

# Games for health for children - current status and needed research

Institute of Digital Media and Child Development Working Group on Games for Health, . , Baranowski, T. , Blumberg, F. , Buday, R. , DeSmet, A. , Fiellin, L.E. , Green, C.S. , Kato, P. , Lu, A.S. , Maloney, A.E. , Mellecker, R. , Morrill, B.A. , Peng, W. , Shegog, R. , Simons, M. , Staiano, A.E. , Thompson, D. and Young, K.

**Author post-print (accepted) deposited by Coventry University's Repository**

**Original citation & hyperlink:**

Institute of Digital Media and Child Development Working Group on Games for Health, . , Baranowski, T. , Blumberg, F. , Buday, R. , DeSmet, A. , Fiellin, L.E. , Green, C.S. , Kato, P. , Lu, A.S. , Maloney, A.E. , Mellecker, R. , Morrill, B.A. , Peng, W. , Shegog, R. , Simons, M. , Staiano, A.E. , Thompson, D. and Young, K. (2015) Games for health for children - current status and needed research. Games for Health Journal, volume 5 (1)

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1089/g4h.2015.0026>

DOI 10.1089/g4h.2015.0026

ISSN 2161-783X

ESSN 2161-7856

Publisher: Mary Ann Liebert, Inc.

**Final publication is available from Mary Ann Liebert, Inc., publishers**

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1089/g4h.2015.0026>

**Copyright © and Moral Rights are retained by the author(s) and/ or other copyright owners. A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge. This item cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder(s). The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.**

**This document is the author's pre-print version, not incorporating any revisions agreed during the peer-review process. Some differences between the published version and this version may remain and you are advised to consult the published version if you wish to cite from it.**

## White Paper: Games for Health for Children – Current Status and Needed Research

Institute of Digital Media and Child Development Working Group on Games for Health

Chair: Tom Baranowski, PhD<sup>15</sup>

Fran Blumberg, PhD<sup>2</sup>

Richard Buday, FAIA<sup>3</sup>

Ann DeSmet, PhD<sup>4</sup>

Lynn E. Fiellin, MD<sup>5</sup>

C. Shawn Green, PhD<sup>6</sup>

Pamela M. Kato, PhD<sup>7</sup>

Amy Shirong Lu, PhD<sup>8</sup>

Ann E. Maloney, MD<sup>9</sup>

Robin Mellecker, PhD<sup>10</sup>

Brooke A. Morrill, PhD<sup>11</sup>

Wei Peng, PhD<sup>12</sup>

Ross Shegog, PhD<sup>13</sup>

Monique Simons, MSc<sup>14</sup>

Amanda E. Staiano, PhD<sup>15</sup>

Debbe Thompson, PhD<sup>1</sup>

Kimberly Young, PhD<sup>16</sup>

**Author Affiliations:** <sup>1</sup>USDA/ARS Children's Nutrition Research Center, Baylor College of Medicine, Department of Pediatrics, Houston TX; <sup>2</sup>Fordham University Graduate School of Education, Division of Psychological and Educational Services, New York, NY; <sup>3</sup>Archimage, Inc., Houston, TX; <sup>4</sup>Ghent University, Department of Movement and Sports Sciences, Ghent, Belgium; <sup>5</sup>play2PREVENT Lab, Yale University School of Medicine, Department of Internal Medicine, New Haven, CT; <sup>6</sup>University of Wisconsin, Department of Psychology, Madison, WI; <sup>7</sup>Coventry University, Serious Games Institute, Coventry, UK; <sup>8</sup>Northeastern University, Department of Communication Studies and Department of Health Sciences, Boston, MA; <sup>9</sup>University of Massachusetts Medical Center, Department of Psychiatry, Worcester, MA; <sup>10</sup>Centre for Physical Activity & Nutrition Research (C-PAN), School of Exercise and Nutrition Sciences, Faculty of Health, Deakin University, Melbourne, Australia; <sup>11</sup>Schell Games, Pittsburgh, PA; <sup>12</sup>Michigan State University, Department of Telecommunications, Information Studies and Media, East Lansing, MI; <sup>13</sup>University of Texas School of Public Health, Center for Health Promotion and Prevention Research, Houston, TX; <sup>14</sup>Utrecht University, Department of Human Geography and Spatial Planning, Utrecht, The Netherlands; <sup>15</sup>Pennington Biomedical Research Center, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA; <sup>16</sup>The Center for Internet Addiction, Bradford, PA

<sup>5</sup>**Corresponding Author:** Tom Baranowski, PhD, Baylor College of Medicine, Children's Nutrition Research Center, 1100 Bates St, Houston, TX 77030, [tbaranow@bcm.edu](mailto:tbaranow@bcm.edu)

**Abstract word count:** 161 **Manuscript word count:** 5,467 (including headings)

**Abstract**

Video Games for Health (G4H) offer exciting, innovative, potentially highly effective methods for increasing knowledge, delivering persuasive messages, changing behaviors, and influencing health outcomes. While early outcome results are promising, additional research is needed to determine the game design and behavior change procedures that best promote G4H effectiveness and to identify and minimize possible adverse effects. Guidelines for ideal use of different types of G4H by children and adolescents should be elucidated to enhance effectiveness and minimize adverse effects. G4H stakeholders include organizational implementers, policy makers, players and their families, researchers, designers, retailers and publishers. All stakeholders should be involved in G4H development and have a voice in setting goals to capitalize on their insights to enhance effectiveness and use of the game. In the future, multiple targeted G4H should be available to meet a population's diverse health needs in developmentally appropriate ways. Substantial, consistent and sophisticated research with appropriate levels of funding is needed to realize the benefits of G4H.

Video games have the ability to engage players in ways different from other media.<sup>1</sup> About 29% of video game players are 18 years old or younger.<sup>2</sup> Games for health (G4H) are an exciting arena for scientific inquiry and a promising intervention modality. In ways unimaginable a generation ago, we are now using sophisticated technology for promoting and assessing health and well-being. Many G4H are built on platforms already familiar to players (such as PCs, web browsers, game consoles, smart phones), making them readily accessible and easy to use. Games are believed to provide engagement and enjoyment to encourage repeat game play; facilitate making choices, risky or otherwise, without immediate personal consequences; and embed behavior change procedures needed to make individual positive health changes.<sup>3</sup>

G4H are being developed and tested across a broad set of diseases (for both prevention and treatment) and health problems. Research has been published on games for medical conditions (e.g. HIV, cystic fibrosis, pain management, Parkinson's disease, obesity); psychiatric conditions (e.g. posttraumatic stress disorder, anxiety, depression, autism spectrum disorder); rehabilitation (e.g. burns, stroke, and traumatic brain injury); health-related social issues (e.g. violence, bullying, race bias); public health (e.g. increasing physical activity via active video games, or exergames, dietary changes, and sexual health); employee wellness, corporate wellness, medical staff interpersonal skills training, and medical education;<sup>4</sup> and for pediatric cancer patients and survivors.<sup>5</sup>

Although G4H have been developed for all age groups, this report is focused on children and adolescents. Children and adolescents vary in their game genre preferences and ability to master the nuances of particular types of games. Developmental stages are not clearly defined in regards to appropriate game play. Little is known about the types of game design elements that appeal to children and adolescents during the developmental periods that children form the requisite cognitive sophistication and executive functioning to appreciate content and game choice options (e.g. in elementary and middle school<sup>6</sup>) or avoid making risky decisions (e.g. in high school<sup>7</sup>).

Pamela Hurst-Della Pietra, MD, Founder and President of the Institute of Digital Media and Child Development, initiated a review of diverse digital media in regard to child health and development. Her goal was focusing the research, health, and policy communities, and general public attention on important and complex G4H issues. Her Institute solicited several white papers to review research in each of these areas and to report what is known and not known in regard to child health and development, to identify key stakeholders, priority research issues, and to articulate guidelines for relevant media use and further development. This white paper follows this structure. Many of the leading G4H researchers were invited to contribute to address these important issues.

### **What Do We Know About G4H?**

Games are a form of play or recreation. Play is generally considered beneficial to child development.<sup>8</sup> At their simplest, games have rules, objectives, choices, challenges, points and criteria for winning or losing,<sup>9, 10</sup> but there are variations. Digital games include characteristics of traditional games, and other features such as non-player characters, deep story or narrative,

avatars, interactivity, simulation, virtual or online communication with other players, and feedback on game choices made.<sup>11</sup> Research on games has divided the understanding of playing of games into aspects of *game design* (e.g., genre, gestalt, user interface, game mechanics), types of *interactivity* between games and player (also called dynamics or game play), and the user's *experience* of playing the game (also called aesthetics, e.g. cognitions, emotions).<sup>12</sup> Positive experiences from playing a game (e.g., “fun”) maintain game interest and attract players to return.<sup>13</sup>

Serious games are designed to achieve a purpose besides entertainment<sup>14</sup> (e.g., *ReMission* was designed to enhance pediatric cancer regimen compliance<sup>15</sup>). G4H are a subcategory of serious games designed to influence a person's health. At the current time, there are at least five different types of G4H (see Figure 1). Five components are needed to understand the first four game types, including design (e.g., the change procedures incorporated into the game), targeted behavior determinants (i.e., influences on behavior usually specified by behavior theory such as self-efficacy and attitude), targeted behavior (e.g., vegetable intake, smoking), targeted health precursors (e.g., relaxation or anxiety reduction before surgery), and targeted health aspects (e.g., adiposity, lung cancer risk, post-surgical recovery time). Some games have been designed primarily to increase health-relevant knowledge; some to change health-related behaviors by changing behavioral determinants; some change behavior by incorporating the behavior (e.g. physical activity) into the game design to advance game play (e.g. exergames); and some influence health by changing health precursors (Figure 1). A fifth category includes games to train health professionals in delivering care.<sup>16</sup>

Game design features with cross-age group appeal include: 1) Interactivity: players' opportunity to initiate actions and receive evaluative information about their actions;<sup>17</sup> 2) Feedback: the often immediate information players receive about the efficacy of their game actions;<sup>18, 19</sup> 3) Agency or control: the player's ability to manage aspects of game play such as the use of control mechanisms and influencing story line;<sup>20</sup> 4) Identity: the player's opportunity to become a game character via an avatar and/or to form relationships and linkages with game characters;<sup>21</sup> and 5) Immersion: a player's sense of presence, transportation, or integration within the game.<sup>22, 23</sup>

### *G4H to Increase Knowledge*

The intersection of experiential (games) and knowledge learning has shown promise for engaging students in academic, health, and societal topic areas.<sup>24-26</sup> Games offer learning opportunities via student-centered learning<sup>27</sup> were more effective than traditional instruction for both student learning and retention in a meta-analysis of 39 studies.<sup>28</sup> Teachers reported that serious games were particularly motivating for low-performing students;<sup>29</sup> however, increased knowledge alone may not influence subsequent health behaviors.<sup>30</sup>

Although adoption of instructional technology within classrooms is not widespread,<sup>31</sup> a recent survey indicated 55% of teachers used games for education in classrooms at least once per week.<sup>29</sup> Reported barriers to using games in the classroom included insufficient time, high cost, and lack of technology resources.<sup>29</sup> Lack of clear standards and guidelines for game developers

makes it difficult to claim a game meets learner requirements.<sup>32</sup>

### *G4H to Change Behavior*

An early systematic review of 25 diverse G4H revealed that all but one had a positive effect on a learning outcome, but the outcomes were diverse and non-comparable.<sup>33</sup> Since then, a substantial number of studies have appeared, allowing ensuing reviews to include more circumscribed content. A recent meta-analysis of 64 games promoting healthy lifestyles revealed games had statistically significant effects on behaviors, stronger effects on behavior determinants, and even effects on health outcomes, although these effects were weaker.<sup>34</sup> A systematic review of 11 video games for diabetes education revealed nine had a positive impact on knowledge, disease management, and/or clinical outcomes.<sup>35</sup> A systematic review of 19 studies on changes in health or safety behaviors among young persons revealed 17 studies reporting at least one statistically significant effect on behavior.<sup>3</sup> A review of virtual reality and videogames for traumatic brain injury rehabilitation found mostly positive outcomes for balance, upper extremity function and various cognitive functioning tests; attitudes toward the games were more positive than for traditional therapy; and no differences in outcomes between games and traditional therapy.<sup>36</sup> A meta-analysis of seven games promoting sexual health behavior found desired effects on determinants but not the behaviors (but only two studies reported tests of effects on behavior).<sup>37</sup> A systematic review of 64 studies of exergames for therapeutic use revealed promising results for enhancing health among patients who were ill or in rehabilitation.<sup>5</sup> A systematic review of 28 games for obesity prevention found 40% of studies had a desired effect on an adiposity related variable.<sup>38</sup> Thus, substantial evidence supports game efficacy in influencing diverse knowledge, psychosocial behavioral determinants, behavior, and health outcomes.

### *G4H that Involve Physical Activity in Game Play*

Exergames require physical activity to advance game progress. In the face of a worldwide obesity epidemic, there has been substantial interest in exergames.<sup>39</sup> Dance games, which started in arcades and progressed to living rooms, evolved to use both upper body sensors and lower body mats, capturing both arm swing and fancy footwork. Energy expenditure from exergames performed in the laboratory was higher than in sedentary games.<sup>40</sup> However, when exergames were offered in unstructured places (i.e., children's homes) as part of a rigorous randomized clinical trial, there was no evidence the exergame increased physical activity intensity or duration in a sustained way.<sup>41, 42</sup> Exergames did not beat pedometers to motivate increased physical activity over time.<sup>41</sup> Alternatively, at least five studies indicated exergames could impact body mass index (BMI) and weight.<sup>15, 43-46</sup> Integrating exergaming into more standard pediatric obesity programs showed added benefits for reducing BMI,<sup>15, 45</sup> increasing moderate-to-vigorous physical activity,<sup>15</sup> and reducing screen time and soda intake.<sup>45</sup> Children (6-11 yo) who played a game linked to their home stationary cycle had higher energy expenditure than those without the game. Since this did not result in higher exhaustion, they were able to keep it up longer.<sup>47</sup>

Schools may provide valuable opportunities for exergaming<sup>44, 48-50</sup> because of their wide reach in terms of socio-economic status and ethnic backgrounds.<sup>51</sup> Children and adolescents

spend most of their time in school sitting. *Mobile Class*,<sup>52</sup> an active video game with school lessons, decreased sedentariness. Active games might enhance interest and competence in physical education.<sup>53-55</sup>

The benefits of gaming (e.g., high appeal, motivation and fun) may be combined with the benefits of being outside. Since parents prefer their child play outside,<sup>56</sup> outdoor play facilities with game elements, *Swinxs*<sup>57</sup> and *YalpSona*<sup>58</sup>, have elicited energy expenditure between seven and ten METs. No research has been reported on their long term effects on physical activity behavior change.

A substantial number of reviews have appeared in the exergame literature. Some have been very positive, suggesting that exergames provide an important tool to obesity prevention and treatment,<sup>59, 60</sup> while others have been critical,<sup>40</sup> and some very critical.<sup>61, 62</sup> A review of reviews of G4H, but mostly of exergames, indicated the quality of such reviews needed to improve, especially assessments of the quality of studies.<sup>63</sup> It appears that exergames can stimulate moderate to vigorous physical activity under controlled conditions and have led to meaningful physical activity, weight and cognitive changes under some field conditions, but the contexts in which these changes have appeared have not been clearly determined.

#### *G4H that Influence Health Precursors*

Playing some video games just prior to surgery reduced anxiety (a health precursor), which was associated with better and quicker health outcomes, and reduced stay duration in the hospital.<sup>64</sup> Empowerment during game play has been proposed as a method for inducing physiological changes that can enhance resilience, reduce fear and anxiety, and enhance health among cancer patients.<sup>65</sup> The interactivity of games (not simply their vivid dynamic sensory stimulation) activated the mesolimbic projection and hippocampal regions of the brain, which were related to more positive attitudes toward cancer chemotherapy.<sup>66</sup> This line of research may identify more health precursor influence pathways (type 4 in Figure 1).

#### *Processes of Change in G4H*

Little is known about how children and adolescents learn during game play,<sup>67, 68</sup> despite demonstrated cognitive benefits of video games for visual attention,<sup>69</sup> executive functioning,<sup>70</sup> and learning preparation (i.e. learning how to learn).<sup>71</sup> There is also limited demonstration of learning transfer from game play to more traditional academic tasks.<sup>72</sup> Complex models have been proposed on how games may influence behavior change,<sup>73-76</sup> which include some combination of attempting to enhance engagement by increasing game “fun” (although we may not know what that is),<sup>77</sup> story or narrative immersion,<sup>78-80</sup> successively more difficult levels (sometimes referred to as inducing scaffolding),<sup>81</sup> involving end users in the game design,<sup>82</sup> and incorporating a variety of behavior change procedures (e.g., goal setting,<sup>83</sup> feedback on aspects of game performance<sup>84, 85</sup>). While some researchers believe G4H may be more fun<sup>86</sup> and game play extended<sup>78</sup> through incorporation of a story, the game industry is divided over the success of blending traditional narrative, such as film, with video game interactivity, believing cut scenes can disrupt game play.<sup>86, 87</sup> Offering companion stories (e.g., comic books or novellas) may

capitalize on the benefits of narrative without disrupting game play.<sup>88</sup>

Despite this promising research on processes of change in G4H, an outcome moderation meta-analysis of 68 lifestyle behavior change game studies revealed many surprises: none of the outcomes (behavior determinants, behaviors, or health indicators) were affected by use of a story, degree of interactivity, rewards, immediate feedback, or tailoring to user characteristics. Degree of challenge (no challenge versus challenge based on level of game play) influenced behavioral precursors, but not behavior or health outcomes.<sup>89</sup> Games using personal goal setting and planning were less effective in influencing determinants than games not including goals, and these personal goal setting games had no effect on behaviors or clinical outcomes.<sup>89</sup> There was no significant effect of the number of behavior change techniques employed on any of the outcomes.<sup>89</sup> A separate meta-analysis of these studies revealed that developing a game using principles of participatory design (i.e., participants as informants or co-designers) led to lower effectiveness on behavior or self-efficacy change than using participants as testers or no participant involvement in design.<sup>90</sup> A limitation of these analyses is that each game design element is determined to be present or not, one at a time, and assessed against outcomes. Impact on outcomes may require combinations of techniques, but that will also require more studies and another analysis. A potential explanation for the lack of effect from narrative may be non-professional stories due to funding constraints. While games are emerging as a promising method for behavior change, extensive additional research and more sophisticated game design are needed to identify ways to enhance engagement, learning, and behavior change.

### **Implications for Child Development**

Entertainment games have been demonstrated to develop psychomotor, cognitive, behavioral, and social skills across developmental periods.<sup>91</sup> The *It's Your Game* curriculum impacted executive cognitive function.<sup>92</sup> Acute executive functioning enhancements were observed in a within-subjects study of 6-10 year old children after playing an exergame versus a sedentary video activity.<sup>93</sup> An acute bout of Wii exergame play within a 20-week exergame intervention improved executive function among African American adolescents who were overweight or obese and from a low-income inner city neighborhood.<sup>46</sup> Principles for enhancing working memory using video games have been proposed.<sup>94</sup> Among children with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder, a specially designed video game enhanced inhibitory performance, working memory, and visuospatial short-term memory.<sup>95</sup> Exergaming reduced repetitive behaviors and enhanced cognitive control among children with autism spectrum disorder.<sup>96</sup> Computer-based training enhanced neuro- and social cognition among schizophrenics.<sup>97</sup> Thus, video games, and specifically serious games and G4H, can positively influence developmental, especially cognitive, outcomes among healthy children and among those with various illnesses and disabilities.<sup>5</sup> Serious games may be targeted to child developmental level, thereby enhancing potential effectiveness and appeal. These effects should be further verified and effective contexts determined. Broader applications could include impacting life skills and enhancing self-management among healthy and targeted other children.

Serious video games intended for children and adolescents are often designed to appeal to



an expansive age range with little consideration of formal features that make for developmentally appropriate game play.<sup>98,99</sup> Some games are more effective in some age groups but not others,<sup>100,101</sup> e.g., younger children may be more interested in exergaming than adolescents.<sup>102,103</sup>

Developmentally appropriate games appear to involve curricular suitability,<sup>104</sup> timely and informative feedback,<sup>10,105</sup> and a balance between players' skills and game challenges.<sup>104</sup>

Research is needed to confirm and expand these factors of developmental appropriateness and effectiveness.

### **G4H Stakeholders**

G4H stakeholders are a large and diverse group, but can be divided into those who: a) are interested in using G4H to advance their or their organization's agenda; b) may benefit from playing the games; c) create G4H for profit; and d) conduct research on G4H.

G4H users interested in advancing their or organizational health objectives include governments (federal, state and local), health industry (public health agencies, health care providers, hospitals, health insurance agencies, pharmaceutical companies offering motivational and training opportunities for effective medication use), businesses (interested in offering health educational programming to their customers or specific skills like machine operation safety, business-employee wellness programs), education (health professions schools, schools (K-12), public and private teachers, child care agencies, parents, children's educational agencies (e.g. museums, botanical gardens)), and non-government organizations (NGOs) (foundations, faith based organizations), among others.

Those who may benefit from playing G4H include diverse patients and students (for self-care) and their parents or families, and health care providers for professional education.

Those who create G4H for profit include owners, managers, and stockholders of G4H companies, game design experts, professional writers, artists, voice artists, animators, programmers, game testers, retailers and publishers.

Those who do research on G4H include computer scientists, game design scientists, educators, health educators, behavior change specialists, psychologists, communications experts, neuroscientists, evaluation specialists, and content specialists (relevant to the targeted content of the game, e.g. nutritionists/dietitians, kinesiologists, medical educators, or rehabilitation therapists).

The creation of any particular G4H, and research on G4H, especially dissemination and implementation research, would benefit from involving one or more representatives from each stakeholder group to assure meeting their needs and expectations and benefitting from their expertise and insights.

### **Priority Research Issues**

While there are many types of research that can and need to be conducted, a prioritized research agenda appears in Table 1. Synthesizing the current literature is challenging because most of the studies in systematic reviews and meta-analyses of outcomes included interventions and measures that were diverse (and sometimes unsophisticated). Samples were often small;

designs had no control group or no randomization (not including the reviews on lifestyle change<sup>34</sup> or sexual health<sup>37</sup>); and interventions were of short duration. Scientifically rigorous research is needed to understand whether and how G4H may influence desired health outcomes or produce adverse effects. Inadequate levels of scientifically rigorous research conducted over longer durations will only lead to questions and possible dismissal of this innovative intervention procedure.

One of the major difficulties in testing the efficacy of G4H is that the "gold standard" intervention design – the placebo-controlled double-blind study – isn't an option. Participants in behavioral studies always know the content of their training and, thus, by definition cannot be blinded (though they may not know the *purpose* of the intervention). Care must be taken to minimize the influence of confounds and maximize the probability of replicable results.<sup>106</sup> This means employing a proper control group (where "proper" may differ substantially depending on whether the goal of the study is to show efficacy or to identify possible mechanisms), ensuring sufficient time on task (as a null result after an intervention that lasts only a few hours is not informative), utilizing proper spacing of training (i.e., distributed rather than massed practice), and wherever possible taking multiple separate measures of the construct of interest (e.g., if one is interested in aerobic fitness, take measures of VO2 max, resting heart rate, recovery heart rate, etc.).

Many answers about efficacious and effective G4H design principles for affecting determinants, behavior or health outcomes are not known. Although the initial meta-analysis of moderating effects of game design thought to be critical in lifestyle change programs indicated many design features and behavior change procedures, as then employed, did not enhance effectiveness,<sup>89, 90</sup> additional (experimental) research on innovative and, thereby, potentially more effective ways of using these features and procedures is needed. Effective game design research must address how stories in G4H engage children; what mechanisms mediate this influence; what (combinations of) features make games developmentally appropriate; and which features facilitate game transfer to real life behavior.

Best practices for behavior change intervention and evaluation were recently identified from a review of systematic reviews.<sup>107</sup> While these should provide guidance to G4H, how best to incorporate these procedures into this innovative medium for different ages needs to be addressed. Different types of stories and games interest different people at different times.<sup>88</sup> Knowing which story and game characteristics appeal to specific types of people could help tailor game design and behavior change procedures to maximize effectiveness.

Since participatory design procedures (as used to date) were not effective in increasing behavior change,<sup>90</sup> research must address the optimal role of formative research, including who should be involved; types of involvement that enhance game effectiveness; the optimal role of feasibility studies in game research;<sup>108-112</sup> the definition of feasibility in game interventions (i.e., when is the game considered feasible); sample sizes needed for feasibility studies (i.e., when statistical power calculations are not appropriate); and whether post-intervention interviews to assess whether an intervention met user needs and suggestions for enhancement were important,

necessary, or helpful. Issues of privacy, confidentiality, and personal risk (e.g., recording illegal activity) associated with real-time data collection must be addressed.

In an international context, G4H may include player restrictions, such as language barriers and culture. For example, exercise intensity and energy expenditure increased when children played select exergames that virtually transported them into traveling through the streets of Hong Kong on the Xavi-X® J-MAT. This game featured Hong Kong celebrity Jackie Chan as an avatar, thereby creating a cultural connection for the children.<sup>113</sup> Games with cultural specificity and language translation may encourage children to engage in more active play. Future research needs to assess the impact of language and cultural specificity in G4H, and cross-country differences in player desires and effectiveness of design elements.

Context may influence the long-term effects of games on target and ancillary behaviors. Sustained use of exergames has been challenging in a school setting. New ideas are needed for exergames to achieve sufficient and sustainable use to produce desired outcomes in schools. G4H research should assess the effectiveness of supportive contexts (e.g., informal learning vs. formal learning; in-class vs. out of class, etc.). G4H may also develop more comprehensive community methods, e.g., combining an intensive primary care approach with school-based intervention and links with community resources, such as Boys and Girls' Clubs, religious organizations, community gardens and dieticians.<sup>114</sup> More engaging narratives involving context<sup>78</sup> and sophisticated feedback targeting elements of context may move G4H to a more sustainable level for mass appeal.

Technology is constantly evolving. A genre of mobile exergames is emerging.<sup>115-117</sup> The intrinsic nature of these games allows the children to be outside, which minimizes inside sitting and may enhance the activity obtained.<sup>118</sup> Apps<sup>119-122</sup> can be linked to mobile exergames and provide tailored feedback and advice at appropriate times and places in real-time when it is more likely to affect behavior change.<sup>119</sup> Some of these games incorporate global positioning systems (GPS), which facilitates location-based elements in exergaming, e.g., geocaching (finding hidden objects).<sup>122</sup> One form of mobile exergame involves augmented reality wherein computer graphics are superimposed over smartphone camera images, or narrated audio played through ear buds while walking outdoors (e.g. *Zombies Run*<sup>123</sup>). In some such games, maps are based on existing streets in the real world and players instructed to collect virtual items or treasures, or to avoid items/traps placed on the map (thus, requiring movement in the real world). Wearable sensors, such as Apple Watch and Fitbit, are being gamified and available on social media.

So far, few mobile apps incorporate game strategies. Collaboration between game designers, health professionals and behavior change experts is warranted to link games and evidence-based behavior change techniques incorporated into apps. Research is needed on the efficacy and effectiveness of such games, and the optimal combination of game mechanics and behavior change procedures to maximize physical activity<sup>124</sup> or other behavior changes. To complete the loop to health, documented behaviors and health outcomes from games and apps could be digitally linked to electronic medical records and made available to a participant's primary care or other healthcare provider. Child safety is an important consideration in

geocaching type games, wherein children's attention to context may be overridden by the excitement of the next find.

Brain-computer interfaces have enabled brain activity to directly control video game progress (e.g. *DayDream*<sup>125</sup>). Games may improve brain function,<sup>126, 127</sup> and neuroscience research<sup>66</sup> may identify one or more profiles of neurological responses to games that can be used as a proxy for early outcomes to enhance the more rapid design of effective G4H. Although physical fitness and cognitive capacity are strongly related,<sup>128, 129</sup> and physical activity can be effective as a treatment for moderate depression,<sup>130, 131</sup> few studies have measured the effects of G4H on working memory or depression.<sup>132</sup> G4H could be combined with individual psychotherapy or medication to cost-effectively provide care for individuals who suffer from brain disorders, but currently lack regular access to qualified mental health professionals. Exergame play has been related to enhanced academic performance;<sup>133</sup> however, these relationships must be more thoroughly established.

To combat G4H cost and technology barriers, continued research is needed to harness the power of G4H in accessible, low-tech ways<sup>134</sup> and with minimal overhead,<sup>135, 136</sup> especially for low budgets.<sup>137</sup> For school use, teachers require a means to show what their students have learned.<sup>138</sup> Game play analytics are a relatively common G4H feature. Methods have been identified for extracting such data in G4H.<sup>139</sup> However, many data analytics remain proprietary to gaming companies, including the algorithm to estimate calorie expenditure during exergame play.<sup>140</sup> Research must address how game play analytics (e.g. quizzes and assessments) or game achievements can best be harnessed to demonstrate student learning or behavior change, and whether objectively measured effects of games on target skills, knowledge and behavior may encourage teachers to adopt serious games as a standard part of curriculum.<sup>141</sup>

We know of only one article that reported adverse events from game play: injuries reported on an independently run website.<sup>142</sup> Hand lacerations or bruises were the most common form of injury, and these most commonly occurred using Wii Sports Tennis.<sup>142</sup> No denominator was available from which to estimate incidence or prevalence. There is accumulating research and associated concern that child media use disrupts sleep<sup>143</sup> and also may lead to media addiction,<sup>144</sup> violence,<sup>145</sup> inappropriate sexual practices,<sup>146</sup> cyberbullying<sup>147</sup> and attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder.<sup>148</sup> The relevant literatures have generally employed self-reported measurement methods with known limitations<sup>149</sup> and failed to differentiate type of media<sup>150</sup> or beneficial versus detrimental media content. Therefore, there are no nuanced prescriptions for media use. Given the dizzying array of possible adverse consequences, however, research is needed on the extent to which G4H contribute to possible adverse health outcomes or have other adverse outcomes.

Additional G4H effectiveness issues concern: how the medical community can leverage G4H for management and treatment of chronic disease (e.g., tracking and motivating patient compliance to medications/treatment plans); how G4H can be integrated into daily life for sustained/continuous play (e.g., wearable technology for monitoring progress in the game, or providing feedback at the end, unlocking or earning gift cards by making and sustaining health behavior changes); the populations that could most benefit from G4H; how G4H could be

adapted for specific needs (e.g., persons with physical disabilities or in rehab, persons with obesity or other chronic conditions); how emerging platforms (e.g., integration with smart watches, mobile phone apps, audio/music, or intelligent personal assistant, e.g., Siri-type audio feedback for ongoing interaction with a virtual trainer) can incorporate G4H, including the necessary behavior change procedures. Considerations must be given to courses, experiences, and internships that can best prepare the next wave of researchers, developers, teachers, and healthcare providers interested in digital media and behavior change.

Thus, while there is ample preliminary evidence of G4H leading to positive outcomes, further research is needed to better understand mechanisms of effect and contextual factors influencing outcomes. Little research exists on possible adverse effects of G4H (e.g., contribution to sedentariness), which also need to be assessed and, if found, better understood.

### **Establish Guidelines for Children, Parents, Educators, Clinicians, Policymakers and Technologists**

#### *Guidelines for application*

The American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) guidelines<sup>151</sup> indicate child screen media exposure should not exceed a total screen time of two hours per day. This two-hour limit, however, does not discriminate between beneficial and nonbeneficial screen media use. Part of the consideration in the two-hour limit was a concern for physical inactivity. Exergames that increase physical activity and do not increase calorie intake during game play<sup>39</sup> may be acceptable for longer intervals, especially among children in unsafe neighborhoods who may not otherwise be allowed outside to be physically active. Another concern compelling the two-hour limit was exposure to sexting, bullying, or other aversive outcomes from access to social media. Playing G4H with demonstrated health benefits would not appear to be a concern. We await AAP's current reappraisal of their guidelines. As far as we know, there has been no report of overuse (addiction?) to G4H, but this has not been explored in the scientific literature. Due diligence suggests systematically looking for and documenting possible adverse events from G4H.

At some point it may help to have a "prescription plan" (paid by health insurance and coordinated by national health care professional groups) to prescribe a specific game or suite of games to achieve given objectives (assuming a given dose for preventive or treatment training effects has been demonstrated) for a given individual (varying on developmental age, game preference, etc.) — a tantalizing hope for the future.

#### *Guidelines for game development*

Establishing guidelines on mechanics and development procedures for G4H would be valuable.<sup>152, 153</sup> Frameworks for serious game design have been proposed.<sup>4, 154, 155</sup> Since little is currently known with confidence about principles in effective G4H design, guidelines to deliver games that meet the serious purpose of impacting health while providing motivational appeal appear premature. To be effective, however, serious games must be fun, and much more fun than many serious games currently provide. Focusing on learning, assessment or behavior change

should not detract from the player's enjoyment. Fun is not easy to achieve and should not be assumed by the expertise of designers, nor deduced from a simple question presented to users. It would seem wise for diverse stakeholders to: 1) collaborate in interdisciplinary teams for game development from concept to market; 2) integrate and apply theories and models from design and development, health communication, gaming, social networking, and behavioral science to guide development, evaluation, and dissemination; 3) attend to formative evaluation with intermediate and end-users to ensure game usability, desirability and feasibility; 4) apply rigorous evaluation to raise the credibility of games by establishing efficacy; and 5) attend to scale and dissemination.<sup>156</sup> Game developers should also pay attention to developmental appropriateness, cultural differences and culturally sensitive issues.<sup>157</sup> Consistent with the medical care dictum of "Do no harm", G4H designers should avoid incorporating violence in light of the evidence that violence in media increases risk of violence among viewers.<sup>158</sup>

### *Funding for game development*

G4H have a number of structural advantages in the marketplace (e.g. individuals may play the games due to interest in the outcomes of the game play, rather than out of a desire to play the game itself; the audiences for some G4H are captive – as in medical or school settings; etc.), and thus do not necessarily need to compete in the same sphere as AAA entertainment video games in terms of budget (which can run in the tens of millions of dollars). For educational games, high production value was not necessary, since games with highly realistic visuals did not outperform the simple textual or cartoon-like games.<sup>28</sup> However, producing effective and compelling G4H nonetheless require a certain level of budget to ensure effective mechanics and dynamics, art and sound, etc. G4H development and research to date in the U.S. have been funded largely by government (e.g., NIH) or foundation (e.g., Robert Wood Johnson Foundation) grants. The health insurance industry has funded development of G4H,<sup>159</sup> but few studies of these games have appeared in the literature. Inadequate funding is due, in part, to perceived adverse effects of video games,<sup>160</sup> in part to an inadequate number of sophisticated clinical trials documenting effectiveness, and in part to a "chocolate-coated broccoli" problem — a challenge to developing truly enjoyable G4H. Part of the problem is business related. Large successful entertainment video game development companies have explored the educational game space, but G4H have not become runaway financial successes like entertainment games. As a result, fewer resources are put into G4H than may be necessary to create high quality engaging experiences. We have yet to reach a tipping/inflection point where industry or healthcare view G4H as viable. As yet, there is no reimbursement for G4H played outside of health settings.<sup>161</sup> A health industry sanctioned prescription for "gameceuticals" for prevention or treatment would be a welcome addition and may be useful in reducing health care costs. Effective G4H could be used by practitioners to promote and enhance behavior change. G4H shown to be effective could be distributed broadly for a relatively low cost (once developed), thus increasing reach and potential public health impact.

### **Concluding Overview**

We are still exploring how best to design G4H and the extent to which a game can impact health (e.g., executive cognitive function, physical activity, dietary change, stress reduction). Moderators and mediators of game impact remain to be understood. Substantial amounts and improved quality of research are needed to advance G4H. Please join us in this exciting adventure with potentially large payoffs for our nation's health.

## References

1. Rigby S, Ryan RM. *Glued to Games: How Video Games Draw Us In and Hold Us Spellbound*. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger; 2011.
2. Entertainment Software Association. 2014 Essential Facts About the Computer and Video Game Industry. 2014 [Accessed:2015 March 24]; Available from: [http://www.theesa.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/ESA\\_EF\\_2014.pdf](http://www.theesa.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/ESA_EF_2014.pdf).
3. Hieftje K, Edelman EJ, Camenga DR, et al. Electronic media-based health interventions promoting behavior change in youth: A systematic review. *JAMA Pediatr* 2013; 167:574-80.
4. Graafland M, Dankbaar M, Mert A, et al. How to systematically assess serious games applied to health care. *JMIR Serious Games* 2014; 2:e11.
5. Staiano AE, Flynn R. Therapeutic uses of active videogames: A systematic review. *Games Health J* 2014; 3:351-65.
6. Del Giudice M. Middle childhood: An evolutionary-developmental synthesis. *Child Dev Perspect* 2014; 8:193-200.
7. Reyna VF, Farley F. Risk and rationality in adolescent decision making. Implications for theory, practice, and public policy. *Psychol Sci Public Interest* 2006; 7:1-44.
8. Frost JL, Wortham SC, Reifel SC. *Play and Child Development*. 3rd ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.; 2007.
9. Prensky M. *Digital Game-Based Learning*. St. Paul, MN: Paragon House; 2007.
10. Salen K, Zimmerman E. *Rules of Play: Game Design Fundamentals*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press; 2004.
11. Wilson KA, Bedwell WL, Lazzara EH, et al. Relationships between game attributes and learning outcomes review and research proposals. *Simul Gaming* 2009; 40:217-66.
12. Hunicke R, LeBlanc M, Zubek R. MDA: A formal approach to game design and game research. *Proceedings of AAAI-04 Workshop on Challenges in Game AI* July 25-29; San Jose, CA. 2004: p. 1-5.
13. Hansen L, Sanders S. Fifth grade students' experiences participating in active gaming in physical education: The persistence to game. *ICHPER-SD J Res* 2010; 5:33-40.
14. Ritterfeld U, Cody M, Vorderer P, editors. *Serious Games: Mechanisms and Effects*. New York: Routledge; 2009.
15. Trost SG, Sundal D, Foster GD, et al. Effects of a pediatric weight management program with and without active video games: A randomized trial. *JAMA Pediatr* 2014; 168:407-13.
16. Kato PM. Video games in health care: Closing the gap. *Rev Gen Psychol* 2010; 14:113-21.
17. Ritterfeld U, Shen C, Wang H, et al. Multimodality and interactivity: Connecting properties of serious games with educational outcomes. *Cyberpsychol Behav* 2009; 12:691-7.
18. Liao CCY, H. CZ, Cheng HNH, et al. My-Mini-Pet: A handheld pet-nurturing game to engage students in arithmetic practices. *J Comput Assist Learn* 2011; 27:76-89.
19. Lieberman DA. What can we learn from playing interactive games? In: Vorderer P, Bryant J, editors. *Playing Video Games: Motives, Responses, and Consequences* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Assoc.; 2006. p. 447-70.
20. Qin H, Rau PL, Salvendy G. Measuring player immersion in the computer game narrative. *Int J Hum Comput Interact* 2009; 25:107-33.
21. Blascovich J, Bailenson J. *Infinite Reality: Avatars, Eternal Life, New Worlds, and the Dawn of the Virtual Revolution*. New York: Harper Collins; 2011.



22. Tamborini R, Skalski P. The role of presence in the experience of electronic games. In: Vorderer P, Bryant J, editors. *Playing Video Games Motives, Responses, and Consequences* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.; 2006.
23. Green MC, Brock TC. The role of transportation in the persuasiveness of public narratives. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 2000; 79:701-21.
24. Donohue C, editor. *Technology and Digital Media in the Early Years: Tools for Teaching and Learning*. New York: Routledge; 2015.
25. Maloy RW, Verock-O'Loughlin RE, Edwards SA, et al. *Transforming Learning with New Technologies*. 2nd ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson; 2013.
26. Squire K. *Video Games and Learning: Teaching and Participatory Culture in the Digital Age*. New York: Teachers College Press; 2011.
27. Watson WR, Mong CJ, Harris CA. A case study of the in-class use of a video game for teaching high school history. *Comput Educ* 2011; 56:466-74.
28. Wouters P, van Nimwegen C, van Oostendorp H, et al. A meta-analysis of the cognitive and motivational effects of serious games. *J Educ Psychol* 2013; 105:249-65.
29. Takeuchi L, Vaala S. Level Up Learning: A National Survey on Teaching with Digital Games. New York: The Joan Ganz Cooney Center at Sesame Workshop; 2014 [Accessed:2015 March 24]; Available from: <http://www.joanganzcooneycenter.org/publication/level-up-learning-a-national-survey-on-teaching-with-digital-games/>.
30. Contento I, Balch GI, Bronner YL, et al. The effectiveness of nutrition education and implications for nutrition education policy, programs, and research: A review of research. *J Nutr Educ* 1995; 27:277-418.
31. Cox MJ. Formal to informal learning with IT: Research challenges and issues for e-learning. *J Comput Assist Learn* 2013; 29:85-105.
32. Yusoff A, Crowder R, Gilbert L. Validation of serious games attributes using the technology acceptance model. *Second International Conference on Games and Virtual Worlds for Serious Applications (VS-GAMES)*; Braga, Portugal. IEEE; 2010: p. 45-51.
33. Baranowski T, Buday R, Thompson DI, et al. Playing for real: Video games and stories for health-related behavior change. *Am J Prev Med* 2008; 34:74-82.
34. DeSmet A, Van Ryckeghem D, Compernelle S, et al. A meta-analysis of serious digital games for healthy lifestyle promotion. *Prev Med* 2014; 69:95-107.
35. DeShazo J, Harris L, Pratt W. Effective intervention or child's play? A review of video games for diabetes education. *Diabetes Technol Ther* 2010; 12:815-22.
36. Pietrzak E, Pullman S, McGuire A. Using virtual reality and videogames for traumatic brain injury rehabilitation: A structured literature review. *Games Health J* 2014; 3:202-14.
37. DeSmet A, Shegog R, Van Ryckeghem D, et al. A systematic review and meta-analysis of interventions for sexual health promotion involving serious digital games. *Games Health J* 2015; 4:78-90.
38. Lu AS, Kharrazi H, Gharghabi F, et al. A systematic review of health games on childhood obesity prevention and intervention. *Games Health J* 2013; 2:131-41.
39. Baranowski T. Are active videogames useful to combat obesity? *Am J Clin Nutr* 2015; [Epub ahead of print].
40. Barnett A, Cerin E, Baranowski T. Active video games for youth: A systematic review. *J Phys Act Health* 2011; 8:724-37.

41. Maloney AE, Threlkeld KA, Cook WL. Comparative effectiveness of a 12-week physical activity intervention for overweight and obese youth: Exergaming with “Dance Dance Revolution”. *Games Health J* 2012; 1:96-103.
42. Baranowski T, Abdelsamad D, Baranowski J, et al. Impact of an active video game on healthy children's physical activity. *Pediatrics* 2012; 129:e636-42.
43. Maddison R, Mhurchu CN, Jull A, et al. Active video games: The mediating effect of aerobic fitness on body composition. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* 2012; 9:54.
44. Staiano AE, Abraham AA, Calvert SL. Adolescent exergame play for weight loss and psychosocial improvement: A controlled physical activity intervention. *Obesity (Silver Spring)* 2013; 21:598-601.
45. Christison A, Khan HA. Exergaming for health: A community-based pediatric weight management program using active video gaming. *Clin Pediatr (Phila)* 2012; 51:382-8.
46. Staiano AE, Abraham AA, Calvert SL. Competitive versus cooperative exergame play for African American adolescents' executive function skills: Short-term effects in a long-term training intervention. *Dev Psychol* 2012; 48:337-42.
47. Haddock BL, Siegel SR, Wikin LD. The addition of a video game to stationary cycling: The impact on energy expenditure in overweight children. *Open Sports Sci J* 2009; 2:42-6.
48. Simons M, Opdam L, van Empelen P. Feasibility of an active game program in a Dutch pre-vocational high school setting *Games Health J* 2013; 2:332-40.
49. Duncan MJ, Staples V. The impact of a school-based active video game play intervention on children's physical activity during recess. *Hum Movement* 2010; 11:95-9.
50. Hoornstra S, de Vet E, Steenhuis I, et al. De E-Fit fiets op de basisschool: onderzoek naar de effectiviteit van de e-fit als middel om kinderen meer te laten bewegen. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Vrije Universiteit, 2010.
51. De Bourdeaudhuij I, Van Cauwenberghe E, Spittaels H, et al. School-based interventions promoting both physical activity and healthy eating in Europe: A systematic review within the HOPE project. *Obes Rev* 2011; 12:205-16.
52. PlayFit. *PlayFit Onderzoek* 2014. Available from: <http://www.playfitproject.nl/ebooks/>.
53. Papastergiou M. Exploring the potential of computer and video games for health and physical education: A literature review. *Comput Educ* 2009; 53:603-22.
54. Gao Z, Zhang T, Stodden D. Children's physical activity levels and psychological correlates in interactive dance versus aerobic dance. *J Sport Health Sci* 2013; 2:146-51.
55. Sun H. Impact of exergames on physical activity and motivation in elementary school students: A follow-up study *J Sport Health Sci* 2013; 2:138-45.
56. De Vet E, Simons M, Wesselman M. Dutch children and parents' views on active and non-active video gaming. *Health Promot Int* 2014; 29:235-43.
57. Jongert MWA, Claessens M, van der Heijden E. Beweegstimulering door middel van een innovatieve buitenspeelhulp, de Swinx. TNO 2009; KvL/GB 2009.072 (in Dutch).
58. Schermers P, Bakker I, de Vries SI, et al. Evaluatie YalpSona. TNO 2008; KvL/B&G 2008.047 (in Dutch).
59. Peng W, Crouse JC, Lin JH. Using active video games for physical activity promotion: A systematic review of the current state of research. *Health Educ Behav* 2013; 40:171-92.
60. Gao Z, Chen S, Pasco D, et al. A meta-analysis of active video games on health outcomes among children and adolescents. *Obes Rev* 2015; [Epub ahead of print].
61. LeBlanc AG, Chaput JP, McFarlane A, et al. Active video games and health indicators in children and youth: A systematic review. *PLoS One* 2013; 8:e65351.

62. Liang Y, Lau PWC. Effects of active videogames on physical activity and related outcomes among healthy children: A systematic review. *Games Health J* 2014; 3:122-44.
63. Parisod H, Pakarinen A, Kauhanen L, et al. Promoting children's health with digital games: A review of reviews *Games Health J* 2014; 3:145-56.
64. Yip P, Middleton P, Cyna AM, et al. Non-pharmacological interventions for assisting the induction of anaesthesia in children. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2009; 3:CD006447.
65. Bruggers C, Govender M, Bowen R, et al. Clinical and neurobiological perspectives of empowering cancer patients using videogames. *Games Health J* 2015; [in press].
66. Cole SW, Yoo DJ, Knutson B. Interactivity and reward-related neural activation during a serious videogame. *PLoS One* 2012; 7:e33909.
67. Blumberg FC, Fisch SM. Introduction: Digital games as a context for cognitive development, learning, and developmental research. In: Blumberg FC, Fisch SM, editors. *Digital Games: A Context for Cognitive Development: New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass; 2013. p. 1-10.
68. De Lisi R, Wolford JL. Improving children's mental rotation accuracy with computer game playing. *J Genet Psychol* 2002; 163:272-82.
69. Green CS, Bavelier D. Effect of action video games on the spatial distribution of visuospatial attention. *J Exp Psychol Hum Percept Perform* 2006; 32:1465-78.
70. Flynn RM, Richert RA, Staiano AE, et al. Effects of exergame play on EF in children and adolescents at a summer camp for low income youth. *J Educ Develop Psychol* 2014; 4:209-25.
71. Bavelier D, Green CS, Pouget A, et al. Brain plasticity through the life span: Learning to learn and action video games. *Annu Rev Neurosci* 2012; 35:391-416.
72. Mayer RE, Johnson CI. Adding instructional features that promote learning in a game-like environment. *J Educ Comput Res* 2010; 42:241-65.
73. Baranowski T, Baranowski J, Thompson D, et al. Behavioral science in video games for children's diet and physical activity change: Key research needs. *J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2011; 5:229-33.
74. Baranowski T, Baranowski J, O'Connor T, et al. Is enhanced physical activity possible using active video games? *Games Health J* 2012; 1:228-32.
75. Thompson D, Baranowski T, Buday R. Conceptual model for the design of a serious video game promoting self-management among youth with type 1 diabetes. *J Diabetes Sci Technol* 2010; 4:744-9.
76. Thompson D, Baranowski T, Buday R, et al. Serious video games for health: How behavioral science guided the development of a serious video game. *Simul Gaming* 2010; 41:587-606.
77. Mellecker R, Lyons EJ, Baranowski T. Disentangling fun and enjoyment in exergames using a expanded design, play, experience framework: A narrative review. *Games Health J* 2013; 2:142-9.
78. Lu AS, Baranowski T, Thompson D, et al. Story immersion of video games for youth health promotion: A review of literature. *Games Health J* 2012; 1:199-204.
79. Lu AS, Thompson D, Baranowski J, et al. Story immersion in a health video game for child obesity prevention. *Games Health J* 2012; 1:37-44.
80. Baranowski T, Lu AS, Buday R, et al. Stories in games for health: More pros or cons? A roundtable discussion. *Games Health J* 2013; 2:256-63.
81. Baranowski T, Belchior P, Chamberlin B, et al. Levels in games for health. *Games Health J* 2014; 3:60-3.

82. DeSmet A, Palmeira A, Beltran A, et al. The yin and yang of formative research in designing serious (exer-)games. *Games Health J* 2015; 4:63-6.
83. Simons M, Baranowski J, Thompson DJ, et al. Child goal setting of dietary and physical activity in a serious videogame *Games Health J* 2013; 2:150-7.
84. Baranowski T, Beltran A, Chen T, et al. Structure of corrective feedback for selection of ineffective vegetable parenting practices for use in a simulation videogame. *Games Health J* 2013; 2:29-33.
85. Baranowski T, Bower K, Krebs P, et al. Effective feedback procedures in games for health: A roundtable discussion. *Games Health J* 2013; 2:320-6.
86. Buday R, Baranowski T, Thompson D. Fun and games and boredom. *Games Health J* 2012; 1:257-61.
87. Buday R. Games for health: An opinion. *Games Health J* 2015; 4:38-42.
88. Brand L, Beltran A, Buday R, et al. Prose fiction as a narrative companion for a vegetable parenting game. *Games Health J* 2015; [in press].
89. DeSmet A, Crombez G, De Bourdeaudhuij I, et al. The effect of behavior change techniques and game features in serious digital games for healthy lifestyle promotion: A meta-analysis. *JMIR Serious Games* 2015; [under review].
90. DeSmet A, Thompson D, Baranowski T, et al. Assessing the moderating role of participatory design in serious game effectiveness: A meta-analysis of serious games for healthy lifestyle promotion. *JMIR Serious Games* 2015; [submitted].
91. Granic I, Lobel A, Engels RC. The benefits of playing video games. *Am Psychol* 2014; 69:66-78.
92. D'Cruz J. Keeping it real: Executive function and sexual health self management of Houston middle school students [Doctoral Dissertation]. Houston, TX: University of Texas School of Public Health; 2014.
93. Best JR. Exergaming immediately enhances children's executive function. *Dev Psychol* 2012; 48:1501-10.
94. Deveau J, Jaeggi SM, Zordan V, et al. How to build better memory training games. *Front Syst Neurosci* 2014; 8:243.
95. Dosis S, Van der Oord S, Wiers RW, et al. Improving executive functioning in children with ADHD: Training multiple executive functions within the context of a computer game. A randomized double-blind placebo controlled trial. *PLoS One* 2015; 10:e0121651.
96. Anderson-Hanley C, Tureck K, Schneiderman RL. Autism and exergaming: Effects on repetitive behaviors and cognition. *Psychol Res Behav Manag* 2011; 4:129-37.
97. Sacks S, Fisher M, Garrett C, et al. Combining computerized social cognitive training with neuroplasticity-based auditory training in schizophrenia. *Clin Schizophr Relat Psychoses* 2013; 7:78-86A.
98. Blumberg FC, Ismailer SS. What do children learn from playing digital games? In: Ritterfeld U, Cody M, Vorderer P, editors. *Serious Games: Mechanisms and Effects*. New York: Routledge; 2009. p. 131-42.
99. Calvert S. *Children's Journeys Through the Information Age*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill; 1999.
100. Buller MK, Kane IL, Martin RC, et al. Randomized trial evaluating computer-based sun safety education for children in elementary school. *J Cancer Educ* 2008; 23:74-9.
101. Karna A, Voeten M, Little TD, et al. Going to scale: A nonrandomized nationwide trial of the KiVa antibullying program for grades 1-9. *J Consult Clin Psychol* 2011; 79:796-805.

102. Simons M, De Vet E, Hoornstra S, et al. Adolescents' views on active and non-active videogames: A focus group study. *Games Health J* 2012; 1:211-8.
103. Dixon R, Maddison R, Ni Mhurchu C, et al. Parents' and children's perceptions of active video games: a focus group study. *J Child Health Care* 2010; 14:189-99.
104. Blumberg FC, Burke LC, Hodent C, et al. Serious games for health: Features, challenges, next steps. *Games Health J* 2014; 3:270-6.
105. Hodent C. Toward a playful and usable education. In: Blumberg FC, editor. *Learning by Playing: Video Gaming in Education*. New York: Oxford University Press; 2014. p. 145-58.
106. Green CS, Strobach T, Schubert T. On methodological standards in training and transfer experiments. *Psychol Res* 2014; 78:756-72.
107. Horodyska K, Luszczynska A, van den Berg M, et al. Good practice characteristics of diet and physical activity interventions and policies: An umbrella review. *BMC Public Health* 2015; 15:19.
108. Leon AC, Davis LL, Kraemer HC. The role and interpretation of pilot studies in clinical research. *J Psychiatr Res* 2011; 45:626-9.
109. Arain M, Campbell MJ, Cooper CL, et al. What is a pilot or feasibility study? A review of current practice and editorial policy. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2010; 10:67.
110. Kraemer HC, Mintz J, Noda A, et al. Caution regarding the use of pilot studies to guide power calculations for study proposals. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 2006; 63:484-9.
111. Bowen DJ, Kreuter M, Spring B, et al. How we design feasibility studies. *Am J Prev Med* 2009; 36:452-7.
112. Stevens J, Taber DR, Murray DM, et al. Advances and controversies in the design of obesity prevention trials. *Obesity (Silver Spring)* 2007; 15:2163-70.
113. Mellecker RR, McManus AM. Active video games and physical activity recommendations: A comparison of the Gamercize Stepper, XBOX Kinect and XaviX J-Mat. *J Sci Med Sport* 2014; 17:288-92.
114. Economos CD, Hyatt RR, Goldberg JP, et al. A community intervention reduces BMI z-score in children: Shape Up Somerville first year results. *Obesity (Silver Spring)* 2007; 15:1325-36.
115. McKenzie S, Bangay S, Barnett LM, et al. Design elements and feasibility of an organized multiplayer mobile active video game for primary school-aged children. *Games Health J* 2014; 3:379-87.
116. Allen KC. Developing and testing smartphone game applications for physical activity promotion in adolescents [Doctoral Dissertation]. Blacksburg, VA: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University; 2013.
117. Garde A, Umedaly A, Abulnaga SM, et al. Assessment of a mobile game (MobileKids Monster Manor) to promote physical activity among children. *Games Health J* 2015; 4:149-58.
118. Baranowski T, Thompson WO, DuRant RH, et al. Observations on physical activity in physical locations: Age, gender, ethnicity and month effects. *Res Q Exerc Sport* 1993; 64:127-33.
119. Middelweerd A, Mollee JS, van der Wal CN, et al. Apps to promote physical activity among adults: a review and content analysis. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* 2014; 11:97.
120. Direito A, Dale LP, Shields E, et al. Do physical activity and dietary smartphone applications incorporate evidence-based behaviour change techniques? *BMC Public Health* 2014; 14:646.

121. Lister C, West JH, Cannon B, et al. Just a fad? Gamification in health and fitness apps. *JMIR Serious Games* 2014; 2:e9.
122. Boulos MN, Yang SP. Exergames for health and fitness: the roles of GPS and geosocial apps. *Int J Health Geogr* 2013; 12:18.
123. Lee M. Sticky ends: Employing thinly-sliced narratives in serious games for mobile platforms. *Int J Multimed Ubiquitous Eng* 2014; 9:349-62.
124. Barnett LM, Bangay S, McKenzie S, et al. Active gaming as a mechanism to promote physical activity and fundamental movement skill in children. *Front Public Health* 2013; 1:74.
125. GainPlay Studio. Day Dream. 2015 [Accessed:2015 April 27]; Available from: <http://www.gainplaystudio.com/daydreamgame/>.
126. Mishra J, Bavelier D, Gazzaley A. How to assess gaming-induced benefits on attention and working memory. *Games Health J* 2012; 1:192-8.
127. Anguera JA, Boccanfuso J, Rintoul JL, et al. Video game training enhances cognitive control in older adults. *Nature* 2013; 501:97-101.
128. Esteban-Cornejo I, Tejero-Gonzalez CM, Sallis JF, et al. Physical activity and cognition in adolescents: A systematic review. *J Sci Med Sport* 2014; [Epub ahead of print].
129. Khan NA, Hillman CH. The relation of childhood physical activity and aerobic fitness to brain function and cognition: A review. *Pediatr Exerc Sci* 2014; 26:138-46.
130. Mammen G, Faulkner G. Physical activity and the prevention of depression: A systematic review of prospective studies. *Am J Prev Med* 2013; 45:649-57.
131. Brown HE, Pearson N, Braithwaite RE, et al. Physical activity interventions and depression in children and adolescents : A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Sports Med* 2013; 43:195-206.
132. Merry SN, Stasiak K, Shepherd M, et al. The effectiveness of SPARX, a computerised self help intervention for adolescents seeking help for depression: Randomised controlled non-inferiority trial. *BMJ* 2012; 344:e2598.
133. Staiano AE, Calvert SL. Exergames for physical education courses: Physical, social, and cognitive benefits. *Child Dev Perspect* 2011; 5:93-8.
134. Moseley A, Whitton N, editors. *New Traditional Games for Learning: A Case Book*. New York: Routledge; 2014.
135. Jones BA, Madden GJ, Wengreen HJ. The FIT Game: Preliminary evaluation of a gamification approach to increasing fruit and vegetable consumption in school. *Prev Med* 2014; 68:76-9.
136. Jones BA, Madden GJ, Wengreen HJ, et al. Gamification of dietary decision-making in an elementary-school cafeteria. *PLoS One* 2014; 9:e93872.
137. Borro Escribano B, del Blanco A, Torrente J, et al. Educational Game Development Approach to a particular case: The donor's evaluation. *Transplant Proc* 2015; 47:13-8.
138. Schrier K, editor. *Learning, Education and Games Volume One: Curricular and Design Considerations*. Pittsburgh, PA: ETC Press; 2014.
139. Hieftje K, Duncan LR, Fiellin LE. Novel methods to collect meaningful data from adolescents for the development of health interventions. *Health Promot Pract* 2014; 15:714-22.
140. Staiano AE, Calvert SL. The promise of exergames as tools to measure physical health. *Entertain Comput* 2011; 2:17-21.
141. Meckbach J, Gibbs B, Almqvist J, et al. Exergames as a teaching tool in physical education? *Sport Sci Rev* 2013; 22:369-86.

142. Sparks D, Chase D, Coughlin L. Wii have a problem: A review of self-reported Wii related injuries. *Inform Prim Care* 2009; 17:55-7.
143. Gradisar M, Wolfson AR, Harvey AG, et al. The sleep and technology use of Americans: Findings from the National Sleep Foundation's 2011 Sleep in America poll. *J Clin Sleep Med* 2013; 9:1291-9.
144. Lemmens JS, Valkenburg PM, Gentile DA. The Internet Gaming Disorder Scale. *Psychol Assess* 2015; [Epub ahead of print].
145. Gentile DA, Li D, Khoo A, et al. Mediators and moderators of long-term effects of violent video games on aggressive behavior: Practice, thinking, and action. *JAMA Pediatr* 2014; 168:450-7.
146. Ybarra ML, Strasburger VC, Mitchell KJ. Sexual media exposure, sexual behavior, and sexual violence victimization in adolescence. *Clin Pediatr (Phila)* 2014; 53:1239-47.
147. Hellström L, Persson L, Hagquist C. Understanding and defining bullying - adolescents' own views. *Arch Public Health* 2015; 73:4.
148. Bioulac S, Arfi L, Bouvard MP. Attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder and video games: A comparative study of hyperactive and control children. *Eur Psychiatry* 2008; 23:134-41.
149. Lubans DR, Hesketh K, Cliff DP, et al. A systematic review of the validity and reliability of sedentary behaviour measures used with children and adolescents. *Obes Rev* 2011; 12:781-99.
150. Hinkley T, Verbestel V, Ahrens W, et al. Early childhood electronic media use as a predictor of poorer well-being: A prospective cohort study. *JAMA Pediatr* 2014; 168:485-92.
151. American Academy of Pediatrics - Council on Communications and Media. Children, adolescents, and the media. *Pediatrics* 2013; 132:958-61.
152. Baranowski T, Buday R, Thompson D, et al. Developing games for health behavior change: Getting started. *Games Health J* 2013; 2:183-90.
153. Baranowski T. Descriptions for articles introducing a new game for health. *Games Health J* 2014; 3:55-6.
154. Cugelman B. Gamification: What it is and why it matters to digital health behavior change developers. *JMIR Serious Games* 2013; 1:e3.
155. Yusoff A, Crowder R, Gilbert L, et al. A conceptual framework for serious games. *Ninth IEEE International Conference on Advanced Learning Technologies*; Riga, Latvia. IEEE; 2009; p. 21-3.
156. Shegog R, Brown K, Bull S, et al. Serious games for sexual health. *Games Health J* 2015; 4:69-77.
157. Chen LC. What's the cultural difference between the West and the East? The consumption of popular "cute" games in the Taiwanese market. *New Media & Society* 2014; 16:1018-33.
158. Bushman BJ, Pollard-Sacks D. Supreme Court decision on violent video games was based on the First Amendment, not scientific evidence. *Am Psychol* 2014; 69:306-7.
159. Landwehr B. Big games: One company's experience with gamification of health. *Games Health J* 2014; 3:64-6.
160. Anderson CA, Shibuya A, Ihori N, et al. Violent video game effects on aggression, empathy, and prosocial behavior in eastern and western countries: A meta-analytic review. *Psychol Bull* 2010; 136:151-73.
161. Baranowski T, Isaac F, Ashford C, et al. Business models for successfully maintaining games for health: A roundtable discussion. *Games Health J* 2013; 2:64-9.

**Table 1. Prioritized Research Agenda**

---

1. Conduct adequately powered randomized clinical trials using objective measures (where possible) of outcomes to establish a stronger empirical base for G4H efficacy and effectiveness.
2. Conduct adequately powered randomized clinical trials to test hypotheses about the game design and behavior change features, including participatory design, that contribute to changes in behavior determinants, behavior and health outcomes (e.g. what is the fun in G4H play and how does it relate to change in desired outcomes).
3. Investigate the game design and behavior change procedures most appropriate to different developmental stages throughout childhood.
4. Investigate the need for culturally specific G4H and the aspects of cultural tailoring or targeting that maximize the efficacy and effectiveness of G4H.
5. Identify the optimal game design and behavior change procedures most appropriate for, and effective in, different contexts (e.g. schools, fitness centers, nursing homes) and how to capitalize on context in attaining change (e.g. cooperation vs. competition with self, others).
6. Exploit the latest advances in relevant technologies (in regard to both game design and behavior change) to maximize efficacy and effectiveness.
7. Identify a profile of neurological responses to effective games to minimize cost in game development such that effects on the neuroprofile become proximal markers of outcome with a high likelihood the resulting game will result in desired changes.
8. Develop games for enhancing mental health and cognitive outcomes and how these game design and behavior change procedures relate to secondary health outcomes (e.g. enhanced memory leads to enhanced regimen compliance, less depression leads to enhanced diet and physical activity).
9. Identify in-game measures indicative of out of game outcomes, and the contexts in which this is most likely to occur.
10. Identify (or clearly empirically contradict) adverse outcomes from G4H, especially the possible contribution of G4H to the increasingly well documented contribution of entertainment games to adverse outcomes (e.g. media addiction, violence, sexual permissiveness, breach of privacy/confidentiality, etc.).



**Figure 1. Four Types of Games for Health**

