

Psychology Today (PT) comments made by Prause, or her aliases, about Gary Wilson

NOTE: The links are ONLY the PT comments referring directly or indirectly to Wilson. Prause and her numerous alias have posted numerous times on *Psychology Today*. The following comments are just the tip of the Prause iceberg.

For much more see these 2 pages documenting Prause's extensive history of harassment and defamation:

- [Nicole Prause's Unethical Harassment and Defamation of Gary Wilson & Others](#)
- [Nicole Prause's Unethical Harassment and Defamation of Gary Wilson & Others \(page 2\)](#)

Begins with comments under "Your Brain On Porn It's Not Addictive", by David Ley

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/514207#comment-514207>

It's funny, isn't it? I

Submitted by Anonymoose on March 7, 2013 - 11:28am

It's funny, isn't it? I guess that's what happens when someone, PhD or not, takes someone else's study and misrepresents the results to further their own agenda. If the author was actually as intelligent as he seems to think his doctorate proves, he wouldn't have needed such a smack down from Mr. Wilson because his article would have taken a much more moderate and humble tone rather than reeking of smug self-superiority.

One EEG is the be-all and end-all of scientific proof you need to address a topic as wide as addiction, "Doctor" Ley? Might be time to hand in your lab coat and take up work writing for one of the tabloid rags.

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/521435#comment-521435>

You should read this

Submitted by Anonymous on April 10, 2013 - 1:36pm

<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10720162.2013.772874> and the citation is Prause, N., Staley, C., & Fong, T. W. (2013). No Evidence of Emotion Dysregulation in "Hypersexuals" Reporting Their Emotions to a Sexual Film. *Sexual Addiction & Compulsivity*, 20(1-2), 106-126. doi: 10.1080/10720162.2013.772874

It was recommended by Nicole Prause.

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/545309#comment-545309>

Baseless assertions

Submitted by Anonymous on August 1, 2013 - 12:36pm

Okay. Fine. Let's do these in order, answering your questions. Then I have one of my own.

Examples of respectful and scientific Ph.D. level critique and evaluation come from Prof. Rory Reid, and Prof. William Struthers here at PT.

<http://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/genes-god/201307/porn-eegs-and-the-end-sex-addiction>

<http://www.rory.net/Pages/PrauseCritique.html>

One may disagree with their interpretations, but they are certainly respectful and scientific.

Next, the journal where Prause et. al. published is peer reviewed:

"Aims & Scope: Socioaffective Neuroscience & Psychology (SNP) is a peer reviewed international Open Access journal that aims to provide a forum for, and stimulate multidisciplinary research into the central nervous system and its complex relationship with the surrounding social environment. Read more here."

<http://www.socioaffectiveneuroscipsychol.net/index.php/snp>

Finally, Dr. Nicole Prause is a Ph.D. level researcher who has published extensively and has serious research credentials. Here's her CV:

http://www.span-lab.com/Assets/pdf/CV_Prause.pdf

Have you seen Gary Wilson's CV? I can't seem to find it online. Credentials aren't everything, but they aren't nothing, either.

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/775451#comment-775451>

Perhaps Prause's preconceptions led to a conclusion opposite of the results

Submitted by John A. Johnson Ph.D. on September 22, 2013 - 9:00pm

My mind still boggles at the Prause claim that her subjects' brains did not respond to sexual images like drug addicts' brains respond to their drug, given that she reports higher P300 readings for the sexual images. Just like addicts who show P300 spikes when presented with their drug of choice.

How could she draw a conclusion that is the opposite of the actual results? I think it could be do to her preconceptions--what she expected to find. I wrote about this elsewhere. <http://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/cui-bono/201308/preconceptions-may-color-conclusions-about-sex-addiction>

Reply to John A. Johnson Ph.D.

Quote John A. Johnson Ph.D.

Debunked

Submitted by Replicated on July 12, 2015 - 6:26pm

A neuroscience study more than twice the size of the Cambridge study in a higher-impact journal reports the opposite:
<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301051115300107>

Reply to Replicated

Quote Replicated

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/775445#comment-775445>

A peer-reviewed rebuttal of this study's claims

Submitted by kikibird on March 4, 2014 - 9:00pm

'High desire', or 'merely' an addiction? A response to Steele et al. by

Donald L. Hilton, Jr., MD

<http://www.socioaffectiveneuroscipsychol.net/index.php/snp/article/view/23833/32589>

Reply to kikibird

Quote kikibird

Not peer-reviewed

Submitted by RealScience on July 12, 2015 - 6:19pm

Actually, letters to the editor are not peer-reviewed and, given that Hilton is not a neuroscientist, it's a pretty embarrassing attempt at a critique.

Reply to RealScience

Quote RealScience

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/775452#comment-775452>

Peer-reviewed analysis of this study

Submitted by anonymous on September 16, 2014 - 3:36pm

'High desire', or 'merely' an addiction? A response to Steele et al.

<http://www.socioaffectiveneuropsychol.net/index.php/snp/article/view/23833/32589>

Reply to anonymous

Quote anonymous

Replication and extension

Submitted by Replicated on July 12, 2015 - 6:28pm

The largest neuroscience study of porn addiction agrees with this study:

<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301051115300107>

Reply to Replicated

Quote Replicated

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/775449#comment-775449>

I have posted a formal reply to this study

Submitted by Gary Wilson on July 20, 2013 - 12:23am

The following post is my response to this study - "UCLA's SPAN Lab Touts Empty Porn Study As Ground-Breaking"

<http://pornstudyskeptics.blogspot.com/2013/07/uclas-span-lab-touts-empty-porn-study.html>

Reply to Gary Wilson

Quote Gary Wilson

Largest neuroscience study of porn addiction debunks

Submitted by Updates on July 12, 2015 - 6:24pm

New study debunks the false objections by addiction-ologists:

<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301051115300107>

Reply to Updates

Quote Updates

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/566626#comment-566626>

PubMed

Submitted by Kenneth Anderson M.A. on July 19, 2013 - 4:32pm

It appears that the journal in which the source article was published is not a PubMed indexed journal. This always makes me suspicious since there are a number of open source journals which will publish your laundry list if you pay them enough. Is this a reputable journal?

Reply to Kenneth Anderson M.A.

Quote Kenneth Anderson M.A.

Peer-reviewed journal

Submitted by Anonymous on November 6, 2013 - 5:52pm

Yes, Socioaffective Neuroscience and Psychology is a peer-reviewed journal, not a pay-for-play. It is relatively new, so they have not yet pursued (as far as I know) impact factor rankings yet. As all the article authors have plenty of pubs in IF-rated journals too, this was probably a requested, peer-reviewed manuscript.

Reply to Anonymous

Quote Anonymous

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/775447#comment-775447>

The Prause research team claims to be able to demonstrate whether the elevated EEG response of their subjects to erotica is an addictive brain response or just a high-libido brain response by correlating a set of questionnaire scores with individual differences in EEG response. But explaining differences in EEG response is a different question from exploring whether the overall group's response looks addictive or not. The Prause group reported that the only statistically significant correlation with the EEG response was a negative correlation ($r = -.33$) with desire for sex with a partner. In other words, there was a slight tendency for subjects with strong EEG responses to erotica to have lower desire for sex with a partner. How does that say anything about whether the brain responses of people who have trouble regulating their viewing of erotica are similar to addicts or non-addicts with a high libido?

Reply to John A. Johnson Ph.D.

Quote John A. Johnson Ph.D.

Larger study replicates original

Submitted by Updates on July 12, 2015 - 6:22pm

Asked, answered, same results:

<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301051115300107>

Reply to Updates

Quote Updates

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/879466#comment-879466>

"Our findings suggest dACC activity reflects the role of sexual desire, which may have similarities to a study on the P300 in CSB subjects correlating with desire [25]Studies of the P300, an event related potential used to study attentional bias in substance use disorders, show elevated measures with respect to use of nicotine [54], alcohol [55], and opiates [56], with measures often correlating with craving indices.".....Thus, both dACC activity in the present CSB study and P300 activity reported in a previous CSB study may reflect similar underlying processes."

There you go - both the Cambridge study and Steel et al. found higher brain activation when exposed to porn cues. You didn't get that from this interview with Prause.

Reply to Anonymouses

Quote Anonymouses

Letters to the editor are not peer-reviewed

Submitted by CorrectingMisinformation on October 30, 2016 - 1:50pm

Actually, "It's in journal, was peer-reviewed" is a false statement. Not all journals or all aspects of journals are peer-reviewed. This was a letter only, not peer-reviewed. It is the opinion of the author only.

Reply to CorrectingMisinformation

Quote CorrectingMisinformation

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/566628#comment-566628>

Naive

Submitted by Anonymous on July 18, 2013 - 10:39am

Comparing brain responses to mood-altering substances with brain responses to mood-altering behaviors is naive at best, clinically facetious at worst. The study appears functionally useless.

[Reply to Anonymous](#)

[Quote Anonymous](#)

The clinicians are doing it

Submitted by Anonymous on November 6, 2013 - 5:55pm

From Carnes (1983) all the way to the Sexual Recovery Institute treatment materials, they all draw direct parallels with substance abuse. I agree, this is completely moronic, and now we have some actual data to suggest one way in which the addiction model truly does not fit these problems.

[Reply to Anonymous](#)

[Quote Anonymous](#)

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/775446#comment-775446>

Your readers might also be interested

Submitted by Marnia Robinson on July 19, 2013 - 12:07pm

in this item from the same journal issue, also about porn addiction:

"Pornography addiction – a supranormal stimulus considered in the context of neuroplasticity" by Donald L. Hilton Jr., MD

Full text: <http://www.socioaffectiveneuropsychol.net/index.php/snp/article/view/20767/29179>

[Reply to Marnia Robinson](#)

[Quote Marnia Robinson](#)

Larger study supports original findings

Submitted by Real Scientist on July 12, 2015 - 6:21pm

Readers might be interested in actual peer-reviewed science too, not un-reviewed letters to the editor by a surgeon with no research training.

<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301051115300107>

[Reply to Real Scientist](#)

[Quote Real Scientist](#)

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/565636#comment-565636>

Passionate is the word for it!

Submitted by John A. Johnson Ph.D. on September 22, 2013 - 9:10pm

Thanks for your comment, Jen.

It seems to me that passion is a double-edged sword. On the good side, passion for a subject means the person is willing to invest a lot of time and energy on that subject. Why would someone study something unless he or she had a passion for it?

On the other hand, if the passionate person already has his/her mind made up, all of that passionate energy is going to be directed toward one possibility, right or wrong. And when wrong, passion leads to blindness to the truth.

I am likely to stay out of these debates and let the empirical researchers decide.

[Reply to John A. Johnson Ph.D.](#)

[Quote John A. Johnson Ph.D.](#)

Website to a fraud?

Submitted by Anonymous on November 2, 2013 - 6:26pm

As you mention, this debate since rife with agendas. However, linking a science debate to some random dude trying to sell books? How is this an improvement? I also think you missed the point of the study...all people show the pattern. This group (1) looks exactly like everyone else, and (2) just to be sure, the brain measure wasn't related to any measure of hypersexuality (though it was to desire for sex with a partner). I'm not sure why it wasn't related to desire to masturbate too, although the authors administered the whole scale and do talk about why that might be.

[Reply to Anonymous](#)

[Quote Anonymous](#)

+++++

Okay, I'm going to be

Submitted by Anonymous on November 3, 2013 - 8:37pm

Okay, I'm going to be optimistic and assume neither the author of this PT post nor the authors of the research article are intentionally biased. On the one hand, that change (sexual pics having the highest change) I would estimate has been replicated by at least 100 laboratories in controls. It's extremely stable. Also, controls are exactly people who are on the low/absent end of the construct of interest. The regressions (not correlations) conducted, could be critiqued for not having the low end well-represented, but the range of the construct appears represented. Finally, we don't know that a control wasn't collected. Science is slow. It could be coming before you throw the scientist out with the biohazard (ha!)

That said, there are many questions this study raises:

1. How would a person with other sexual problems respond?
2. What will change with different kinds of pictures?
3. What about films?

The bigger question, though, is...why did it take so long to get a study like this done in the first place? Really, both the pro and con crowd should be embarrassed by the poor level of science in this area.

There are actual scientists blogging about this topic if you need better links. This is a blogger who appears to have no credentials and made many mistakes in their "review". I'll even give you the pro-addiction science links. PT shouldn't be relying on crappy reviews like that. Perhaps it was meant to be a commentary on bias that the PT author chose only a pro-addiction link only from a non-scientist blogger?

Reply to Anonymous

Quote Anonymous

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/566091#comment-566091>

As I said, my major interest is in the psychological factors that affect the conduct and interpretation of scientific research, more than the concept of sex addiction per se. Perhaps it was easier for me to point to the site of a true believer in the concept of sex addiction to illustrate possible psychological factors affecting the interpretation of research than to a more staid, neutral site maintained by professional sex researchers. If there is such an allegedly non-biased site (pro- or anti-addiction), I'd love to get the URL to see for myself whether it is indeed unbiased. Finding a non-biased discussion of sex addiction would be a first for me.

Reply to John A. Johnson Ph.D.

Quote John A. Johnson Ph.D.

Craptastic

Submitted by Jen on November 4, 2013 - 4:02pm

Indeed. Sounds to me like the author perhaps ought to have paid greater heed to your feedback, prior to publishing.

Hate to point out what is so painfully obvious here, buuuut, it can be safely said that if the major debate surrounding one's publishing is it's validity, rather than it's content, there is a definite problem.

Reply to Jen

Quote Jen

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/566638#comment-566638>

Eh, not to get sidetracked

Submitted by Anonymous on November 6, 2013 - 6:58pm

Eh, not to get sidetracked but "We abbreviate the Pearson correlation coefficient with the small letter r, which stands for regression" definitely not. Regression locates the error differently than correlation. You can easily tell who actually read the study reviewed...if they say "correlation" they did not know what was done statistically (guy in your link made the same mistake). Don't be that guy!

Anyway, I didn't find a ton of scientific bloggers talking about this issue, but there were some really nice, more balanced reviews you could reference:

Other PT blogger and academic addictions guy:

<http://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/addiction-in-society/201307/the-apocryphal-debate-about-sex-addiction>

From the main guy trying to get hypersexuality into the DSM:

<http://www.rory.net/pages/prausecritique.html>

A guy who publishes on addiction, though not about this study:

<http://www.sexologytoday.org/2012/03/steve-mcqueens-shame-valid-portrayal-of.html>

Sure beats a random massage therapist in Oregon for their ability to more evenly critique. I don't agree with all these either, of course, but that's the point. These at least highlight the good and the bad, whereas the critique cited is actually factually false (e.g., the SNP authors collected and reported the entire SDI scale). It's always better not to promote patently false information!

[Reply to Anonymous](#)

[Quote Anonymous](#)

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/566683#comment-566683>

Reply to John A. Johnson Ph.D.

Quote John A. Johnson Ph.D.

Analyses misrepresented again

Submitted by Anonymous on November 6, 2013 - 11:15pm

"To directly assess the relationship between condition amplitude differences in the P300, two-step hierarchical regressions were calculated."

I'm frequently statistical consultant, and you're embarrassing yourself. The errors term is different between regression and correlation...they are, in fact "two different things". How on earth are you employed in a psych dept? At least stay away from my students!

Reply to Anonymous

Quote Anonymous

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/571871#comment-571871>

Difference between primary and exploratory analyses

Submitted by Anonymous on November 29, 2013 - 2:51pm

Yep, blogger is making an error. From the study:

"The ability of the hypersexual measures to predict variance in the mean amplitude of the P300 beyond the variance predicted by sexual desire alone was tested."

Thus the appropriate test for that hypothesis is, as the authors stated:

"In the first step, only the dyadic self-report variable was included as a predictor and in the second step the remaining self-report variables were added as predictors. "

Indeed, the regression analysis is labelled "Hypothesis test". How is it possible that people keep missing this?

Then, the authors state:

"Correlations between the ERP measures and the self-report measures were also computed."

These are actually labelled "exploratory" as is appropriate for uncorrected multiple correlations.

This is just drilling down on one example of the idiocy of the pro-addiction beneficiaries.

[Reply to Anonymous](#)

[Quote Anonymous](#)

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/940410#comment-940410>

Turf profits clear

Submitted by ICD11 is not published, you profit by lying on October 14, 2017 - 8:01pm

Actually, a sex therapist can treat any of these. A CSAT (which you are) has sh*t training in sex, including that BDSM is pathological and that homosexuality obsessive-compulsivity exists. You charge thousands for inpatient center treatment with no evidence they help...and it is likely they harm by increasing shame. You stand to profit with your comments. The author does not. An undercover reporter just exposed FRAUD by CSATs for profit after she was told to join treatment for over \$1,000/day for her non-existent "sex addiction".

Reply to ICD11 is not published, you profit by lying

Quote ICD11 is not published, you profit by lying

your angry comment proves my point

Submitted by Geoff Goodman, Ph.D. on October 17, 2017 - 12:19pm

How do you know so much about CSAT training if you haven't gone through it? Curious. Unlike you, I'm both a sex therapist and a sex addiction therapist, and my sex therapy training did not adequately train me to treat people with sex addiction. But this article wasn't about CSATs-- it mentioned that sex addiction doesn't exist, and I wanted to show that the rest of the world is going to be diagnosing sex addiction in ICD-11. It's time that sex therapists join the 21st century and recognize sex addiction; otherwise, they will be left even further behind and lose even more turf.

Reply to Geoff Goodman, Ph.D.

Quote Geoff Goodman, Ph.D.

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/942544#comment-942544>

False assumption

Submitted by Profit over patients on October 27, 2017 - 3:28am

"Unlike you" assumes quite a lot...which happens not to be true. I've seen CSAT training, and they are filled with intentionally false information to whip up patient distress. IITAP and CSAT care about one thing: money.

Reply to Profit over patients

Quote Profit over patients

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/940411#comment-940411>

Hallmark of pseudoscience

Submitted by Anonymous on October 14, 2017 - 8:03pm

Yep, many in this list show the opposite of what anonymous claims. He just throws them up hoping yuo will be overwhelmed and not evaluate any of them...a hallmark of pseudoscience

Reply to Anonymous

Quote Anonymous

You are confused. The hallmark of pseudoscience....

Submitted by anonymous on October 15, 2017 - 10:26pm

...is not citing any studies. Please do tell use which studies show the opposite of what anonymous claims?

Reply to anonymous

Quote anonymous

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/893899#comment-893899>

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/893901#comment-893901>

Profiteering trolls define Psychology Today comments

Submitted by Nicole Prause, PhD on January 2, 2017 - 11:23pm

Prove that I have not answered you hundreds of times already:
give your name anonymous troll. Or are you violating a no-
contact order so have to keep hidden or be arrested?

IIITAP, YBOP, extensive sexist attacks

Submitted by Nicole Prause, PhD on January 2, 2017 - 11:32pm

For those unfamiliar with the history, the personal attacks to
try to silence scientists by these groups have been extreme:

[https://s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/weilerdefamation
/SexismInNeuroscience.jpg](https://s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/weilerdefamation/SexismInNeuroscience.jpg)

requiring a series of cease and desist and no-contact orders.
They regularly resort to illegal harassment. The comments
here appear to be yet another extension.

Alice Dreger, PhD, has written and spoken extensively about
the attacks on sex scientists using these same tactics for
years:

<https://twitter.com/AliceDreger/status/814871328004210688>

and there is an extensive history about congressional
attacks on sex researchers:

Epstein, S. (2006). The new attack on sexuality research:
Morality and the politics of knowledge production. Sexuality
Research and Social Policy Journal of NSRC, 3(1), 1-12.
doi:10.1525/srsp.2006.3.1.01

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/893859#comment-893859>

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/893876#comment-893876>

Exactly, all profiteers

Submitted by Nicole Prause, PhD on January 2, 2017 - 7:47pm

Two therapists whose entire income is dependent on calling it an addiction, a for-profit organization whose existence is dependent on calling it addiction that falsely claimed I was a member of AASECT in personal attack, and a religious organization (<http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2015/10/20/porn-kills-love-mormons-anti-smut-crusade.html>) known for pseudoscience by international neuroscientists (<http://www.sltrib.com/opinion/4680276-155/op-ed-anti-porn-school-program-misrepresents-science>).

Free guide for these well-known profiteering, fake science websites:

<https://s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/liberos.media/EvaluatingInformationAboutSexFilms.png>

My income has no dependence on the label: the science is on AASECT's side.

Cite some science then because

Submitted by anonymous on January 2, 2017 - 9:28pm

the op-ed that you authored and linked to cites almost nothing.

This response to your Salt Lake Tribune op-ed points this out and cite hundreds of studies to back their claims: <http://fightthenewdrug.org/op-ed-exactly-misrepresenting-science-pornography/>

Let's see if you can avoid ad hominem and stay on topic.

No expertise to claims

Submitted by Nicole Prause, PhD on January 2, 2017 - 9:51pm

I havr dozens of peer-reviewed published papers already debunking (hundreds when I include my international coauthors) and these are merely profiteering blogs.

"Anonymous" trolls who havr been answered hundreds of times and continue to pretend they have not have earned no further effort.

At least the public is aware who lines your pockets...and not mine.

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/957310#comment-957310>

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/957360#comment-957360>

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/957886#comment-957886>

Addiction is out

Submitted by Misrepresentations on January 24, 2018 - 5:56pm

Did Donald Trump write this? Because it is just lies from start to finish. Not only was the context exactly "Internet Use" under which the ICD committee stated "pornography" belonged, but the entire committee just reiterated same in a the paper Dr. Ley was describing. They explicitly describe the decision not to either have the description in the "addiction" section and not to use the "narrower term" of "sex addiction". They rejected the addiction model every way possible, yet this activist is trying to gaslight everyone.

Fascinating that you claim this person is "harassing" people, yet you are the one making the personal attacks in the forum. Gary Wilson. What a psychopath.

Reply to Misrepresentations

Quote Misrepresentations

Really now?

Submitted by Anonymous 2 on January 24, 2018 - 11:02pm

Gary Wilson, enough of your anonymous "copy and paste" posts.

Start thinking for yourself for a change. David Ley is correct. The "sex addiction" model is a failure, except at making money. Large amounts of money.

Either those folks who are sex addiction therapists are committing fraud by treating for sex addiction but charging insurance companies for an actual diagnosis, or they're committing highway robbery by taking advantage of an unknowing public, a public that is scared to death of porn and sex. This is a shame, and will go down in history to be looked upon like Anthony Comstock or J. Harvey Kellogg!

Reply to Anonymous 2

Quote Anonymous 2

Yep, it's out

Submitted by Anonymous 2 on January 27, 2018 - 7:27pm

Gary...I mean, "anonymous," no harassment, she named nobody here.

1. Are you saying that sex/porn addiction is IN the ICD 11? Because I can find nothing to back that up.

Reply to Anonymous 2

Quote Anonymous 2

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/958178#comment-958178>

The DSM and ICD are atheoretical and base diagnoses on signs, symptoms and behaviors. So, you won't find porn or sex addiction, but you won't find gambling addiction. But sex addiction can be diagnosed with "compulsive sexual behaviour disorder", just as gambling addiction can be diagnosed with "pathological gambling" (DSM-5), and alcoholism can be diagnosed with "alcohol use disorder" (DSM-5).

Reply to kim

Quote kim

"sex addiction" and "porn addiction" rejected

Submitted by Nicole Prause, PhD on January 29, 2018 - 12:31pm

If you diagnose "sex addiction" or "porn addiction" be prepared to lose your license. I will file it myself.

From Kraus et al (2018) Compulsive sexual behaviour disorder in the ICD-11:

"For ICD-11, a relatively conservative position has been recommended, recognizing that we do not yet have definitive information on whether the processes involved in the development and maintenance of the disorder are equivalent to those observed in substance use disorders, gambling and gaming. For this reason, compulsive sexual behaviour disorder is not included in the ICD-11 grouping of disorders due to substance use and addictive behaviours, but rather in that of impulse control disorders."

From Grant et al (2014) Impulse control disorders and "behavioural addictions" in the ICD-11. definitions team:

"A third key controversy in the field is whether problematic Internet use is an independent disorder. The Working Group noted that this is a heterogeneous condition, and that use of the Internet may in fact constitute a delivery system for various forms of impulse control dysfunction (e.g., pathological game playing or pornography viewing). Based on the limited current data, it would therefore seem premature to include it in the ICD-11."

ICD-11 specifically removed even the narrower term "sex addiction" from their draft back in June 2017 specifically due to not having evidence to support it (documentation available).

If you continue to use a fake diagnosis on a falsified model, you are participating in fraud with patients. Increasing shame in patients is most likely to make them worse, and you should lose any license for engaging in it.

Reply to Nicole Prause, PhD

Quote Nicole Prause, PhD

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/958207#comment-958207>

Janniko Georgiadis disagrees with you

Submitted by anonymous on January 29, 2018 - 3:41pm

In the following review of the literature (Functional Neuroanatomy of Human Cortex Cerebri in Relation to Wanting Sex and Having It") Georgiadis says that watching porn is equivalent to having sex:

In the current conceptual framework, where sexual arousal is part of sexual consummation, having sex does not require physical genital contact either with another individual or masturbatory. Take the example of pornography. Thinking about ways to gain access to it, or actively searching for it, and perhaps experiencing desire during the process, is considered sexual wanting. Watching selected pornographic material, even without masturbation, can be considered "having sex" when there is genital arousal.

Reply to anonymous

Quote anonymous

Georgiadis authored letter sex not addictive

Submitted by Nicole Prause, PhD on January 29, 2018 - 3:46pm

Actually, Dr. Georgiadis authored this letter with us in Lancet Psychiatry: Prause, Janssen, Georgiadis, Finn, & Pfaus (2018). Data do not support sex as addictive. Lancet Psychiatry.

Your gross, intentional misreading of his review aside, you, anonymous non-scientist, do not speak for Dr. Georgiadis. You are trying to shift the discussion to primary versus secondary reinforcements, which we also already have shown is not as represented in our EEG study in Archives of Sexual Behavior.

If you do not present any credentials, you are clearly just an activist.

Reply to Nicole Prause, PhD

Quote Nicole Prause, PhD

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/981254#comment-981254>

Harassment from YourBrainOnPorn Gary Wilson

Submitted by Anonymous on May 11, 2018 - 3:38pm

It turns out the above posts from ronny_b are pasted directly from two websites: YourBrainOnPorn and PornStudyCritiques. Both are run by Gary Wilson. Go ahead, paste the "responses" into a search engine to see none of this was actually written for this blog post.

This looks like harassment, not real critique. Screaming the same things at someone over and over without ever listening to them is not science.

[Reply to Anonymous](#)

[Quote Anonymous](#)

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/980844#comment-980844>

Longitudinal data show porn less violent and content is not pref

Submitted by Anonymous on May 10, 2018 - 12:58pm

The 10-year, longitudinal study "Harder and Harder"? Is Mainstream Pornography Becoming Increasingly Violent and Do Viewers Prefer Violent Content?" in the Journal of Sex Research demonstrated the actual case: no.

"More specifically, we utilized a sample of 269 videos to test two hypotheses related to this claim: (1) depictions of aggression have increased over the past decade and (2) viewers respond favorably to depictions of aggression. Our analyses show no support for either of these claims."

The best evidence is that "ronny b" is a mere activist with an ax (ex?) to grind lying about data.

[Reply to Anonymous](#)

[Quote Anonymous](#)

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/994242#comment-994242>

Gary Wilson, known fraud, fabricating again to protect his cash

Submitted by Anon on July 2, 2018 - 1:13pm

Wow, Gary Wilson is stalking this poor writer, copy+pasting this garbage from his anti-porn website set up to profit from men he causes distress. Go ahead, Google any part of the response and you will see this person is known for these fabrications and threatening providers. He posted in every comments section of this 3-part series. Talk about obsessive! Gary Wilson needs mental health help pronto.

Reply to Anon

Quote Anon

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/996026#comment-996026>

Article slated for retraction: "Is internet pornography..."

Submitted by Alison Cook on July 7, 2018 - 7:48pm

Michael your spidey-sense was right on. That article "Is internet pornography causing sexual dysfunctions? A review with clinical reports" was just covered by Retraction Watch NS was not actually peer-reviewed. It turns out the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) review found that the authors did not properly consent the cases (assuming they existed at all, which is dubious given the fraud), the listed paper editor Scott Lane withdrew in a correction (saying he did not serve as the editor...no one did because it was not peer-review), and two of the authors had undisclosed financial conflicts of interest.

Yes, they are absolutely rotten to the core to still be citing that paper. They know it is fraudulent, were caught in the fraud by COPE, and are still listing it like nothing happened. Outrageous.

Reply to Alison Cook

Quote Alison Cook

Well, whadya know!

Submitted by Michael Castleman M.A. on July 7, 2018 - 8:33pm

Thank you, Alison, for pointing this out. The deeper one delves into "sex addiction," the fishier things smell.

Reply to Michael Castleman M.A.

Quote Michael Castleman M.A.

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/994235#comment-994235>

Gary Wilson, known fraud, fabricating again to protect his cash

Submitted by bilatine@o3enzyme.com on July 2, 2018 - 12:57pm

This insane response are copied+pasted directly from anti-porn websites of anti-porn activist Gary Wilson.

...whose TEDx talk is cited for intentionally misrepresenting science ("This talk contains several assertions that are not supported by academically...")

...and whose only "paper" is marked for retraction due to ethical violations (see RetractionWatch article) "COPE, which has no enforcement authority, said in an email to the publisher that it would have recommended retraction of the article."

Feel free to ignore this intentionally misrepresented information from a paid activist.

[Reply to bilatine@o3enzyme.com](#)

[Quote bilatine@o3enzyme.com](#)

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/994240#comment-994240>

That was a rebuked "letter" Gary Willson is trying to hide

Submitted by Anon on July 2, 2018 - 1:10pm

The crazy posts are from a pai anti-porn advocate Gary Wilson (copy+pasted from his website). Talk about cherry-picking, he doesn't mention the original authors literally rebuked that letter to the editor (it was not a paper) point-by-point years ago.

Classic fraud.

"Red Herring: Hook, Line, and Stinker" is the letter respond already published.

[Reply to Anon](#)

[Quote Anon](#)

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/886499#comment-886499>

Angry poster provides no content

Submitted by Nicole Prause on November 30, 2016 - 7:06pm

The poster insists "name one", but I am honestly not sure what it is I am supposed to be responding to. I have a PhD in research and taught research methods for years to college students, so the infographic is a useful way of communicating basic principles for evaluating science to people who (ahem) have no background in science. The website is on the list of "bad sources" in the infographic, which you clearly did not read nor attempt to respond to since you are posting from it.

Here is another infographic, which shows the website you refer to primarily is interested in denigrating women, in addition to falsifying science:

<https://twitter.com/NicoleRPrause/status/796443696791048192>

Your arguments have been copy+pasted without thought so many times it led me to have to create these. To readers who got this far, this is literally the same strategy they have used for 30 years instead of actually working on treatments to help people who are distressed.

So now...enjoy!

Reply to Nicole Prause

Quote Nicole Prause

Are you referring to my comment, Dr. Prause?

Submitted by Not an Infographic on November 30, 2016 - 8:04pm

Because nowhere did I say "name one". And citing 2 lists of peer-reviewed studies from the link that Staci Sprout provided is hardly "angry".

I just wanted to make sure that readers could see for themselves where the preponderance of empirical research points.

The second snappy infographic, like the first, contains no empirical evidence to support the AASECT position.

Reply to Not an Infographic

Quote Not an Infographic

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/886515#comment-886515>

Are you referring to my comment, Dr. Prause?

Submitted by Not an Infographic on November 30, 2016 - 8:04pm

Because nowhere did I say "name one". And citing 2 lists of peer-reviewed studies from the link that Staci Sprout provided is hardly "angry".

I just wanted to make sure that readers could see for themselves where the preponderance of empirical research points.

The second snappy infographic, like the first, contains no empirical evidence to support the AASECT position.

Reply to Not an Infographic

Quote Not an Infographic

Good example of deception

Submitted by Nicole Prause on November 30, 2016 - 8:20pm

Notice how the poster:

1. Still fails to provide any credentials
2. Claims conspiracy, they know better than the experts because of a secret website they created
3. Uses denigrating language to try to provoke and insult rather than problem-solve.
4. Still refuses to acknowledge any positive aspects of sex films (logic error: black or white thinking)

This poster is the problem.

For my part, we just today published a brain stimulation technique that can help people manage their sex drive <http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0165646>

Reply to Nicole Prause

Quote Nicole Prause

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/886703#comment-886703>

Question: how can a single EEG study debunk the addiction model when:

- 1) Several peer-reviewed papers question the study's interpretations and methods.
- 2) There are 2 dozen or so neuroscience studies that support the addiction model.
- 3) Science doesn't lean to a single outlying study; it leans to the preponderance of evidence.

Reply to anonymous

Quote anonymous

Stalker

Submitted by Anonymous on December 1, 2016 - 6:58pm

This is copy and pasted from Gary Wilson's website without acknowledgement. Gary Wilson has stalked, threatened and used sexist language against Dr. Prause for over 4 years. It has no basis in reality, and is part of why AASECT had to disavow the fake neuroscience presented (notice no quotes for any of it, because they don't exist):

<http://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-cybersecurity-socialmedia-idUSKCN0XP1WD>

"The abuse varied in scope, from repeated claims that she faked her data to comments about her appearance.

"I had a TED Talk (posted online) and they just filled it with 'tranny' comments," said Prause, who worked at the University of California-Los Angeles at the time the attacks began. "They have definitely singled me out."

Prause filed a cease-and-desist order against her harassers, and said those persons are no longer allowed to contact her directly. But Prause said she spent around \$5,000 to mitigate the damage over the years, hiring an attorney and someone to take screenshots of the abuse lobbed at her online."

<https://www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/2016/nov/25/female-orgasm-research>

"People started posting stories online that I had falsified my data and I received all kinds of sexist attacks," she said. Soon anonymous emails of complaint were turning up at the office of the president of UCLA, where she worked from 2012 to 2014, demanding that Prause be fired."

http://poptech.org/popcasts/finding_liberos

"Now, my name is on this stalker's website over 1500 times"

Online stalking, harassment, and fake conspiracies are their only defense and the entire field knows Gary Wilson as a fraud.

Reply to Anonymous

Quote Anonymous

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/886718#comment-886718>

Gary Wilson

Submitted by Staci Sprout on January 18, 2017 - 11:55am

I want to express my disagreement with this post - talk about blame-shifting! Gary Wilson has helped countless people with his paradigm-shifting, brave work. It is not difficult to sort out his credibility when you read his writing or view his TED talk. 7,504,539 views - that is striking a nerve culturally. What is all this meanness about deriding "credibility"?

Anyone who cares about child sexual development, especially of young boys, will honor the contributions of Gary Wilson to the global conversation.

Reply to Staci Sprout

Quote Staci Sprout

Debunked months ago

Submitted by Anonymous on December 1, 2016 - 9:01pm

Yep, this is Gary Wilson and he loves to lie to people. This was published months ago, literally alongside Gola's (which was a letter, not peer-reviewed) and debunks it all, but Gary Wilson pretends it doesn't exist to deceive readers:

<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301051116301867>

Gary Wilson is the definition of scientific fraud as defined here:

<http://www.forbes.com/sites/emilywillingham/2012/11/08/10-questions-to-distinguish-real-from-fake-science/#e606e36533bf>

He meets every single criteria.

Reply to Anonymous

Quote Anonymous

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/886856#comment-886856>

That letter by Prause et al., debunked nothing in

Submitted by anonymous on December 2, 2016 - 12:18am

Dr. Mateusz Gola's critique of Prause et al., 2015. Nor did the Prause et al. letter to the editor address the 4 other critiques listed above.

A link to the full Mateusz Gola critique -

<https://www.researchgate.net/publication>

/303511291_Decreased_LPP_for_sexual_images_in_problema

Here's an extensive analysis of the Prause et al. reply to Dr. Gola -

<http://yourbrainonporn.com/critique-letter-editor-%E2%80%9Cprause-et-al-2015-latest-falsification-addiction-predictions%E2%80%9D>

Reply to anonymous

Quote anonymous

Promoting fake news

Submitted by Anonymous on December 2, 2016 - 12:55pm

Wait wait wait, so the authors RESPONDED to the letter. you tried to fake out the readers of these comments by not mentioning it initially, and when you get caught, you direct people to a fake news website that you wrote?

Gary Wilson is delusional.

Reply to Anonymous

Quote Anonymous

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/887468#comment-887468>

Gary Wilson trolling

Submitted by PornHelps on December 6, 2016 - 12:31am

See David Ley's comments section where I caught Gary Wilson posting as "anonymous" and caught his IP address on the website www.pornhelps.com

Gary Wilson is sick, obsessed, has no knowledge in this area, and regularly harasses therapist in hopes of beating them into submission.

Busted again, idiot.

Reply to PornHelps

Quote PornHelps

Wonder who pornhelps really is?

Submitted by anonymous on December 7, 2016 - 10:59pm

I just checked out pornhelps twitter account and discovered a few things:

Pornhelps is a neuroscientist (15 years studying as neuroscientist. Same as Prause?)
<https://twitter.com/pornhelps/status/768836072990056448>

Here's Pornhelps attacking neuroscientist Mateusz Gola in the comments section under his new study which support the porn addiction model - <http://biorxiv.org/content/early/2016/06/08/057083#comment-2733252037>

Here's Pornhelps attacking reddit/nofap founder Alexander Rhodes and Time editor Belinda Luscombe - <https://twitter.com/pornhelps/status/756504811252494336>

Dr. Prause joins in calling Alexander a liar - <https://twitter.com/NicoleRPrause/status/756515304004616192>

Dr. Prause joins in calling Belinda Luscombe a liar - <https://twitter.com/NicoleRPrause/status/756515304004616192>

And the studies on the front page of pornhelps.com appear to be same studies Dr. Prause always cites in her talks and interviews.

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/887843#comment-887843>
<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/887844#comment-887844>

Idiot Gary Wilson

Submitted by Anonymous on December 8, 2016 -
2:59am

You do realize there is a list where all of that information is circulated that you claim traces back. It is widely known, amongst no-insane stalkers.

I agree with previous posters. This is clearly Gary Wilson copy+pasting once again from his own website caught in his lonely web of meaningless life with nothing to do except troll therapists online all day.

Gary Wilson, you are an idiot, your website is a complete fraud, and your life is meaningless.

[Reply to Anonymous](#)

[Quote Anonymous](#)

Agreed Gary Wilson needs evaluation

Submitted by Anonymous on December 8, 2016 -
3:10am

My friend asked me to look at this thread and I have to agree. Gary Wilson, you are a stalker and you need to seek mental health care immediately. Show a trusted friend, if you have any, your posts. Someone who is not a conspiracy theorist and doesn't have a dog in the porn fight. This is not the normal behavior of an adult, even a passionate adult. You have a serious mental problem and need to see someone.

There are dozens of people who know you lurk and paste from your website in these forums. Just because someone now has proof should scare you, instead you start inventing conspiracies from your obsessions. This truly looks psychotic and I hope you will get the help you clearly need.

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/888724#comment-888724>

Gary Wilson trolling fake news websites

Submitted by Anonymous on December 12, 2016 - 6:34pm

"All the commenters here are one person."

Gary Wilson, the mentally ill person who cannot let his trolling stop. You have embarrassed yourself in every one of those links. This is a post about AASECT, which Prause said she doesn't even belong to, and you have exhibited your clear mental illness by being unable to stop pretending somebody is her.

You do realize that hundreds of people now know this is you Gary Wilson? That your website is pure fabrication from beginning to end, showing you have an agenda and know nothing about what you are writing about?

ANd you just cannot resist can you. Show us how sick you are. Show us you cannot let this go. Go ahead, your troll, post your next conspiracy theory about women. You must have been rejected an awful lot to hate women this much.

Reply to Anonymous

Quote Anonymous

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/891811#comment-891811>

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/888737#comment-888737>

"pornhelps" deleted their twitter

Submitted by glenda on December 25, 2016 - 1:20pm

I clicked on the links and the pornhelps twitter account no longer exists. What are they hiding?

Reply to glenda

Quote glenda

I clicked on the links and

Submitted by Anonymous on December 26, 2016 - 1:39pm

I clicked on the links and the pornhelps twitter account no longer exists. What are they hiding?

Wow, conspiracy theory much? Straight through Christmas Day? Classic Gary Wilson mental illness.

Reply to Anonymous

Quote Anonymous

29th repost?!

Submitted by Anonymous on December 12, 2016 - 8:15pm

I just Googled this and this troll has posted this exact same thing 29 times online! Stalker much?!

Reply to Anonymous

Quote Anonymous

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/886723#comment-886723>

I did none of those Dr. Prause - as everyone can see.

Submitted by Not an Infographic on November 30, 2016 - 10:30pm

Let's examine your claims, Dr. Prause:

"1. Still fails to provide any credentials."

But I did provide 80 peer-reviewed studies and 10 reviews of the literature. You have provided no studies to support the AASECT position.

"2. Claims conspiracy, they know better than the experts because of a secret website they created"

I did not such thing, as everyone can see.

"3. Uses denigrating language to try to provoke and insult rather than problem-solve."

Nope again. As everyone can see

"4. Still refuses to acknowledge any positive aspects of sex films (logic error: black or white thinking)"

Nope again. That wasn't part of our back and forth, was it?

This exchange has been quite revealing.

Reply to Not an Infographic

Quote Not an Infographic

Quite.

Submitted by Mark Dobson on November 30, 2016 - 10:50pm

"As everyone can see" is right: I'm no Dr, but if this is how Dr Prause conducts her public discussions, it's hard to see her as insightful.

Reply to Mark Dobson

Quote Mark Dobson

Incredible puppet harassment

Submitted by Anonymous on December 1, 2016 - 9:38pm

It's amazing she sticks with it with all these trolls about! Luckily they don't reach us as easily across the pond. My 3 year old niece was making fun of this TEDx talk and I said "yes, he is funny!" because that's the only way to read it. Bizarre people.

Reply to Anonymous

Quote Anonymous

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/888727#comment-888727>

Could you imagine Valerie Voon of Cambridge University

Submitted by anonymous on December 10, 2016 - 2:00pm

spending her time posting in the comments sections under blog posts? Could you imagine Voon or Simone Kuhn of the Max Planck institute railing against organizations (such as SASH or IITAP) in the comments section or on their twitter accounts? Could you imagine Voon or Kuhn claiming that their single study "proved" that porn addiction existed, and no other studies needed to be done?

Reply to anonymous

Quote anonymous

Gary Wilson fake

Submitted by Anonymous on December 12, 2016 - 6:52pm

Can you imagine Gary Wilson ever attacking Voon? Maybe the problem is the mentally ill, obsessed stalker who attacks every therapist, educator, and scientist who writes anything positive about porn. THAT is psychotic.

And Wilson seems unaware that his trolling has been posted all over listservs he is not on. We all know Gary Wilson is a sick troll.

Reply to Anonymous

Quote Anonymous

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/908801#comment-908801>

Patrick Carnes Trained Quacks just changed the label

Submitted by Nobodys Fool on March 16, 2017 - 7:34pm

The poorly trained quacks from Patrick Carnes fringe group have merely changed the name of "sexual addiction" to "out of control sexual behavior." The concept still has zero construct validity and has been repeatedly rejected by the paraphilia work group of the American Psychiatric Community. Stay away from these poorly trained quacks and if you are experiencing "hypersexual behavior," go to a practitioner trained in medicine.

Reply to Nobodys Fool

Quote Nobodys Fool

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/886174#comment-886174>

Anecdotes do not Trump data

Submitted by Anonymous on November 29, 2016 - 3:21pm

"both because I was affected by it myself"

And we have our answer!

If you are serious, provide the peer-reviewed citation that conflicts with the large pre-registered 3-experiment trial presented in the article. Cross-sectional and non-peer-reviewed studies are no longer relevant.

Reply to Anonymous

Quote Anonymous

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/886202#comment-886202>

Another study also found sex films increases desire for partner

Submitted by Nicole Prause on November 29, 2016 - 4:50pm

Our study was not as large as this one, but it was an experiment to test causality and showed the same: sex films increased the desire for the partner and did not contribute to feeling less satisfied or less attracted:

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23224749>

Reply to Nicole Prause

Quote Nicole Prause

Confused

Submitted by anonymous on November 30, 2016 - 11:59am

The abstract seems to say that viewing visual sexual stimuli increased the desire to have sex with their partner. Porn made them were hornier. No surprise there.

The abstract also said that "Viewing the erotic films also induced greater reports of negative affect, guilt, and anxiety. That can't be good.

I just don't get how this shows us anything.

Reply to anonymous

Quote anonymous

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/886450#comment-886450>

Core finding contradicts central claim

Submitted by Nicole Prause on November 30, 2016 - 3:39pm

Perhaps re-read your post again: the core claim of conservative anti-porn groups is that viewing sex films makes you not want your current partner any more. Clearly, between our study and this new study, that is not true.

Also, we actually wrote that there was high MIXED affect (positive and negative). This is characteristic of sex films, always has been, and always will be so long as we continue to shame people for viewing them so that they feel guilty. Consider why you ignored the reported positive affect and only mentioned the negative.

Science is important, in part, because we do not have an angle. We report everything that we find, positive or negative, as you nicely highlighted by citing our negative findings as well.

Reply to Nicole Prause

Quote Nicole Prause

These 2 studies don't assess porn use & relationships

Submitted by anonymous on November 30, 2016 - 6:20pm

Again, your study found that watching porn made people want to have sex. This is to be expected.

Nether your study or the one described in the blog post tell us anything about the real life effects of porn use of relationships.

Let's take an extreme example: taking cocaine increases sexual arousal and often results in a greater desire to engage in sex. But this tells us nothing about the effects of chronic cocaine use on sexuality or relationships.

Reply to anonymous

Quote anonymous

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/886495#comment-886495>

Evaluating fake science

Submitted by Nicole Prause on November 30, 2016 - 6:40pm

Let's use this guide to show how anonymous is attempting to deceive readers:

<https://twitter.com/NicoleRPrause/status/803836047771701250>

The author fails to identify. We have know reason to think they have any expertise in this area. They show in their comments that they do not understand experimental design, predictive utility, or causality, basic principles of science.

The author engages in black or white thinking. They fail to acknowledge any of the positives of sex films, even the very study just cited, pretending everything about them is always negative.

Personal attacks where the author attempts to lecture the scientist - who actually conducted the research - on their own findings using denigrating language like "to be expected".

I have no faith that the poster has any expertise nor intention t engage in actual discussion, so I would merely refer them back to the group of therapist, educators and researchers who agree (<http://view.exacttarget.com/?qs=975f0e3819eac8091afbe4f19ef1bb4db835686dd958627f27e31>)

This is an "appeal to authority", but the poster's primary intention is to mislead people and requires a reference to actual authorities.

Since the poster has no intention of having actual dialogue and holds no expertise, I am done.

[Reply to Nicole Prause](#)

[Quote Nicole Prause](#)

+++++

Last response to unresponsive anonymous

Submitted by Nicole Prause on November 30, 2016 - 9:10pm

"This is an appeal to authority fallacy. "

No, this is an appeal to authority because you need a basic understanding of science to even engage in this debate.

You don't have it, and that is reasonable to require.

"I never said anything about porn being all good or bad"

Yes, you did. You failed to describe the positive aspects in a study you tried to twist as saying something negative. You still have yet to describe a benefit, even in your response.

We await your positive descriptors, because I have multiple publications already discussing both positives and negatives. My balance is not in question, yours is.

"No one here has attacked you"

In addition to the citations I provided and you ignored in your own responses, there is a long history of you and others posting false information about me as attacks rather than the facts:

<http://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-cybersecurity-socialmedia-idUSKCN0XP1WD>

<https://twitter.com/NicoleRPrause/status/796443696791048192>

Since you have been completely unresponsive and have no curiosity nor expertise, I am done.

Reply to Nicole Prause

Quote Nicole Prause

This is amazing

Submitted by anonymous on November 30, 2016 - 10:56pm

I've never witnessed a response like this from a researcher on PT: Unfounded accusations, off-topic diatribes, accusing people of saying or doing things they didn't do.

Good luck with your life, Dr. Prause.

Reply to anonymous

Quote anonymous

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/886291#comment-886291>

See above for another study

Submitted by Anonymous on November 29, 2016 - 11:36pm

This was the second disconfirming and contained a series of studies, not just 1. The earlier study actually found experimentally that desire for the current partner increased, she said. This evidence also is better than studies that are not experimental because they can only be correlations (nothing about cause). If you ever cited the earlier study and are now fighting a strong, failed replication, are you just refusing to acknowledge any benefits of porn? Of course it is not all bad and hundreds of publications list benefits.

Reply to Anonymous

Quote Anonymous

Hundreds of studies list benefits? Not so.

Submitted by anonymous on December 1, 2016 - 3:08pm

There are not "hundreds of studies that list benefits" of porn use to the user and to relationships.

Reply to anonymous

Quote anonymous

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/887088#comment-887088>

Porn helps studies

Submitted by PornHelps on December 3, 2016 - 2:29pm

Here is a long list of studies showing the benefits of porn on individuals, relationships, society, performers, and women:

www.pornhelps.com

[Reply to PornHelps](#)

[Quote PornHelps](#)

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/893859#comment-893859>

Some other views on AASECT

Submitted by anonymous on January 2, 2017 - 7:35pm

- Response to AASECT Position Statement. <https://www.iitap.com/blog/2016/12/14/response-to-aasect-position-statement/>
- How does the AASECT discounting of Sex & Porn Addiction affect the 12-step community? <http://www.doctoddlove.com/todd-love-blog/how-aasect-sex-addiction-denial-impacts-12step-recovery-programs>
- Decoding AASECT's "Position on Sex Addiction". <http://www.pornhelp.org/blog/decoding-aasects-position-on-sex-addiction>
- Denial of Sex Addiction Hurts Our Clients. <http://namasteadvice.com/denial-of-sex-addiction-hurts-our-clients/>
- The Revealing Backstory to the AASECT Position Statement on Sex/Porn Addiction.
<http://fightthenewdrug.org/fight-new-drugs-official-response-aasects-recent-statement-porn-addiction/>

Exactly, all profiteers

Submitted by Nicole Prause, PhD on January 2, 2017 - 7:47pm

Two therapists whose entire income is dependent on calling it an addiction, a for-profit organization whose existence is dependent on calling it addiction that falsely claimed I was a member of AASECT in personal attack, and a religious organization (<http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2015/10/20/porn-kills-love-mormons-anti-smut-crusade.html>) known for pseudoscience by international neuroscientists (<http://www.sltrib.com/opinion/4680276-155/op-ed-anti-porn-school-program-misrepresents-science>).

Free guide for these well-known profiteering, fake science websites:

<https://s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/liberos.media/EvaluatingInformationAboutSexFilms.png>

My income has no dependence on the label: the science is on AASECT's side.

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/893876#comment-893876>

Cite some science then because

Submitted by anonymous on January 2, 2017 - 9:28pm

the op-ed that you authored and linked to cites almost nothing.

This response to your Salt Lake Tribune op-ed points this out and cite hundreds of studies to back their claims: <http://fightthenewdrug.org/op-ed-exactly-misrepresenting-science-pornography/>

Let's see if you can avoid ad hominem and stay on topic.

No expertise to claims

Submitted by Nicole Prause, PhD on January 2, 2017 - 9:51pm

I havr dozens of peer-reviewed published papers already debunking (hundreds when I include my international coauthors) and these are merely profiteering blogs.

"Anonymous" trolls who havr been answered hundreds of times and continue to pretend they have not have earned no further effort.

At least the public is aware who lines your pockets...and not mine.

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/858886#comment-858886>

BRAINS!!

Submitted by David J. Ley Ph.D. on July 25, 2016 - 5:32pm

Reading comments from these folks always makes me feel like I'm in a zombie movie. They're obsessed with brains, they're irrational, and they just never seem to go away and leave you alone. If they were as obsessed with porn in the past, as they are now with brains and fighting porn, then I can definitely see where they had problems in their lives.

Reply to David J. Ley Ph.D.

Quote David J. Ley Ph.D.

PENIS!!!

Submitted by Maude on July 25, 2016 - 7:51pm

Their fetish for the brain is pseudo-science as bad as vaccines and autism...but they have to try to ignore all this evidence against them by claiming it doesn't matter? Don't tell the entire field of medicine, boy will they be pissed!

Reply to Maude

Quote Maude

STUDIES! Neither Ley or Maude cite a single study, whereas

Submitted by keetreal on July 26, 2016 - 1:19pm

I cited 30 peer-reviewed papers supporting the porn addiction model (24 neurological studies & 7 reviews of the literature). So tossing around the term "pseudoscience" seems just a tad misplaced. How

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/859044#comment-859044>

Marnia Robinson

Submitted by Maude on July 26, 2016 - 1:42pm

In summary, they responded to nothing in the study reviewed.

They did provide backlinks to Marnia Robinson's website, wife of YourBrainOnPorn blogger.

I think we have our answer!

Reply to Maude

Quote Maude

There's no study in Ley's post

Submitted by keetreal on July 26, 2016 - 3:45pm

Sorry, but I see no peer-reviewed study in Ley's post. Prause stated that her data will never be published. As a result, the claims about the data remains anecdotal, at best.

The claim that "feeling addicted to porn" should somehow correlate with penile injuries is a straw man argument.

Reply to keetreal

Quote keetreal

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/859151#comment-859151>

Data

Submitted by Maude on July 26, 2016 - 11:26pm

"happy to share the data with any scientists"
so I guess you're not a scientist despite all your science
claims, because your statement is clearly false.

"claims about the data remains anecdotal"
no, the crazy anti-porn websites are full of anecdotes, this is
what happens when people actually test your wild claims,
like that a penile injury is evidence of addiction.

It's not. It is being used to create more fear and drive young
men to the wares.

[Reply to Maude](#)

[Quote Maude](#)

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/1112104#comment-1112104>

Wow

Submitted by REALLY NOW on May 27, 2019 - 3:43pm

Hey Gary Wilson...I mean Keetreal...

Tell us what your degree is in? And where did you
teach these anatomy and physiology classes? We
know it wasn't at Southern Oregon U where your
position was terminated...

Spit it out, Gary.

[Reply to REALLY NOW](#)

[Quote REALLY NOW](#)

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/859532#comment-859532>

False claims

Submitted by Maude on July 28, 2016 - 7:17pm

"No correlation"

I don't see anywhere where they said correlation. Maybe you're not sure what statistics are?

"No other conditions"

For this to be important, you would have to prove there was another condition that is related to penis injuries that needed to be controlled for.

"The claim that penile injury should related to porn addiction"

David Ley linked to the article making exactly that claim. If you are admitting that these random guys claims should not be trusted, we agree!

"In the past Prause's claims about her studies have not always matched her data."

And yet, they are all in journals. This is a distraction anyway, just an ad hominem attack to distract.

Reply to Maude

Quote Maude

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/859722#comment-859722>

Missing the point again

Submitted by Maude on July 29, 2016 - 2:10pm

Your response doesn't actually respond to anything I posted.

- "Correlation" and "relationship" are completely different terms. It looks like the right test was used.

- None of the issues you mentioned have been linked to penis injuries before.

- It sounds like you are supporting the idea that these men should not be using penis scabs as evidence of porn addiction. Is there a reason you don't want to just say that?

- Unless any of those articles have been retracted, there is no reason to think they are inaccurate...no matter how much you copy+paste from your website.

[Reply to Maude](#)

[Quote Maude](#)

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/859910#comment-859910>

Nice try, still correct

Submitted by Maude on July 30, 2016 - 12:55pm

No studies have been retracted. You are using a website to try to create a conspiracy where none exists to take attention away from the point of this article. If you copy and paste an EIGHTH time, the same content, you have made my point.

And no, you have not clearly stated what you will only imply: no one really considers penile scabs from masturbation evidence of "addiction" except these weird men.

[Reply to Maude](#)

[Quote Maude](#)

Prause misrpresnted her findings to the media

Submitted by keetreal on July 30, 2016 - 1:58pm

...and continues to do so. Documented above (and below). Put simply, one can misrepresent a study's findings with impunity. Academic journals do not monitor the claims made by an author in the media. I guess you didn't know that, Maude

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/860017#comment-860017>

I rest my case, you have no case

Submitted by Maude on July 30, 2016 - 8:41pm

Another copy+paste from a website. No papers have ever been retracted. None of the news has ever been corrected. Nothing has ever been filed along any of these lines that you claim. These clearly are not false, no matter how much you want them to be. Once again, the data presented in Ley's article debunk your crack ideas.

For all who want to see the ravings of a conspiracy theory nut, bless you for having read this far. Now you see what they are up to!

I rest my case.

[Reply to Maude](#)

[Quote Maude](#)

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/860139#comment-860139>

Copy+Paste brigade

Submitted by Maude on July 31, 2016 - 3:01pm

The founder of the referenced website also believes 9/11 was a USA government conspiracy:

<http://www.scholarsfor911truth.org/21-2/>

The facts remain:

- No media have ever been corrected despite these fantastic claims of conspiracy
- No article has ever been retracted, despite these fantastic claims of conspiracy

This new information continues to show how far anti-porn people will go, including fantastic conspiracy claims not backed by any evidence (see above), consistent only with the character of the author.

Reply to Maude

Quote Maude

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/860305#comment-860305>

Still no conspiracy

Submitted by Maude on August 1, 2016 - 3:25pm

One common logic fault is all-or-nothing thinking.

Here is an example of logic fault:

"That means everything Prause said about her study was false."

This cannot possibly be true.

A random person on a blog does not refute the facts:

- No media have ever been corrected despite these fantastic claims of conspiracy
- No article has ever been retracted, despite these fantastic claims of conspiracy

No one agrees with your blogs. You are talking to an echo chamber.

Reply to Maude

Quote Maude

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/860307#comment-860307>

Checking out

Submitted by Maude on August 1, 2016 - 3:39pm

I am done with this getting off track, ignorance, and lack of progress.

Bottom line is that this person is unable to respond to the facts presented in Dr. Ley's post, has tried to avoid the topic by attacking other people, and all evidence shows their claims are mere conspiracy theory.

This exchange is a great example for others. See the hallmarks of pseudoscience above? Lengthy posts, off-topic, conspiratorial, and character assassination instead of responsive to the topic. A sock puppet account to create the appearance of agreement. Links only back to one website, whose owner is the wife of the owner of other anti-porn blogs. No external evidence supports their claims, which would have resulted in actual consequences if they were true.

This is how they operate.

The data stand.

Reply to Maude

Quote Maude

You have failed respond to the content of my posts/studies cited

Submitted by keetreal on August 1, 2016 - 6:11pm

I have cited 60 studies that falsify everything that Prause and Ley put forth in the media. You cite nothing and cannot engage in actual debate - that is the hallmark of pseudoscience.

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/1112112#comment-1112112>

Education

Submitted by REALLY NOW on May 27, 2019 - 3:57pm

Gary ...Er...Keetreal,

When are you going to answer MY question that I've asked multiple times on various sites?

WHAT is your degree in and where did you get it?

Reply to REALLY NOW

Quote REALLY NOW

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/995594#comment-995594>

Gary Wilson fraud

Submitted by Boring on July 6, 2018 - 6:20pm

Every PT article on pornography Gary Wilson trolls with fake names copy+pasting directly from his paid, anti-porn website (because you cannot post URLs in the comments). Go ahead, Google, literally every single thing is this fraud SPAMMING his website content all over PT because he cannot get it through his skull that that evidence is not there, ICD-11 rejected it too, and get on with his life. Obsessive much Gary Wilson? Maybe we know who has the mental disorder...

Reply to Boring

Quote Boring

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/909296#comment-909296>

A series of links from someone who has no training in research

Submitted by Nobodys Fool on March 19, 2017 - 8:38pm

Anyone can post links. What you seem extremely limited in is the ability to understand the scientific method and the basics of quantitative research. BTW, I have had 5 years of graduate level training in research methodology.

Reply to Nobodys Fool

Quote Nobodys Fool

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/909297#comment-909297>

Lies and myth? What would you

Submitted by Anon on June 26, 2013 - 8:43am

Lies and myth? What would you say to people who are actually addicted to Porn/Sex and other behavioral addictions? Its like saying to alcohol addict that alcoholism does not exist, even though he can not stop drinking uncontrollably and knows from direct experience that it does exist.

Reply to Anon

Quote Anon

Reply to you query

Submitted by Nobodys Fool on March 19, 2017 - 8:48pm

I would refer someone who presented with hypersexual behavior to a physician who could find out what this symptom really means. We know there are several medical and psychiatric disorders and medication that have hypersexual behavior as a symptom.

etiology, diagnosis & management of Hypersexuality: a review

B Chughtai, D Sciallo, S Khan, H Rehman, E Mohan, J Rehman

Citation

B Chughtai, D Sciallo, S Khan, H Rehman, E Mohan, J Rehman. etiology, diagnosis & management of Hypersexuality: a review. The Internet Journal of Urology. 2009 Volume 6 Number 2.

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/909300#comment-909300>

"Sex Addiction"

Submitted by Nobody's Fool on March 26, 2017 - 2:42pm

Are you a scientist or a mental health professional? BTW, the recovery rate using the 12-steps model is about 5-10 percent. Great job you assholes are doing with your Minnesota Model.

Reply to Nobody's Fool

Quote Nobody's Fool

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/606933#comment-606933>

A website dedicated to

Submitted by Anonymous on May 2, 2014 - 12:06pm

A website dedicated to critiquing only studies that suggest porn isn't evil? As long as a study shows negative effects of porn, it's good?

Bias much?

Reply to Anonymous

Quote Anonymous

Ley is not bias of course.....

Submitted by second opinion on May 2, 2014 - 2:43pm

Have you read Ley's book? Have you read his blog posts?

Have you read Prause's comments? Or seen her studies?

The word bias doesn't cover it.

Then you read the critique of Ley, Prause, Finn review, and you discover that they left out all negative studies and misrepresented many of the studies they cite to support their thesis.

Here's an entire section where they misrepresented all the studies:

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/607111#comment-607111>

- Citation 145 has nothing to do with above statement. It's "Dieting and binging: a causal analysis"

Studies that examine use of VSS in MSM find that these men overwhelmingly endorse these positive benefits from VSS use [146]

- Citation 146 has nothing to do with men who have sex with men. It is about 12 and 13-year olds. "Sexual risk taking in adolescence: the role of self-regulation and attraction to risk"

Reply to second opinion

Quote second opinion

It sounds like you're

Submitted by LOLing on May 2, 2014 - 3:46pm

It sounds like you're admitting you never critique articles that suggest porn is negative.

Show me a single link where you did.

Reply to LOLing

Quote LOLing

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/607065#comment-607065>

The earlier poster is right.

Submitted by Doubtful on May 2, 2014 - 12:18pm

The earlier poster is right. That website only critiques studies that find porn might have benefits and accepts, without question, any study that suggests porn is bad. Find a better source.

Reply to Doubtful

Quote Doubtful

!

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/606933#comment-606933>

Pro-addiction crazies out in full force

Submitted by Anonymous on May 1, 2014 - 8:48pm

That same person is posting the same link on, like, every news story that even starts to be critical of sex addiction. I think Gary Wilson and Marnia Robinson might be addicted to blogs and conspiracy theories! (Those are the owners of the mysterious website linked.)

I feel terrible for the PT writer whose comments got hijacked by these cases.

Let's see what the crazies do with this post...

Reply to Anonymous

Quote Anonymous

Anti-Addiction manipulators out in full force

Submitted by Gabe Deem on May 2, 2014 - 12:06am

"That same person is posting the same link on, like, every news story that even starts to be critical of sex addiction."

Well... you mean all the stories critical of sex addiction EXCEPT David Ley's? Because he turned off comments on some of his articles.

The only thing "crazy" (and funny to me) is Ley or Prause still have not addressed the content in the analysis of his "review". Just like absolutely no one in this comment section has addressed it. Just like any one on any of those other stories you're talking... no one will address the fact that Ley manipulated his findings, or unknowingly did not include stuff that he should have.

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/606989#comment-606989>

You are so very young. I know

Submitted by Anonymous on May 2, 2014 - 12:20am

You are so very young. I know you will not be able to hear this now, but consider that you might not want your sex life posted all over the Internet in 10 years. Whatever you want to change about your own sexual behavior you absolutely have the right to do, and I wish you luck, but I am very worried about someone your age being used by the machine. A little time, a little humbleness, and little curiosity...things might look very different looking back in time with the perspective of experience.

Just please be careful. I hate to see more people get hurt by that crowd.

Reply to Anonymous

Quote Anonymous

Aww, too kind

Submitted by Gabe Deem on May 2, 2014 - 1:40pm

Thanks for the words of concern. However, I feel pretty confident that many years from now (hopefully), lying on my death bed, I won't regret being honest in order to help others.

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/607078#comment-607078>

Probably because they see

Submitted by LOLing on May 2, 2014 - 1:06pm

Probably because they see nothing to respond to in that crazy rant!
Typical conspiracy theorist: SEE! THEY WILL NOT EVEN ANSWER MY
CLEAR PROOF THAT ALIENS LANDED ON MY FRONT LAWN!

Correct, when the ideas are so far out of touch with reality, there is
nothing to say. Sounds like they did the right thing by not responding to
the rantings of a nutter.

[Reply to LOLing](#)

[Quote LOLing](#)

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/1006227#comment-1006227>

Not published for a reason

Submitted by Anonymous on August 8, 2018 - 9:36pm

You cite an unknown has-been religious professor who hasn't even published
his pet "critique" anywhere. It literally didn't even clear the lowest bar of
evidence. Thanks, but I'll stick with science!

[Reply to Anonymous](#)

[Quote Anonymous](#)

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/1006362#comment-1006362>

First study fraud

Submitted by Anonymous on August 9, 2018 - 12:12pm

This is copied and pasted from an anti-porn website (google it, first hit) and the very first paper is in Retraction Watch for fraud. Specifically, the paper was not actually peer-reviewed (the editor asked his name to be taken off), they never consented the "patients" and the citations were fake, amongst other jaw-dropping fraud.

So, yeah, ignore this paid anti-pornography shill.

Reply to Anonymous

Quote Anonymous

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/1006395#comment-1006395>

Activist faking science

Submitted by Anonymous on August 9, 2018 - 1:49pm

This is copied and pasted from the anti-pornography website yourbrainonporn that also claims scientists are sexually molesting children in their laboratories. As expected, the studies are misrepresented and exclude all stronger, replicated experimental evidence showing these do not hold.

Reply to Anonymous

Quote Anonymous

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/1006793#comment-1006793>

Data not consistent with "poor performers"

Submitted by Anonymous on August 10, 2018 - 12:57pm

This was studied and rejected by scientists already. Female performers are powerful agents, not weaklings for you to sh*t on with your preconceived false notions of what women are supposed to be.

Griffith, J. D., Mitchell, S., Hart, C. L., Adams, L. T., & Gu, L. L. (2013).

Pornography actresses: An assessment of the damaged goods hypothesis. Journal of Sex Research, 50(7), 621-632.

"Porn actresses were more likely to identify as bisexual, first had sex at an earlier age, had more sexual partners, were more concerned about contracting a sexually transmitted disease (STD), and enjoyed sex more than the matched sample, although there were no differences in incidence of CSA. In terms of psychological characteristics, porn actresses had higher levels of self-esteem, positive feelings, social support, sexual satisfaction, and spirituality compared to the matched group. "

[Reply to Anonymous](#)

[Quote Anonymous](#)

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/1009839#comment-1009839>

More fraud from performer-shaming frauds

Submitted by Anonymous on August 17, 2018 - 9:49pm

#1 was "self-administered to a convenience sample of 134 current female adult film performers" compared to women in college not matched for education. Published in a no-impact journal.

#2 contained no data.

#3 was only "interviews" of 18 performers recruited from a friggin mental health center ("recruited through Protecting Adult Welfare")

The study cited before yours was appropriately matched on education and shows YOU cherry picked sh*t studies to justify your hate and stigma against performers. Leave them alone. It is a legal and OSHA-regulated industry and you clearly have no business lying about the challenges they do NOT face. Let people who actually do not stigmatize performers and can help them with issues they actually face (e.g., racially disparate wages).

This is exactly what scientists mean when they talk about the intentional misinformation of "porn panic" by religious-morality-fueled public presenting fraudulent summaries of papers from crap journals.

[Reply to Anonymous](#)

[Quote Anonymous](#)

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/958178#comment-958178>

"sex addiction" and "porn addiction" rejected

Submitted by Nicole Prause, PhD on January 29, 2018 - 12:31pm

If you diagnose "sex addiction" or "porn addiction" be prepared to lose your license. I will file it myself.

From Kraus et al (2018) Compulsive sexual behaviour disorder in the ICD-11:

"For ICD-11, a relatively conservative position has been recommended, recognizing that we do not yet have definitive information on whether the processes involved in the development and maintenance of the disorder are equivalent to those observed in substance use disorders, gambling and gaming. For this reason, compulsive sexual behaviour disorder is not included in the ICD-11 grouping of disorders due to substance use and addictive behaviours, but rather in that of impulse control disorders."

From Grant et al (2014) Impulse control disorders and "behavioural addictions" in the ICD-11. definitions team:

"A third key controversy in the field is whether problematic Internet use is an independent disorder. The Working Group noted that this is a heterogeneous condition, and that use of the Internet may in fact constitute a delivery system for various forms of impulse control dysfunction (e.g., pathological game playing or pornography viewing). Based on the limited current data, it would therefore seem premature to include it in the ICD-11."

ICD-11 specifically removed even the narrower term "sex addiction" from their draft back in June 2017 specifically due to not having evidence to support it (documentation available).

If you continue to use a fake diagnosis on a falsified model, you are participating in fraud with patients. Increasing shame in patients is most likely to make them worse, and you should lose any license for engaging in it.

Reply to Nicole Prause, PhD

Quote Nicole Prause, PhD

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/958210#comment-958210>

Janniko Georgiadis disagrees with you

Submitted by anonymous on January 29, 2018 - 3:41pm

In the following review of the literature (Functional Neuroanatomy of Human Cortex Cerebri in Relation to Wanting Sex and Having It") Georgiadis says that watching porn is equivalent to having sex:

In the current conceptual framework, where sexual arousal is part of sexual consummation, having sex does not require physical genital contact either with another individual or masturbatory. Take the example of pornography. Thinking about ways to gain access to it, or actively searching for it, and perhaps experiencing desire during the process, is considered sexual wanting. Watching selected pornographic material, even without masturbation, can be considered "having sex" when there is genital arousal.

Reply to anonymous

Quote anonymous

Georgiadis authored letter sex not addictive

Submitted by Nicole Prause, PhD on January 29, 2018 - 3:46pm

Actually, Dr. Georgiadis authored this letter with us in Lancet Psychiatry: Prause, Janssen, Georgiadis, Finn, & Pfaus (2018). Data do not support sex as addictive. Lancet Psychiatry.

Your gross, intentional misreading of his review aside, you, anonymous non-scientist, do not speak for Dr. Georgiadis. You are trying to shift the discussion to primary versus secondary reinforcements, which we also already have shown is not as represented in our EEG study in Archives of Sexual Behavior.

If you do not present any credentials, you are clearly just an activist.

Reply to Nicole Prause, PhD

Quote Nicole Prause, PhD

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/1007247#comment-1007247>

Good points! The agenda

Submitted by anonymous on August 11, 2018 - 12:35pm

Good points! The agenda-driven anti-porn crusaders posting massive copy-and-paste boilerplate elsewhere here have one a single stereotype in mind, namely, the guy already IN a relationship (which many men are not) whose relationship falls apart because of porn. So their complaint is just about porn, with no mention, as you point out, that it could have more of a story line. But that way of fixing it doesn't fit the narrative/agenda of the crusaders.

Reply to anonymous

Quote anonymous

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/1141509#comment-1141509>

Psychotic posting

Submitted by Non-psychotic responding on August 16, 2019 - 1:07am

Gary Wllson is reposting material directly from yourbrainonporn here in the comments section, with in hour of posting. These have all been refuted, hundreds of times, which he never acknowledges, then goes into his classic psychosis. He should be in a mental institution, he is obsessive and mentally ill. Everyone can see that, plain as day.

Reply to Non-psychotic responding

Quote Non-psychotic responding

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/1141676#comment-1141676>

Park et al reported zero findings

Submitted by Psychometrics on August 16, 2019 - 2:01pm

Castleman is correct. Park et al did not report any actual assessment of any physiological parameter. Indeed, throughout the paper there is no value presented for any cardiovascular index, SNS or PNS index, blood titres, nothing. Park et al shows conclusively that they showed nothing conclusive. Nowhere does it say "participants" were even asked their permission to include them as cases. IRB is mentioned nowhere. That's a major red flag for ethics problems too. It raises the question of whether these supposed "cases" even existed with no values presented nor consent sought. Yikes.

Reply to Psychometrics

Quote Psychometrics

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/1141706#comment-1141706>

Park had no data

Submitted by Park et al had no data on August 16, 2019 - 4:27pm

It was not a review. Types of reviews may include systematic reviews, meta-analysis, and the like. It did none of those.

Authors "trust me" is not data. They presented zero figures, stats, or anything to support their assertions about their cases. They could have done an ABA design, time-wait control, etc. They did none of these.

Downloads are not a metric of impact. H-index is. The scientific impact of Park et al. appears to be zero. Castleman is right to dismiss it as propaganda.

Reply to Park et al had no data

Quote Park et al had no data

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/996026#comment-996026>

Article slated for retraction: "Is internet pornography..."

Submitted by Alison Cook on July 7, 2018 - 7:48pm

Michael your spidey-sense was right on. That article "Is internet pornography causing sexual dysfunctions? A review with clinical reports" was just covered by Retraction Watch NS was not actually peer-reviewed. It turns out the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) review found that the authors did not properly consent the cases (assuming they existed at all, which is dubious given the fraud), the listed paper editor Scott Lane withdrew in a correction (saying he did not serve as the editor...no one did because it was not peer-review), and two of the authors had undisclosed financial conflicts of interest.

Yes, they are absolutely rotten to the core to still be citing that paper. They know it is fraudulent, were caught in the fraud by COPE, and are still listing it like nothing happened. Outrageous.

[Reply to Alison Cook](#)

[Quote Alison Cook](#)

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/887090#comment-887090>

Actresses do well

Submitted by Anonymous on December 3, 2016 - 2:39pm

There actually are data on this dispelling the "damaged goods" hypothesis that you are describing:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00224499.2012.719168>

and an interview about the benefits reported by a performer that is compelling to me:

<http://www.pornhelps.com/performerprofiles/>

more to come, waiting on some paperwork!

[Reply to Anonymous](#)

[Quote Anonymous](#)

+++++

Experimental is stronger

Submitted by Anonymous on November 29, 2016 - 3:16pm

Exactly. Cross-sectional. Which is why this study is stronger than everything you cite, including size, pre-registration, methods...basically everything. Science is not a see-saw. Having a bunch of bad, cross-sectional studies that failed to control for anything or experimentally manipulate anything does not "outweigh" large, well-powered science.

[Reply to Anonymous](#)

[Quote Anonymous](#)

Lab exposure to photos outweighs dozens of population studies?

Submitted by loren jacobs on November 30, 2016 - 2:44pm

Let me get this: You are saying that assessing the effects of a one time exposure to a Penthouse-like picture tells us more than dozens of cross-sectional and longitudinal studies assessing the effects of porn use on relationships?

This is like saying that all cross-sectional and longitudinal studies on the long-term effects of smoking have been debunked by a single lab study showing that smoking a pack of cigarettes failed to cause cancer.

[Reply to loren jacobs](#)

[Quote loren jacobs](#)

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/1037049#comment-1037049>

NoFap could be next; Hate group

Submitted by Nicole Prause on October 28, 2018 - 3:29pm

His timing is perfect. Hate speech results in hateful acts. NoFap has been promoting hate speech for years, including against specific women. There are scientific papers published about the misogyny in NoFap groups. Incel's have murdered. I fully expect one of these murders will someday be from these anti-masturbation anti-porn groups. HLeY is calling attention to their hate speech while they still have time to try to correct. It is past time to stop promoting hate speech on your platforms...or this is what one of your followers will do next. Stop promoting fascism, misogyny, and antisemitism.

Reply to Nicole Prause

Quote Nicole Prause

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/reply/1120771/1038434>

NoFap threatens to rape and stalk women

Submitted by Nicole Prause on October 31, 2018 - 10:51am

As the misogynist, misrepresentations of this anonymous troll make clear, this is why I get rape threats and am stalked by NoFap followers.

I do not owe anyone an education on published science they refuse to publish themselves, so would encourage you to stop threatening female scientists online.

Reply to Nicole Prause

Quote Nicole Prause

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/reply/1120771/1037481>

Science documenting the misogyny from these groups

Submitted by Nicole Prause on October 29, 2018 - 2:05pm

"I want that power back': Discourses of masculinity within an online pornography abstinence forum"

This was a systematic review of the content in those forums. I believe Ley's point is not to say everyone must masturbate at some regular schedule. If you choose not to masturbate, just don't promote for-profit groups that support misogyny and advertise Proud Boys and other antisemitic groups. As far as I am aware, the only celebrity fan of YourBrainOnPorn is David Duke, which he described as preventing race mixing.

There are many ways to reach your goals that don't line the pockets of hate groups.

Reply to Nicole Prause

Quote Nicole Prause

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/1037651#comment-1037651>

Science documenting the misogyny from these groups

Submitted by Nicole Prause on October 29, 2018 - 2:05pm

"I want that power back': Discourses of masculinity within an online pornography abstinence forum"

This was a systematic review of the content in those forums. I believe Ley's point is not to say everyone must masturbate at some regular schedule. If you choose not to masturbate, just don't promote for-profit groups that support misogyny and advertise Proud Boys and other antisemitic groups. As far as I am aware, the only celebrity fan of YourBrainOnPorn is David Duke, which he described as preventing race mixing.

There are many ways to reach your goals that don't line the pockets of hate groups.

Reply to Nicole Prause

Quote Nicole Prause

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/reply/1120771/1038235>

Peer-reviewed: you don't have it

Submitted by Nicole Prause on October 30, 2018 - 10:38pm

They reported their systematic approach, a point you proved yourself by posting their method. You disclose nothing, were subject to no standards, made no attempt to observe in any systematic way...that is the difference between peer-review.

So yes, get it published or stick to your blogs, but there's a reason you'll never be able to publish your ramblings: They are poorly reasoned. I suspect this is because you have a conflict of interest. NoFap is a for-profit site; they make money by scaring people into having a problem they don't actually have.

Reply to Nicole Prause

Quote Nicole Prause

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/reply/1120771/1038434>

NoFap threatens to rape and stalk women

Submitted by Nicole Prause on October 31, 2018 - 10:51am

As the misogynist, misrepresentations of this anonymous troll make clear, this is why I get rape threats and am stalked by NoFap followers.

I do not owe anyone an education on published science they refuse to publish themselves, so would encourage you to stop threatening female scientists online.

Reply to Nicole Prause

Quote Nicole Prause

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/reply/1093824/868133>

SPSP update

Submitted by Nicole Prause on September 8, 2016 - 11:21am

Thank you for your post. To provide further context, a therapist with CSAT, a sex addiction certification of IITAP, actually wrote SPSP before I gave that talk. She claimed that I was not a licensed psychologist (I am), that I was fired from UCLA (I was not, I was promoted, finished my contract and started a company), and that my data had been faked in an effort to prevent me from even being allowed to speak at SPSP. This therapist now, of course, is facing an APA ethics complaint for her actions. She cannot lose her board because no actual patient was involved, so she will still be making money off unsuspecting patients.

Scientists who threaten the income of people treating sex and porn as addicting are being attacked by the therapists themselves. It is sad, frightening, and the public should be aware that some therapists will claim anything to take their money. It can be very difficult for the public to tell who is actually working in their best interest any more. I do not personally see patients myself any more (full time scientist), so I have no financial interests in the outcome.

Reply to Nicole Prause

Quote Nicole Prause

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/893840#comment-893840>

Clinical scientists additional concerns

Submitted by Nicole Prause, PhD on January 2, 2017 - 6:26pm

Thanks for your column. There is a larger problem reflected here. Most of the public does not realize that psychological treatments are not held to the same standards of evidence as medical treatments. The problem of therapists not using empirically-supported treatments is fairly wide-spread, I have just never seen the problem as bad in any field as sex and porn "addiction". Decades of practice and they still have zero randomly controlled trials, still the gold standard of evidence.

That is not interest in helping patients, that's just helping their pocket book.

Another example is that we just published brain stimulation efficacy in changing sexual responsiveness. The trial (<http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0165646>) is comparable in sample size and efficacy to the few existing non-random, uncontrolled trials of treatments that do exist (one ACT trial excepted). However, TMS will not make them money, so they ignore it. (Incidentally, it makes me no money either.)

Those interested in this history of psychology may like to read about the start of the clinical science movement:

http://apsychoserver.psych.arizona.edu/JJBAREprints/PSYC621/McFall_Manifesto_1991.pdf

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/942544#comment-942544>

your angry comment proves my point

Submitted by Geoff Goodman, Ph.D. on October 17, 2017 - 12:19pm

How do you know so much about CSAT training if you haven't gone through it? Curious. Unlike you, I'm both a sex therapist and a sex addiction therapist, and my sex therapy training did not adequately train me to treat people with sex addiction. But this article wasn't about CSATs-- it mentioned that sex addiction doesn't exist, and I wanted to show that the rest of the world is going to be diagnosing sex addiction in ICD-11. It's time that sex therapists join the 21st century and recognize sex addiction; otherwise, they will be left even further behind and lose even more turf.

Reply to Geoff Goodman, Ph.D.

Quote Geoff Goodman, Ph.D.

False assumption

Submitted by Profit over patients on October 27, 2017 - 3:28am

"Unlike you" assumes quite a lot...which happens not to be true. I've seen CSAT training, and they are filled with intentionally false information to whip up patient distress. IITAP and CSAT care about one thing: money.

Reply to Profit over patients

Quote Profit over patients

+++++

Porn helps studies

Submitted by PornHelps on December 3, 2016 - 2:29pm

Here is a long list of studies showing the benefits of porn on individuals, relationships, society, performers, and women:

www.pornhelps.com

Reply to PornHelps

Quote PornHelps

What a joke. There's no long list of studies.

Submitted by anonymous on December 3, 2016 - 8:27pm

I see 5 or 6 cherry-picked studies with results that don't match the glossy "pornhelps" claims. A few examples:

Headline at "pornhelps" says "Stronger Erections" - but none of the 3 cited studies assessed erections in the lab. And none found that porn use lead to stronger erections with partners.

The third study cited (Cantor et al., 2013) had the same group subjects as a 2015 study from the same researchers. The 2015 reported that 71% of the compulsive porn user had sexual dysfunctions - <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25032736>

"Pornhelps" is citing a study that totally debunks their assertion. Pretty entertaining.

+++++

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/ca/comment/reply/1135830/1168260>

Addiction?

Submitted by Serge on November 9, 2019 - 10:04am

The question is not what areas of brain "light up", but whether person experiences a destructive compulsion, that they repeatedly fail to resist, that interferes with their life, takes too much of their time, etc. That would qualify as 'addiction' in terms of behavior, no?

Reply to Serge

Quote Serge

Addiction only belongs to chemicals

Submitted by Joe Kort, Ph.D. on November 9, 2019 - 10:18am

Many things could be explained by the definition of addiction and it isn't addiction. Sexual dysregulation is a better way to look at it so that we see each person as unique and not paint them with a broad brush.

Reply to Joe Kort, Ph.D.

Quote Joe Kort, Ph.D.

DSM and ICD disagree with you

Submitted by anonymous on November 9, 2019 - 12:38pm

Gambling addiction was long ago recognized by DSM.

The new ICD-11 has both Gambling Disorder and Gaming Disorder in the addiction category.

Reply to anonymous

Quote anonymous

The DSM and ICD don't always get it right

Submitted by Joe Kort, Ph.D. on November 9, 2019 - 1:39pm

The DSM included homosexuality and then removed it in 1973. The inclusion on consensual paraphilias have changed to "if the client expresses distress" whereas before it was anyone with a paraphilia. It is a work in progress.

Reply to Joe Kort, Ph.D.

Quote Joe Kort, Ph.D.

They got it right with behavioral addictions

Submitted by anonymous on November 9, 2019 - 3:30pm

Removing homosexuality was the right thing, as was adding behavioral addictions. Tons of research has been published revealing that behavioral addictions induce brain changes that mirror those occurring in substance addictions.

A whole has occurred in addiction science since 1973.

Reply to anonymous

Quote anonymous

go to www.realyourbrainonporn.com for real science on porn

Submitted by Joe Kort, Ph.D. on November 9, 2019 - 3:44pm

really important to know the unbiased real science.

Reply to Joe Kort, Ph.D.

Quote Joe Kort, Ph.D.

Thank you, Dr. Kort, for standing up to control freaks

Submitted by Frank on November 9, 2019 - 4:04pm

There is no shortage of people out there that throw around pseudo-science in their efforts to impose their agenda on what people are allowed to do in the privacy of their own homes. Thank you for standing up to them.

Your entire article is a

Submitted by Anon on June 26, 2013 - 8:09am

Your entire article is a logical fallacy of Argumentum Ad Hominem because you say that sex addiction does not exist because people who acknowledge it are wrongly motivated.

Here are links to articles that discuss scientific evidence for the existence of both Porn and Sex addiction.

<http://yourbrainonporn.com/porn-pseudoscience-and-%CE%B4fosb>

<http://yourbrainonporn.com/the-end-of-the-porn-debate>

<http://yourbrainonporn.com/dsm-5-attempts-to-sweep-porn-addiction-under-rug>

<http://yourbrainonporn.com/porn-addiction-not-sex-addiction-and-why-it-matters>

<http://www.highexistence.com/supernatural-stimuli-comic>

<http://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/cupids-poisoned-arrow/201106/ominous-news-internet-addiction-atrophies-brains>

Reply to Anon

Quote Anon

A series of links from someone who has no training in research

Submitted by Nobodys Fool on March 19, 2017 - 8:38pm

Anyone can post links. What you seem extremely limited in is the ability to understand the scientific method and the basics of quantitative research. BTW, I have had 5 years of graduate level training in research methodology.

Reply to Nobodys Fool

Quote Nobodys Fool

[https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/959329#comment-959329\](https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/comment/959329#comment-959329)

Fair enough - but why

Submitted by Anonymous on December 9, 2012 - 2:46pm

tout the current decision by the DSM? You clearly get it that the DSM is a political document. Reality cannot be accurately reflected by an ever changing document.

I guess your entire argument rests on the "lack of research", rather than the lack of evidence.

[Reply to Anonymous](#)

[Quote Anonymous](#)

What Lack of Research?

Submitted by Eileen Smyth on February 10, 2013 - 10:40am

Please tell me about this lack of research, because it's my understanding there's been plenty. It just hasn't yielded evidence.

[Reply to Eileen Smyth](#)

[Quote Eileen Smyth](#)

Junk Science

Submitted by Nobody's Fool on February 3, 2018 - 6:21pm

The new quack category used by the followers of Patrick Carnes is "out-of-control sexual behavior." I had one of these quacks as an instructor in grad school. When asked for some quantitative research to support his claims, he replied that numbers confuse him.

[Reply to Nobody's Fool](#)

[Quote Nobody's Fool](#)