 criteria used for diagnostic classification, addicted athletes exhibited significantly more withdrawal-related symptoms (W = 192.5, p = .005, r = .48), a higher frequency of current comorbidities (W = 175, p = .012, r = .43), and more past comorbidities (W = 200.5, p = .001, r = .57) compared to non-addicted athletes (see Figures 5 and 6).



Figure 5. Past and current comorbidities among exercise-addicted and non-addicted athletes. Left: Percentage of athletes reporting specific comorbid diagnoses for addicted (red) and non-addicted (grey) groups. Center and right: Boxplots showing the summed number of past and current comorbidities, respectively. Athletes classified as exercise addicted reported significantly more past ($p < 0.001$) and current ($p = 0.012$) comorbidities compared to non-addicted athletes. OCD = Obsessive–Compulsive Disorder, ADHD = Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder.



Figure 6. Withdrawal symptoms reported by athletes classified as exercise addicted and non-addicted. Left: Percentage of athletes reporting specific withdrawal symptoms. Right: Boxplots showing the total number of withdrawal symptoms reported by each group. Addicted athletes showed significantly more withdrawal symptoms compared to non-addicted athletes ($p = 0.005$).

3.3 Predictive modeling of exercise addiction

To identify the most informative predictors distinguishing between exercise-addicted and non-addicted athletes, a LASSO logistic regression was conducted including all variables that had shown significant group differences in previous analyses. The model was trained using 10-fold cross-validation to select the optimal degree of regularization (λ). The best-performing model was obtained at λ_1SE = 0.116, yielding a parsimonious set of predictors with non-zero coefficients. Two variables emerged as relevant predictors of exercise addiction. These included the EDS withdrawal subscale ((β = 0.153, OR = 1.17), the interview-based withdrawal symptom sum score (β = 0.265, OR = 1.30) and the interview-based past comorbidity sum score (β = 0.279, OR = 1.32). The model achieved an overall classification accuracy of 94.1% and an area under the ROC curve (AUC) of 0.97, indicating excellent discrimination between addicted and non-addicted athletes.

4 Discussion

The present study combined questionnaire-based screening with structured clinical interviews to investigate EA in endurance athletes. Using a two-step design, we first identified athletes "at risk" according to the EDS and subsequently evaluated them against proposed ICD-11 criteria for addictive disorders. This approach yielded three main findings. First, only about two-thirds of athletes classified as "at risk" by the EDS met clinical criteria for EA in interviews, corresponding to a false-positive rate of 29.4%. Second, athletes diagnosed as exercise addicted differed from their non-addicted counterparts mainly in psychological and motivational domains, rather than in training behavior or anthropometric characteristics. Third, LASSO regression identified withdrawal symptoms and anamnestically reported comorbidities as the strongest predictors of clinical addiction status.

Diagnostic validity of questionnaire-based screening for exercise addiction

These findings provide important evidence regarding the diagnostic validity of questionnaire-based screening for EA. Consistent with Müller et al. (2014), the proportion of athletes classified as "at risk" according to the Exercise Dependence Scale (EDS) was highly comparable across studies—18.4% in the present sample versus 17.2% in theirs. This similarity suggests that the EDS identifies a comparable proportion of individuals with potentially problematic exercise patterns across different samples and contexts. However, the proportion of athletes who ultimately met criteria for a clinical diagnosis differed between studies. In Müller et al. (2014) only 10 of 23 "at-risk" individuals (approximately 30%) received a diagnosis of EA following the clinical interview, corresponding to a false-positive rate of around 70%. In contrast, in the present study, 24 of 34 (70.6%) participants classified as "at risk" fulfilled the ICD-11 criteria for disorders due to addictive behaviours, resulting in a lower false-positive rate of 29.4%.

Several methodological differences may account for this discrepancy. The present study used the ICD-11 framework, which provides more explicit behavioral and temporal criteria for addictive disorders than earlier diagnostic systems. Moreover, our sample consisted exclusively of endurance athletes, whereas Müller et al. (2014) examined a more heterogeneous group including fitness clients, sport students, recreational exercisers, and eating disorder patients. Such differences in sample composition and diagnostic approach may influence the proportion of false-positive classifications observed. Overall, both studies converge in showing that questionnaire-based screening tends to overestimate the prevalence of EA, underscoring the need for multi-method assessment approaches

Psychological and clinical differences between addicted and non-addicted athletes

Beyond diagnostic classification, the present findings reveal several meaningful psychological and clinical distinctions between athletes with and without exercise addiction. Although both groups displayed comparable training volumes, duration of athletic involvement, and BMI, addicted athletes were significantly older on average. This may indicate that exercise addiction can develop gradually over years of intensive training or that prolonged engagement in endurance sports increases vulnerability to compulsive behavioral patterns.

In line with previous research on exercise addiction (Lichtenstein et al., 2014), addicted athletes reported lower overall life satisfaction, a pattern also observed in other mental disorders (Meule & Voderholzer, 2020), suggesting less adaptive psychosocial functioning despite their high exercise engagement. The motivational profile further differentiated the two groups: exercise-addicted athletes exhibited stronger weight-related motivation and lower performance-oriented motivation. This shift from achievement-driven to weight- and control-oriented motives may reflect an underlying change from goal-directed to compulsive behavior, consistent with theories linking exercise addiction to affect regulation and body-related concerns rather than athletic performance (Costa et al., 2013; González-Hernández et al., 2023).

The pattern of EDS subscale differences supports this interpretation. Addicted athletes scored higher on the withdrawal and continuation subscales, indicating that negative reinforcement processes—exercising to avoid distress or negative affect—play a central role in maintaining the behavior. In contrast, tolerance, lack of control, and time investment did not differ significantly, possibly reflecting the structured and high-volume training routines that are normative in competitive sports rather than pathological.

Psychopathological differences were most pronounced in interpersonal sensitivity and global distress indices (PST, GSI, PSDI) on the SCL-90-R, pointing to heightened emotional vulnerability and social insecurity among addicted athletes. These findings are consistent with prior studies showing that perfectionism, interpersonal sensitivity, and self-esteem deficits contribute to compulsive exercise tendencies (Freimuth et al., 2011; Weinstein & Szabo, 2023). However, the absence of group differences in depression or anxiety may suggest that exercise still functions as an emotion-regulation strategy, potentially masking affective symptoms in this population.

Importantly, the interview-based data add a clinical dimension to these findings. Addicted athletes reported significantly more withdrawal symptoms and a higher frequency of both past and current comorbidities compared to non-addicted athletes. The particularly high odds ratio for *past comorbidities* in the LASSO model—along with withdrawal symptoms and interview-based anamnesis scores as the strongest predictors (AUC = 0.97)—highlights that exercise addiction often occurs in the context of preexisting psychological vulnerability. This pattern suggests that EA may frequently develop as a secondary or compensatory condition, emerging from prior psychopathology or maladaptive coping attempts, rather than as a purely sport-specific disorder.

Together, these results underscore that the defining characteristics of clinically relevant exercise addiction are not found in the amount or intensity of exercise per se, but in the presence of

withdrawal-related affective symptoms, comorbid psychopathology, and maladaptive motivational patterns.

Clinical implications and diagnostic considerations

The present findings have important implications for both research and clinical assessment of exercise addiction. First, they support the notion that screening tools such as the EDS, while valuable for identifying individuals with elevated risk scores, should not be used in isolation for diagnostic purposes (Weinstein & Szabo, 2023). The relatively high false-positive rate underscores the need for structured clinical interviews that incorporate e.g. ICD-11 criteria, including impaired control, increasing priority of exercise, and continuation despite harm. These features capture the qualitative aspects of addiction that go beyond frequency or intensity of training.

Second, the strong predictive role of withdrawal symptoms and comorbidity history suggests that assessment protocols should include systematic screening for psychiatric history and affective dysregulation. Clinicians working with athletes should be particularly attentive when exercise is used as a coping mechanism for anxiety, stress, or eating-related concerns, as these may signal the transition from high commitment to dependency-like behavior.

Third, the distinction between primary and secondary forms of exercise addiction deserves greater attention. Our findings that past psychopathology strongly predicts current EA align with conceptual models proposing that EA often emerges as a maladaptive coping strategy, particularly in individuals with prior affective or eating disorders. This perspective may have implications for treatment planning—suggesting that addressing underlying emotional regulation difficulties or body image concerns may be more effective than solely targeting exercise behavior itself.

Finally, these results highlight the importance of adopting a multi-method assessment strategy that integrates self-report screening, motivational profiling, and clinical interview data. Such approaches can enhance diagnostic specificity and help prevent the overpathologization of dedicated athletes whose high training volume reflects professional ambition rather than addiction.

Limitations and Future Directions

Several limitations should be acknowledged. The number of clinically interviewed athletes was relatively small, which may limit statistical power and generalizability, especially regarding gender or sport-type differences. Although the interview demonstrated excellent interrater reliability (97%) and was grounded in ICD-11 criteria, it is not yet a standardized diagnostic instrument for exercise addiction. Future research should seek to refine and validate such interviews across athletic populations.

All assessments relied on self-report and retrospective recall, introducing potential biases due to social desirability or memory effects. Moreover, the cross-sectional design precludes causal conclusions—particularly concerning whether exercise addiction develops secondary to other psychopathology or vice versa. Longitudinal and experimental studies are needed to clarify these trajectories.

Finally, while the LASSO model identified a parsimonious set of predictors—withdrawal symptoms, comorbidity history, and interview-based anamnesis—external validation is essential to confirm their diagnostic value. Future research should also examine protective factors (e.g., coaching support, identity balance) and evaluate the applicability of emerging behavioral addiction frameworks, such as craving or functional impairment, to exercise-related disorders.

Conclusion

The present study demonstrates that a considerable proportion of athletes who screen "at risk" on the EDS do not meet ICD-11 criteria for exercise addiction in clinical interviews, highlighting the limited diagnostic specificity of questionnaire-based screening. Addicted athletes differed from their non-addicted counterparts primarily in psychological and clinical characteristics—such as stronger withdrawal symptoms, lower life satisfaction, and more frequent comorbidities—rather than in training volume or duration. Moreover, past and current comorbidities emerged as the strongest predictors of addiction status, suggesting that exercise addiction may often develop in the context of, or as a maladaptive coping mechanism for, pre-existing psychological difficulties. These findings underscore the need to consider comorbid psychopathology and withdrawal-related features in the differential diagnosis of exercise addiction.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Sissy Höbelt for her support in conducting the interviews.

Funding and Conflict of Interests:

None.

Data Availability Statement:

The data of our study will be made available via a request to the Authors.

Author contributions:

MG, MH and K-JB designed the experiment. MG and K-JB collected the data. MG AA, MG, FD, AS, BS, EW analyzed the data. All authors discussed the results, revised the article critically for important intellectual content, and approved the final article.

References

Costa, S., Hausenblas, H. A., Oliva, P., Cuzzocrea, F., & Larcan, R. (2013). The role of age, gender, mood states and exercise frequency on exercise dependence. *J Behav Addict*, *2*(4), 216-223. https://doi.org/10.1556/jba.2.2013.014

Freimuth, M., Moniz, S., & Kim, S. R. (2011). Clarifying exercise addiction: differential diagnosis, co-occurring disorders, and phases of addiction. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*, *8*(10), 4069-4081. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph8104069

González-Hernández, J., Baños, R., Morquecho-Sánchez, R., Pineda-Espejel, H. A., & Chamorro, J. L. (2023). Perfectionism Patterns, Dark Personality, and Exercise Addiction Trend in High-Intensity Sports. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*, *21*(1), 308-320. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-021-00595-y

Griffiths, M. D., Szabo, A., & Terry, A. (2005). The exercise addiction inventory: a quick and easy screening tool for health practitioners. *Br J Sports Med*, *39*(6), e30. https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsm.2004.017020

Hausenblas, H. A., & Downs, D. S. (2002). Exercise dependence: A systematic review. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *3*(2), 89-123. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1469-0292(00)00015-7

Lichtenstein, M. B., Christiansen, E., Elklit, A., Bilenberg, N., & Støving, R. K. (2014). Exercise addiction: a study of eating disorder symptoms, quality of life, personality traits and attachment styles. *Psychiatry Res*, *215*(2), 410-416. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2013.11.010

Meule, A., & Voderholzer, U. (2020). Life satisfaction in persons with mental disorders. *Qual Life Res*, *29*(11), 3043-3052. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-020-02556-9

Müller, A., Claes, L., Smits, D., Gefeller, O., Hilbert, A., Herberg, A., Müller, V., Hofmeister, D., & de Zwaan, M. (2013). Validation of the German version of the exercise dependence scale. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, *29*, 213-219.

Müller, A., Cook, B., Zander, H., Herberg, A., Müller, V., & de Zwaan, M. (2014). Does the German version of the Exercise Dependence Scale measure exercise dependence? *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *15*(3), 288-292. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2013.12.003

[Record #597 is using a reference type undefined in this output style.]

Tibshirani, R. (2018). Regression Shrinkage and Selection Via the Lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, *58*(1), 267-288. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2517-6161.1996.tb02080.x

Weinstein, A., & Szabo, A. (2023). Exercise addiction: A narrative overview of research issues. *Dialogues Clin Neurosci*, *25*(1), 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1080/19585969.2023.2164841