1 Assessing video games' compliance with loot box warning label industry self-2 regulation 3 Leon Y. Xiao\*++ [0000-0003-0709-0777] < lexi@itu.dk> 4 5 \*: Center for Digital Play, IT University of Copenhagen, Denmark 6 7 †: School of Law, Queen Mary University of London, United Kingdom 8 \*: The Honourable Society of Lincoln's Inn, United Kingdom 9 10 **Abstract** 11 Loot boxes in video games are a form of in-game transactions with randomised 12 elements. Concerns have been raised about loot boxes' similarities with gambling 13 and their potential harms (e.g., overspending). Recognising players' and parents' 14 concerns, in mid-2020, the Entertainment Software Rating Board (ESRB) and PEGI 15 (Pan-European Game Information) announced that games containing loot boxes or 16 any forms of in-game transactions with randomised elements will be marked by a 17 new label stating 'In-Game Purchases (Includes Random Items)' and 'In-game 18 Purchases (Includes Paid Random Items),' respectively. This measure is intended to 19 provide more information to consumers and allow them to make more informed 20 purchasing decisions. This measure is not legally-binding and has been adopted as 21 industry self-regulation or corporate social responsibility. Previous research has 22 suggested that industry self-regulation might not be effectively complied with due 23 to conflicting commercial interests. The present study proposes to assess (i) whether 24 the ESRB and PEGI applied the warning to games consistently and (ii) whether 25 games that contain loot boxes accurately display the warning on the Google Play 26 Store. Conclusions will be drawn as to whether the measure has been complied with 27 by companies to an adequate degree and whether the measure has achieved its self-28 regulatory aims or require improvements. 29 30 **Keywords (10 Max):** 31 Loot boxes; Video games; Video gaming regulation; Interactive entertainment law; 32 Information technology law; Consumer protection; Industry self-regulation; Social 33 corporate responsibility

## 34 Conflict of Interest

- 35 L.Y.X. was employed by LiveMe, then a subsidiary of Cheetah Mobile
- 36 (NYSE:CMCM), as an in-house counsel intern from July to August 2019 in Beijing,
- 37 People's Republic of China. L.Y.X. was not involved with the monetisation of video
- 38 games by Cheetah Mobile or its subsidiaries. L.Y.X. undertook a brief period of
- 39 voluntary work experience at Wiggin LLP (Solicitors Regulation Authority (SRA)
- 40 number: 420659) in London, England in August 2022. L.Y.X. has met with and
- 41 discussed policy, regulation, and enforcement with the Belgian Gaming Commission
- 42 [Belgische Kansspelcommissie] (June 2022), the Danish Competition and Consumer
- 43 Authority [Konkurrence- og Forbrugerstyrelsen] (August 2022) and the Department
- 44 for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) of the UK Government (August 2022).
- 45 L.Y.X. has been invited to provide advice to the DCMS on the technical working
- 46 group for loot boxes and the Video Games Research Framework. L.Y.X. was the
- 47 recipient of an AFSG (Academic Forum for the Study of Gambling) Postgraduate
- 48 Research Support Grant that was derived from 'regulatory settlements applied for
- 49 socially responsible purposes' received by the UK Gambling Commission and
- administered by Gambling Research Exchange Ontario (GREO) (March 2022). L.Y.X.
- 51 has accepted funding to publish academic papers open access from GREO that was
- 52 received by the UK Gambling Commission as above (October & November 2022).
- 53 L.Y.X. has accepted conference travel and attendance grants from the Socio-Legal
- 54 Studies Association (February 2022), the Current Advances in Gambling Research
- 55 Conference Organising Committee with support from Gambling Research Exchange
- Ontario (GREO) (February 2022), the International Relations Office of The
- 57 Jagiellonian University (Uniwersytet Jagielloński), the Polish National Agency for
- 58 Academic Exchange (NAWA; Narodowa Agencja Wymiany Akademickiej) and the
- 59 Republic of Poland (Rzeczpospolita Polska) with co-financing from the European
- 60 Social Fund of the European Commission of the European Union under the
- 61 Knowledge Education Development Operational Programme (May 2022), and the
- 62 Society for the Study of Addiction (November 2022). L.Y.X. was supported by
- 63 academic scholarships awarded by The Honourable Society of Lincoln's Inn and The
- 64 City Law School, City, University of London.

## 65 1. Introduction 66 Paid loot boxes are products within video games that players buy to obtain 67 randomised rewards<sup>[1,2]</sup>. Some loot boxes are 'non-paid' and can be obtained without spending real-world money; however, the present study focuses on paid loot boxes. 68 69 Hereinafter, 'loot boxes' refers to all forms of randomised video game monetisation 70 methods, *i.e.*, any 'in-game transactions with randomised elements' [3]. Concerns have 71 been raised about loot boxes' similarities with gambling and the risks that 72 consumers might overspend money and experience harm<sup>[4-9]</sup>. Children and other 73 vulnerable consumers (e.g., people experiencing problem gambling issues) might be at particular risk of harm<sup>[10,11]</sup>. Many countries are considering imposing legal 74 regulation and a few countries have already taken regulatory actions<sup>[12–16]</sup>. However, 75 in most countries at present, paid loot boxes are specifically regulated only through 76 77 industry self-regulation<sup>[17]</sup>. There are two prominent loot box self-regulatory 78 measures: probability disclosures and text-based warning labels attached to age 79 ratings. 80 81 The Apple App Store, similar to many other hardware and software platforms<sup>[18]</sup>, 82 imposes the self-regulatory requirement that all games available on that platform 'offering "loot boxes" or other mechanisms that provide randomized virtual items 83 for purchase'[19] must disclose the probabilities of obtaining those items to customers 84 85 prior to purchase. Xiao et al. assessed companies' compliance with Apple's self-86 regulatory measure amongst the 100 highest-grossing iPhone games in the UK and 87 found that only 64% of games containing loot boxes disclosed probabilities. This 88 compliance rate was significantly lower than the 95.6% observed in Mainland China

The second self-regulatory measure is to prewarn players about the presence of loot boxes. The Entertainment Software Rating Board (ESRB), established by the Entertainment Software Association (ESA), reviews the content of video games and provides age ratings depending on the inclusion of certain material, *e.g.*, the amount and degree of violence and sexual content<sup>[21]</sup>. The ESRB is adopted in North America. PEGI (Pan-European Game Information) performs a similar function in Europe generally<sup>[22]</sup>. Recognising the concerns that have been raised about loot boxes, on 13

where probability disclosures were (and continue to be) required by law<sup>[20]</sup>.

89

98

99

April 2020, the ESRB and PEGI announced that they will attach an additional text-based warning to the age ratings of video games containing loot boxes<sup>[23]</sup>. The ESRB

100 uses the 'In-Game Purchases (Includes Random Items)' 'interactive element'[3], whilst 101 PEGI uses the 'In-game Purchases (Includes Paid Random Items)' 'content 102 descriptor'[24]. These two largely identical labels are intended to cover, according to 103 the ESRB, 'all transactions with randomized elements.' [3] The ESRB and PEGI both 104 consciously chose to specifically *not* use the term 'loot boxes' to 'avoid confusing 105 consumers'[3], particularly parents who might not have sufficient knowledge about 106 video games or 'ludoliteracy.' 107 108 According to the ESRB, their label accounts for: 109 110 "... loot boxes and all similar mechanics that offer random items in exchange 111 for real-world currency or in-game currency that can be purchased with real 112 money.'[3] 113 114 According to PEGI, their label covers: 115 116 "... all in-game offers to purchase digital goods or premiums where players 117 don't know exactly what they are getting prior to the purchase (e.g. loot 118 boxes, card packs, prize wheels).'[24] 119 120 These definitions accord with the wide definition for 'loot boxes' adopted by the present study. These labels were intended to 'provide the additional information if 121 the game features paid random items'[24], such that '...consumers can make more 122 123 informed decisions when purchasing or downloading a game, instead of finding out 124 after the fact.'[3] Notably, the presence of these labels, or rather the presence of loot 125 boxes, does not affect a game's age rating because neither the ESRB nor PEGI 126 recognises loot boxes as actual 'gambling' or 'simulated gambling' [25,26]. These labels 127 can therefore attach to games containing loot boxes but are rated suitable for young children (i.e., ESRB's 'E' or 'Everyone' rating and PEGI's 'PEGI 3' rating)[24]. This is 128 129 unlike how other content, such as depiction of 'realistic violence,' 'illegal drugs, 130 alcohol or tobacco' or 'simulated gambling,' would (in certain situations, automatically  $^{[27]}$ ) attract higher age ratings  $^{[28,29]}$ . Xiao has previously criticised the 131

labels for not providing sufficient information to truly help players and parents

make more informed purchase decisions<sup>[23]</sup>. The labels fail to identify and explain

where and how the loot boxes in a specific game can be purchased and so players

132

135 and children cannot easily actively avoid engaging with the mechanics. The labels 136 also do *not* signify whether or not the relevant mechanic provides rewards that can 137 then be transferred to other players and 'cashed-out' [30] (i.e., have real-world monetary value), which is a relevant consideration for many gambling 138 139 regulators<sup>[9,16,17]</sup>. The labels might be of some assistance by providing information at 140 the initial point of purchasing or downloading the game; however, once the player 141 has begun playing the game, the labels are no longer helpful. An improvement 142 might be to specifically describe the loot box mechanics to help players actively avoid them and to provide a choice in the options menu to turn the ability to 143 144 purchase loot boxes on or off (potentially even with the default option set to 'off'). 145 Through experimental studies, Garrett et al. have concluded that these labels fail to adequately warn consumers about the potential risks involved with loot boxes and 146 147 therefore 'fail to adequately inform consumer spending decisions'[31]. 148 149 The ESRB's and PEGI's wide definitions for 'in-game transactions with randomised 150 elements'[3] and what the present study refers to as 'loot boxes' are effectively 151 identical, despite trivial variations in the wording of the definitions and of the labels. 152 Therefore, the reasonable expectation is that a game containing loot boxes should be 153 labelled with the 'In-Game Purchases (Includes Random Items)' interactive element 154 after being rated by the ESRB in North America and with the 'In-game Purchases 155 (Includes Paid Random Items)' content descriptor after being rated by PEGI in 156 Europe. The ESRB and PEGI should be *consistent* when deciding whether a game 157 contains loot boxes. If one of them fails to label a game with the loot box warning 158 when the other has done so, then the former has highly likely inaccurately rated said 159 game's loot box presence by failing to identify it. The only highly unlikely exception 160 being that a game potentially has separate North American and European versions 161 and only one of which contained loot boxes: such a situation has never been 162 popularly reported. 163 164 Research Question 1: Are video games being consistently given the loot box self-165 regulatory warning label by the ESRB and PEGI? 166 167 Hypothesis 1: All games that have been labelled with the 'In-Game Purchases 168 (Includes Random Items)' interactive element by the ESRB should also have been

170 descriptor by PEGI and vice versa. 171 172 The ESRB and PEGI only play a direct role when rating physically published games 173 and are only indirectly involved in the rating of each individual digitally released 174 game. Both the ESRB and PEGI are 'participating rating authorities' of the IARC 175 (International Age Rating Coalition), which is a simplified system that allows game 176 companies to simultaneously obtain multiple age ratings for use in different territories for digitally delivered games<sup>[32]</sup>. After companies fill in a single 177 questionnaire about their games' content, the IARC will produce age ratings that 178 179 'also include content descriptors and interactive elements, identifying games and 180 apps that [inter alia] offer in-app/game purchases (as well as those that are randomized)' (emphasis added).<sup>[32]</sup> Specifically, the IARC uses the 'In-Game Purchases (Includes 181 182 Random Items)' interactive element, which is the ESRB's label and whose wording 183 differs slightly from that of the PEGI label. The IARC is not implemented on the 184 Apple App Store (which uses its own age rating system<sup>[33]</sup>) but is adopted by the 185 Google Play Store and other major platforms<sup>[32]</sup>. Depending on which national 186 version of the Google Play Store is visited, the appropriate age rating for that territory is shown. For example, for the game Guns of Glory (FunPlus, 2017), the US 187 188 Google Play Store displays the ESRB rating of Everyone 10+ 189 (https://play.google.com/store/apps/details?id=com.diandian.gog&hl=en&gl=us), 190 whilst the Danish Google Play Store displays the PEGI rating of 7 191 (https://play.google.com/store/apps/details?id=com.diandian.gog&hl=en&gl=dk) 192 . *Guns of Glory* has previously been identified as containing loot boxes in multiple studies<sup>[18,34,35]</sup>. Indeed, the IARC has attached the 'In-Game Purchases (Includes 193 194 Random Items)' label to the game on both the US and Danish Google Play Stores 195 alongside the respective ESRB and PEGI age ratings. 196 197 Notably, the IARC explains that 'Interactive Elements are assigned universally, 198 providing notice about the ability to make in-game purchases (including 199 randomized ones)...' (emphasis added)<sup>[36]</sup>. This contrasts with the IARC's 200 assignment of 'Age Rating and Content Descriptors,' which will differ by region<sup>[36]</sup>. 201 In other words, a game containing loot boxes can receive different age ratings in 202 different regions under the IARC system, but the loot box warning label, which is an 203 interactive element, should be attached to that game regardless of region. Universal

labelled with the 'In-game Purchases (Includes Paid Random Items)' content

20 <del>4</del>	or global assignment of the label means that the IARC has effectively extended the
205	'jurisdictional' scope of the loot box self-regulatory warning label requirement to
206	countries beyond those covered by the ESRB and PEGI. For example, Germany,
207	despite being in Europe, does not use PEGI and instead adopts the alternative USK
208	(Unterhaltungssoftware Selbstkontrolle) to provide age ratings. <u>Up until 31</u>
209	December 2022, tThe USK does did not assess the presence of loot boxes and does
210	did not require the use of a label to signify their presence in relation to physical
211	games marketed in Germany <sup>[37]</sup> . (On 14 December 2022, the USK announced that it
212	will begin to assess the presence of loot boxes and attach the 'In-Game-Käufe +
213	zufällige Objekte [In-game purchases + random items]' label accordingly to new
214	game submissions from 1 January 2023 <sup>[38]</sup> .) Notably, as of 18-16 September December
215	2022, the official USK webpage explaining the integration of the USK age ratings
216	within the IARC system has not been updated to explain that the IARC will now
217	additionally attach 'In-Game-Käufe (zufällige Objekte möglich) [In-Game Purchases
218	(Includes Random Items)]' to games containing loot boxes and, instead, the webpage
219	still only states that games allowing for additional in-game purchases will be
220	attached with the generic 'In-Game-Einkäufe [In-Game Purchases]'[39]. However, the
221	USK is a 'participating rating authority' of the IARC <sup>[32]</sup> , and so, even before the USK
222	introduced its own loot box warning label, games containing loot boxes are were
223	being attached with 'In-Game-Käufe (zufällige Objekte möglich)' on the German
224	Google Play Store: for example, Guns of Glory
225	(https://play.google.com/store/apps/details?id=com.diandian.gog&hl=de≷=de)
226	as of 18 September 2022.
227	
228	Draft laws in the US that have failed to pass <sup>[40]</sup> tried to require games containing loot
229	boxes to 'prominently disclose to the consumer at the time of purchase a bright
230	red label that is easily legible and which reads: "Warning: contains in-game
231	purchases and gambling-like mechanisms which may be harmful or addictive "'[41,42].
232	Another Bill intending to require the following (arguably note entirely scientifically
233	inaccurate) loot box warning label within the US state of Illinois remains under
234	consideration:
235	
236	'Attention Parents: A Loot Box System exists in this game that permits an
237	unlimited amount of REAL MONEY to be spent without any age restriction.
238	REAL MONEY is exchanged for random digital items. This process has been

239 linked to REAL LIFE GAMBLING ADDICTIONS in both children and adults. Please regulate your own spending as well as your children's spending'[43]. 240 241 242 Other countries might be considering imposing similar information-based warning 243 labels to address the potential harms of loot boxes. Previous research has found that 244 other industries, such as alcohol<sup>[44]</sup>, tobacco<sup>[45]</sup>, and gambling<sup>[46]</sup>, have all taken 245 various corporate actions that likely reduced the effectiveness of product warnings. 246 Loot box probability disclosures are known to have been implemented suboptimally by video game companies: specifically, lacking prominence and being 247 difficult to access<sup>[18,20]</sup>. Compliance with Belgium's 'ban' on loot boxes through 248 249 applying pre-existing gambling law has also been poor<sup>[35]</sup>. 250 251 When filling in the content rating questionnaire, Google warns that: 252 'Misrepresentation of your app's content may result in removal or suspension, so it 253 is important to provide accurate responses to the content rating questionnaire.' The 254 IARC also recognises that ratings can be changed through 'post-release 255 modification'[47] and states that: 'IARC rating authorities [inter alia, the ESRB and 256 PEGI] monitor ratings assigned to games and apps to ensure accuracy. Corrections, 257 if needed, are implemented promptly by storefronts.' However, considering prior 258 research, reasonable doubt must be cast on the compliance rate with the self-259 regulatory requirement of attaching loot box warning labels. 260 261 Rather than to assess the 100 presently highest-grossing Google Play Store games as 262 to whether they contain loot boxes (as previous studies have done[18,20,34,35]) and then 263 to check whether they are displaying the label, it is more economical and efficient to instead examine games previously known to contain loot boxes. If a game that was 264 265 known to contain loot boxes is displaying the label, then it is no longer necessary to 266 assess whether said game still contains loot boxes through gameplay, as this can be 267 reasonably assumed. Only those games previously known to contain loot boxes but 268 are not displaying the label need to be re-assessed through gameplay. This 269 expediency is desirable because it is hoped that the present study's results could be 270 published promptly and thereby contribute to the efforts of the UK Government's 271 Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport's technical working group that is 272 developing industry self-regulation for loot boxes with the aim of reducing harm<sup>[48]</sup>. 273 The sample selection (as detailed below) will be based on previously highest274 grossing games (many of which will likely still remain high-grossing and popular 275 games presently)[18,20,34,35]. This therefore represents a sample of particular interest for 276 players, parents, policymakers, and the age rating organisations. However, some 277 limitations should be noted. Firstly, the compliance rate amongst this sample of 278 historically (and potentially presently) high-grossing games is not necessarily 279 representative of that of financially worse performing games (which might be less 280 scrutinised by players and other companies and therefore less likely to comply or, 281 contrastingly, might be performing worse financially because they have accurately 282 displayed the label) or the overall situation on the Google Play Store. Secondly, these games were previously highlighted in published academic work as having contained 283 284 loot boxes<sup>[18,20,34,35]</sup>, and, therefore, their operating companies might have since 285 become more likely to comply (when compared to a newly published game that has 286 not yet gained any notoriety), as companies have reportedly complied with the 287 Belgian 'ban' on loot boxes only following the publication of Xiao and media 288 reporting thereof<sup>[35,49]</sup> and four years after they were originally supposed to have 289 done so. 290 291 Research Question 2: Are video games previously known to be high-grossing and 292 contain loot boxes and presently containing loot boxes on the Google Play Store 293 accurately displaying the IARC 'In-Game Purchases (Includes Random Items)' label?

Hypothesis 2: Video games previously known to be high-grossing and contain loot boxes and presently containing loot boxes on the Google Play Store will accurately display the IARC 'In-Game Purchases (Includes Random Items)' label. Hypothesis 2: All titles in the present sample of video games previously known to contain loot boxes, and which are presently available on the Google Play Store and continue to contain loot boxes, will accurately display the IARC 'In-Game Purchases (Includes Random Items)' label.

The present series of two studies will not seek to assess the efficacy of the loot box self-regulatory labels on consumer behaviour[see 31] and instead will seek to assess (i) whether the ESRB and PEGI have *consistently* applied the loot box self-regulatory warning label and (ii) whether companies have complied with this self-regulation by accurately labelling games containing loot boxes with the relevant notice.

308

294

295

296

297

298

299

300

301

302 303

304

305

306

## 309 2. Method 310 2.1. Study 1 311 The ESRB provides a public search tool for identifying the age ratings, content 312 descriptors, and, importantly for Study 1, interactive elements, including the 'In-Game Purchases (Includes Random Items)' label, for specific games<sup>[50]</sup>. However, it is 313 314 not possible to use the search tool to specifically identify only games with the 'In-315 Game Purchases (Includes Random Items)' label. Using the relevant filter for the label unhelpfully brings up all games with 'No Interactive Elements' (the 316 317 overwhelming majority) and those with the relevant label. The ESRB also publishes 318 a list of all games that it has rated in reverse chronological order<sup>[51]</sup>. By using the 319 'Refine Search' function of the search tool and limiting the 'Time Frame' to 'Past 320 Year' (the longest period that could be chosen) and applying no other filters, a list of 321 all games that were rated in the year leading up to 21 September 2022 were extracted 322 through data scraping. This list consisted of 698 individual entries (a few games 323 appeared as multiple entries as different editions and platforms were sometimes 324 rated and listed separately). In total, 20 entries (2.9%) were labelled by the ESRB with 325 the 'In-Game Purchases (Includes Random Items)' interactive element. Two entries 326 were excluded for bearing the exact same name as another entry. A third entry was 327 excluded because although it bears an additional subtitle (FIFA 22 Legacy Edition), it 328 is the same game as another entry (FIFA 22) and appear to have likely been rated on 329 the same date. A list of 17 individual video game titles that were labelled by the 330 ESRB with the loot box self-regulatory warning in the year leading up to 21 331 September 2022 was thereby produced. Based on how many games appeared as 332 results when the Time Frame filter was set to 'Past Year,' it can be estimated 333 (appreciating that seasonable variability and COVID-19 impacts cannot be accounted for) that the ESRB rated approximately 700 games per year historically. 334 335 This information can be used to infer that the ESRB rated approximately 992 games 336 in the 17 months between 13 April 2020 (the date on which the Labels were 337 announced and began to be assigned) and 21 September 2021 (the date after which 338 the list of games rated in the past year leading up to 21 September 2022 started). The 339 1,000 games that immediately precede the 698 entries that have already been 340 collected on the reverse chronological order list will be collated through data 341 scraping. The entries labelled by the ESRB with the 'In-Game Purchases (Includes 342 Random Items)' interactive element will be identified, and any entries bearing the 343 same or a substantially similar name will be excluded as above. These entries will be

combined with the 17 previously identified entries to form an approximately complete list of games that have been labelled by the ESRB with the loot box selfregulatory warning since 13 April 2020 (hereinafter, the 'ESRB List'). The ESRB List will be generated thusly because it was deemed impractical to analyse all 31,636 individual historical entries (existing on 21 September 2022) and the ESRB provided no information as to the exact date that a rating was given, besides allowing an inference to be drawn through the Time Frame filter. Certain games are also published months after a rating has been granted, so the release date of games also cannot be used to determine the relevant rating date. It was deemed unwise and potentially leading to a conflict of interest (and a change in compliance behaviour) to contact the ESRB and ask for a complete list of games that it has labelled with the warning, although this might be done following the publication of the present study. PEGI similarly provides a search tool for identifying the age ratings and content descriptors (including the 'In-game Purchases (Includes Paid Random Items)' label) for specific games<sup>[52]</sup>. Unlike the ESRB search tool, the PEGI search tool *can* be used to produce a list of all games ever rated by PEGI that were given the 'In-game Purchases' content descriptor, if the 'DESCIRPTOR' of 'In-Game Purchases' is selected in the 'EXTENDED SEARCH' options<sup>[53]</sup>. The 'In-game Purchases (Includes Paid Random Items)' is treated as a subtype of the overarching 'In-game Purchases' content descriptor, and therefore all games that have been given the loot box selfregulatory warning are included in said list. On 21 September 2022, a list of 523 individual results of games that have ever been labelled by PEGI with the 'In-game Purchases' content descriptor was produced. Again, a number of games appeared as multiple entries as different editions and platforms were sometimes rated and listed separately. In total, 125 results (23.9%) were ever labelled by PEGI with the 'In-game Purchases (Includes Paid Random Items)' content descriptor. Entries were excluded for bearing the same name as another entry (55 entries) and being the same game as

373 as compared to 'World of Tanks;' 6 entries). A list of all 64 individual video game 374

titles that have ever been labelled by PEGI with the loot box self-regulatory warning

another entry despite minor changes to the title (e.g., 'World of Tanks on PlayStation 4'

was thereby produced (hereinafter, the 'PEGI List').

The following variable will be measured:

344 345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352

353

354

355

356 357

358

359 360

361

362

363

364

365

366

367

368

369 370

371

372

375

376 377

Presence of the loot box self-regulatory warning label on the other system

The games on the ESRB List will be entered into the PEGI search tool<sup>[52]</sup> and vice versa with the PEGI List and the ESRB search tool<sup>[50]</sup>. Screenshots will be taken of the relevant ratings, content descriptors, and/or interactive elements. If the corresponding loot box self-regulatory label can be found for the game on the other age rating system, then this game will be marked as 'consistent,' but if not, then 'inconsistent.' If a game appears on both the ESRB List and the PEGI List, then it will be analysed only once. Some reasonable flexibility is allowed when searching for a corresponding game if a game with the exact same title cannot be found. Any deviation will be recorded. If a game cannot be found on the other system even after allowing a reasonable amount of flexibility with the search term, then it will be excluded from analysis.

The 'consistency rate' between the ESRB's and PEGI's usage of the loot box warning self-regulation will be calculated as follows:

 $\frac{\textit{Games that have been labeled with the loot box warning by both the ESRB and PEGI}}{\textit{(All games on the ESRB and PEGI Lists } - \textit{Any duplicate or excluded games)}}$ 

Hypothesis 1 will be accepted if the consistency rate is  $\geq$  95%. Otherwise, Hypothesis 1 will be rejected. In terms of the interpretation of results, a consistency rate of  $\geq$  95% will be viewed as the ESRB and PEGI having been sufficiently consistent. A consistency rate of  $\geq$  80% but < 95% will be deemed as the self-regulatory measure not having been applied sufficiently consistently by the ESRB and PEGI, and thus the rating processes require improvements to enhance cohesion. A consistency rate of < 80% will be seen as the measure having been applied inconsistently, and thus the rating processes being in need of significant improvements. These cut-offs and corresponding potential interpretations were based on the author's own opinion on what is a 'satisfactory' self-regulatory measure and what he deemed most policymakers would agree with.

Study 1 achieves level 3 of bias control as recognised by PCI RR, as it was necessary to attempt to collate the ESRB and PEGI Lists to affirm the study's practical feasibility. I certify that I have 'not yet observed ANY part of the data/evidence,' [54] specifically, I have not searched for games on either List using the other rating system's search tool.

## **2.2. Study 2**

The sample of 100 (or potentially fewer) games will be selected using the following steps:

- 1. The sample will be derived from the samples of four previous studies assessing loot box prevalence amongst mobile games in different countries, which examined 531 separate instances of video games and identified whether they contained loot boxes<sup>[18,20,34,35]</sup>.
- 2. Amongst those 531 games, 100 were originally studied in Chinese and not in English<sup>[20]</sup>. Those 100 Chinese games were reviewed in 2021 to identify a subset of 31 games that were also then available in English, which were reassessed in a UK study<sup>[18]</sup>. The present study is less interested with the compliance situation of games available only in Chinese and more concerned with the compliance situation in North America and Europe (*i.e.*, 'Western' countries) where the ESRB and PEGI self-regulate; therefore, those 100 Chinese games will not be reviewed again as the previously distilled list of 31 games that were available in both languages will be taken into account.
- 3. A list of 431 games combining the results of three previous studies will be collated<sup>[18,20,34]</sup>. Any duplicates and any games assessed to have *not* previously contained loot boxes will be removed. Some reasonable flexibility as the game's title is allowed when searching for and removing duplicate games (*e.g.*, changes to the subtitle to reflect a content update). Any deviation will be recorded. The remaining games will therefore form a list of non-duplicate games that were known to contain loot boxes.
- 4. It is known that two so-called 'sand box' games (specifically, *Roblox* (Roblox Corporation, 2006) and *Minecraft* (Mojang Studios, 2011)) will be included on that list. These two games contain a significant amount of third-party usergenerated content, including loot boxes<sup>[18,35]</sup>. This represents a particular compliance difficulty as these 'platform' games' developers and publishers would need to ensure not only compliance by themselves but also compliance by many third parties creating content for these games<sup>[49,55]</sup>. To ensure that both of these game will be assessed, they will be removed from the list and not form part of the sample. Their compliance situation will be separately

- reported. If either game becomes unavailable for download and incapable of being assessed, then this would be noted in lieu.
  - 5. Therefore, the present study's sample will be a total of 100 random games from the list of non-duplicate games that were known to contain loot boxes.
  - 6. Alternatively, if that list contains fewer than 100 games, the entire list will form the sample.
  - 7. If any game in the sample will no longer be available for download from the Google Play Store by the data collection period then it will be excluded from the sample and replaced with another random game from the list. If that list will contain fewer than 100 games or if no games will be left on that list to replace the excluded game, then the study will proceed with the available games even if the sample will be formed of fewer than 100 games.
  - 8. The same exclusion and replacement (if possible) procedure will apply if *Guns of Glory* is to be included. This game is specifically being excluded as it has been used as an example to test and illustrate the present study's methodology for the stage 1 registered report submission and its 'results' have already been observed.

466 The following variables will be measured:

468 Presence of the interactive element of 'In-Game Purchases (Includes Random Items)'

- The Google Play Store page of the relevant game will be reviewed to check whether
- 470 the IARC interactive element of 'In-Game Purchases (Includes Random Items)' has
- been noted alongside the game's age rating. The US and Danish Google Play Stores
- for each game will be checked to see whether the label has been attached to both the
- 473 ESRB and the PEGI ratings, respectively. A simple change of the parameter
- 474 'gl=[country code]' in the game's Google Play Store URL allows for the switching of
- 475 regions. The country code for the US is 'us,' whilst Denmark uses 'dk.' To illustrate
- 476 using the example of *Guns of Glory*, the US store can be visited through the following
- 477 URL:

482

450

451

452

453

454

455

456

457

458

459

460

461462

463

464

465

- 478 <a href="https://play.google.com/store/apps/details?id=com.diandian.gog&hl=en&gl=us">https://play.google.com/store/apps/details?id=com.diandian.gog&hl=en&gl=us</a>,
- whilst the Danish store can be visited through:
- 480 https://play.google.com/store/apps/details?id=com.diandian.gog&hl=en&gl=dk.
- 481 A PDF printout of the relevant webpages (showing the URL visited) will be made.

*Presence of paid loot boxes (newly assessed)* 483 484 If the Google Play Store page of a game known to previously contain paid loot boxes 485 will not show the IARC interactive element of 'In-Game Purchases (Includes Random Items)' alongside the game's age rating, then that game will be played for 486 487 up to an hour to identify whether paid loot boxes are still being implemented and 488 sold in that game. Any identified paid loot boxes will be screenshotted. If a paid loot 489 box cannot be identified within that timeframe, then the game will be coded as not 490 containing paid loot boxes. 491 To align with the methodology of prior studies<sup>[18,20,35]</sup>, a 'paid loot box' will be 492 defined as being either an Embedded-Isolated random reward mechanism (which 493 494 are video game mechanics that players must pay real-world money to activate and 495 which provide randomised rewards that do *not* possess direct real-world monetary 496 value) or an Embedded-Embedded random reward mechanism (whose activation 497 also must be paid for by players with real-world money but which do provide 498 randomised rewards that possess direct real-world monetary value), as defined by 499 Nielsen & Grabarczyk (2019)[4]. 500 501 In particular, it is emphasised that so-called 'social casino games' or 'simulated 502 casino games,' in which the player is able to spend real-world money to participate 503 in simulated traditional gambling activities (i.e., 'games of chance' or 'mixed games 504 of chance and skill; 'e.g., slot machines, poker, and blackjack) and win or lose virtual 505 currency randomly<sup>[35]</sup>, will be counted as games containing 'loot boxes' for the 506 purposes of Hypothesis 2, despite some debate on that point within the academic 507 literature<sup>[56,57]</sup>. This is because spending real-world money to participate in a social 508 casino game constitutes an in-game '[transaction] with randomized elements,' per 509 the ESRB's definition<sup>[3]</sup>. The present study's definition of 'paid loot box' encompasses 510 both mechanics that are commonly known as 'loot boxes' and social casino games. This accords with both the ESRB's and PEGI's definitions for mechanics that the loot 511 box warning labels are supposed to cover<sup>[3][24]</sup>. However, the relevant compliance 512 513 rate (see below) amongst 'social casino games' (which will be identified using the 514 definition above) and non-'social casino games' will be additionally separately 515 reported to provide nuance.

Further, again aligning with the methodology of prior studies<sup>[18,35]</sup>, so-called 'sand box' games, such as *Minecraft* or *Roblox*, that contain a significant amount of third-party user-generated content will be assumed to contain paid loot boxes without the need for such a mechanic to be specifically identified and screenshotted.

Date and time of data collection

The date and time, based on Central European Time (or Central European Summer

Time, depending on which will be used by Denmark at the data collection period), on and at which the interactive element and paid loot boxes will be searched for, will

526 be recorded.

Inter-rater reliability through dual-coding will not be calculated because the methodology has been repeatedly used and refined and is known to be reliable<sup>[58]</sup>. The raw data and a full library of PDF printouts and screenshots showing, *inter alia*, the relevant Google Play Store webpage sections and in-game loot box purchase pages for each game will be made available via <[OSF deposit link]> for public scrutiny.

The 'compliance rate' with the loot box warning self-regulation will be calculated as follows:

 $1 - \frac{\textit{Games newly assessed as containing loot boxes but not displaying the interactive element}}{(\textit{All games previously known to previously contain loot boxes} - \textit{Games newly assessed as not containing loot boxes})}$ 

Hypothesis 2 will be accepted if the compliance rate is  $\geq$  95%. Otherwise, Hypothesis 2 will be rejected. In terms of the interpretation of results, a compliance rate of  $\geq$  95% will be viewed as the self-regulatory measure having been nearly perfectly complied with and worthy of commendation. A compliance rate of  $\geq$  80% but < 95% will be deemed as the self-regulatory measure having been mostly complied with, although improvements are needed. A compliance rate of < 80% will be seen as the measure having *not* been adequately complied with and in need of significant improvements to achieve its regulatory aim. Again, these cut-offs and corresponding potential interpretations were based on the author's own opinion on what is a 'satisfactory' self-regulatory measure and what he deemed most policymakers would agree with.

551 Study 2 achieves level 6 of bias control as recognised by PCI RR as the relevant data 552 do not yet exist.[54] 553 554 The sample sizes for both studies are justified on the basis of resource constraints: 555 specifically, the researcher has limited time and is seeking to promptly complete the 556 study in time to assist in the government-supported, industry self-regulatory efforts 557 regarding loot boxes currently underway in the UK<sup>[48]</sup>. 558 559 In accordance with the *Danish Code of Conduct for Research Integrity*<sup>[59]</sup>, as adopted by the IT University of Copenhagen, the present series of two studies will not require 560 561 research ethics assessment and approval because no human participants or personal 562 data will be involved and only publicly available information will be examined and 563 recorded. 564 565 3. Results 566 tbd 567 568 4. Discussion 569 tbd 570 571 5. Conclusion

572

tbd

573 **Positionality Statement** 574 In terms of the author's personal engagement with loot boxes, he plays video games 575 containing loot boxes, but he has never purchased any loot boxes with real-world 576 money. 577 578 **Data Availability Statement** 579 The raw data and a full library of PDF printouts and screenshots showing, inter alia, 580 the relevant Google Play Store webpage sections and in-game loot box purchase 581 pages for each game will be publicly available in the Open Science Framework at 582 [OSF LINK TO BE CREATED]. 583 584 Acknowledgement 585 Thanks to David Zendle for inspiring this study, discussing potential methodologies 586 with the author, and graciously allowing the author to pursue this project 587 independently. Credit is also due to all the co-authors of Zendle et al. (2021) for 588 making the underlying data publicly available for further study and reanalysis<sup>[34]</sup>. 589 Thanks to Rune Kristian Lundedal Nielsen and Laura L. Henderson for helpful 590 comments on earlier drafts of this manuscript. 591 592 **Funding Information** 593 L.Y.X. is supported by a PhD Fellowship funded by the IT University of Copenhagen 594 (IT-Universitetet i København), which is publicly funded by the Kingdom of 595 Denmark (Kongeriget Danmark).

- 596 References
- 597 1. Xiao, L. Y. (2022). Loot boxes. In P. Grabarczyk, E. Aarseth, I. K. H. Jørgensen, M.
- 598 S. Debus, M. Vozaru, N. P. Houe, R. K. L. Nielsen, & F. Bakkerud (Eds.),
- 599 Encyclopedia of Ludic Terms. IT University of Copenhagen.
- 600 https://eolt.org/articles/loot-boxes
- 2. Xiao, L. Y., Henderson, L. L., Nielsen, R. K. L., Grabarczyk, P., & Newall, P. W. S.
- 602 (2021). Loot Boxes, Gambling-Like Mechanics in Video Games. In N. Lee
- 603 (Ed.), Encyclopedia of Computer Graphics and Games. Springer.
- 604 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-08234-9\_459-1
- 3. Entertainment Software Rating Board (ESRB). (2020, April 13). Introducing a New
- Interactive Element: In-Game Purchases (Includes Random Items). ESRB
- 607 Official Website. https://www.esrb.org/blog/in-game-purchases-includes-
- 608 random-items/
- 4. Nielsen, R. K. L., & Grabarczyk, P. (2019). Are Loot Boxes Gambling? Random
- Reward Mechanisms in Video Games. *Transactions of the Digital Games*
- Research Association, 4(3), 171–207. https://doi.org/10.26503/todigra.v4i3.104
- 5. Zendle, D., & Cairns, P. (2018). Video game loot boxes are linked to problem
- gambling: Results of a large-scale survey. *PLOS ONE*, 13(11), e0206767.
- 614 https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0206767
- 6. Spicer, S. G., Nicklin, L. L., Uther, M., Lloyd, J., Lloyd, H., & Close, J. (2021). Loot
- boxes, problem gambling and problem video gaming: A systematic review
- and meta-synthesis. *New Media & Society*, 14614448211027176.
- 618 https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448211027175
- 7. Drummond, A., & Sauer, J. D. (2018). Video Game Loot Boxes Are Psychologically
- Akin to Gambling. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 2(8), 530–532.
- 621 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-018-0360-1

- 622 8. Drummond, A., Sauer, J. D., Hall, L. C., Zendle, D., & Loudon, M. R. (2020). Why
- loot boxes could be regulated as gambling. Nature Human Behaviour, 4, 986–
- 624 988. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-020-0900-3
- 9. Xiao, L. Y. (2022). Which Implementations of Loot Boxes Constitute Gambling? A
- 626 UK Legal Perspective on the Potential Harms of Random Reward
- 627 Mechanisms. International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction, 20(1), 437–
- 628 454. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-020-00372-3
- 629 10. Close, J., Spicer, S. G., Nicklin, L. L., Uther, M., Lloyd, J., & Lloyd, H. (2021).
- Secondary analysis of loot box data: Are high-spending "whales" wealthy
- gamers or problem gamblers? *Addictive Behaviors*, 117, 106851.
- https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2021.106851
- 633 11. Wardle, H., & Zendle, D. (2021). Loot Boxes, Gambling, and Problem Gambling
- Among Young People: Results from a Cross-Sectional Online Survey.
- 635 *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking,* 24(4), 267–274.
- 636 https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2020.0299
- 637 12. Derrington, S., Star, S., & Kelly, S. J. (2021). The Case for Uniform Loot Box
- Regulation: A New Classification Typology and Reform Agenda. *Journal of*
- 639 *Gambling Issues*, 46, Article 0. https://doi.org/10.4309/jgi.2021.46.15
- 13. Leahy, D. (2022). Rocking the Boat: Loot Boxes in Online Digital Games, the
- Regulatory Challenge, and the EU's Unfair Commercial Practices Directive.
- 642 *Journal of Consumer Policy*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10603-022-09522-7
- 643 14. Moshirnia, A. (2018). Precious and Worthless: A Comparative Perspective on
- Loot Boxes and Gambling. Minnesota Journal of Law, Science & Technology,
- 645 20(1), 77–114.
- 646 15. Evans, S. (2022). Pandora's Loot Box. George Washington Law Review, 90(2), 376–
- 647 444. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3733910

648 16. Xiao, L. Y. (2021). Regulating Loot Boxes as Gambling? Towards a Combined 649 Legal and Self-Regulatory Consumer Protection Approach. *Interactive* 650 Entertainment Law Review, 4(1), 27–47. https://doi.org/10.4337/ielr.2021.01.02 651 17. Xiao, L. Y., Henderson, L. L., Nielsen, R. K. L., & Newall, P. W. S. (2022). 652 Regulating gambling-like video game loot boxes: A public health framework 653 comparing industry self-regulation, existing national legal approaches, and 654 other potential approaches. In *Current Addiction Reports* (Vol. 9, Issue 3, pp. 655 163–178). https://doi.org/10.1007/s40429-022-00424-9 18. Xiao, L. Y., Henderson, L. L., & Newall, P. (2021). What are the odds? Lower 656 657 compliance with Western loot box probability disclosure industry self-regulation than Chinese legal regulation. OSF Preprints. 658 659 https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/g5wd9 660 19. Apple. (2021, June 7). App Store Review Guidelines. Apple Developer. 661 https://developer.apple.com/app-store/review/guidelines/ 662 20. Xiao, L. Y., Henderson, L. L., Yang, Y., & Newall, P. W. S. (2021). Gaming the 663 system: Suboptimal compliance with loot box probability disclosure 664 regulations in China. Behavioural Public Policy, Advance Online Publication, 1– 665 27. https://doi.org/10.1017/bpp.2021.23 666 21. Entertainment Software Rating Board. (2022). About ESRB. ESRB Official Website. https://www.esrb.org/about/ 667 668 22. Pan European Game Information (PEGI). (2022). The PEGI organisation. PEGI 669 Official Website. https://pegi.info/page/pegi-organisation 670 23. Xiao, L. Y. (2021). ESRB's and PEGI's Self-Regulatory 'Includes Random Items' 671 Labels Fail to Ensure Consumer Protection. International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction, 19(6), 2358-2361. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-020-672

673

00329-6

674 24. Pan European Game Information (PEGI). (2020, April 13). PEGI Introduces Notice 675 To Inform About Presence of Paid Random Items. PEGI Official Website. 676 https://pegi.info/news/pegi-introduces-feature-notice 677 25. Schreier, J. (2017, October 11). ESRB Says It Doesn't See 'Loot Boxes' As Gambling. 678 Kotaku. https://kotaku.com/esrb-says-it-doesnt-see-loot-boxes-as-gambling-679 1819363091 680 26. Palumbo, A. (2017, October 12). PEGI on Loot Boxes: We Can't Define What's 681 Gambling, Only A Gambling Commission Can. Wccftech. 682 https://wccftech.com/pegi-loot-boxes-cant-define-gambling/ 683 27. Robertson, A. (2021, August 2). PEGI Rating For Gambling Descriptor Is Now 684 Always 18+. AskAboutGames From the Video Standards Council Rating 685 Board. https://www.askaboutgames.com/news/pegi-rating-for-gambling-is-686 now-always-18 687 28. Entertainment Software Rating Board (ESRB). (n.d.). Ratings Guide. ESRB Official 688 Website. Retrieved 13 April 2020, from https://www.esrb.org/ratings-689 guide/ 690 29. Pan European Game Information (PEGI). (2022). What Do the Labels Mean? [PEGI 691 Official Website]. 692 https://web.archive.org/web/20220726111205/https://pegi.info/what-do-693 the-labels-mean 694 30. Zendle, D., Cairns, P., Barnett, H., & McCall, C. (2019). Paying for loot boxes is 695 linked to problem gambling, regardless of specific features like cash-out and 696 pay-to-win. Computers in Human Behavior, 102, 181–191. 697 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2019.07.003

- 698 31. Garrett, E., Drummond, A., Lowe-Calverley, E., & Sauer, J. D. (2022). Current loot 699 box warnings are ineffective for informing consumers. *Computers in Human*
- 700 *Behavior*, 107534. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2022.107534
- 701 32. International Age Rating Coalition (IARC). (2022). About the International Age
- 702 Rating Coalition. https://www.globalratings.com/about.aspx
- 33. Apple. (2022). *App ratings—App Store Connect Help*. https://help.apple.com/app-
- 704 store-connect / # / dev269f11291
- 34. Zendle, D., Meyer, R., Cairns, P., Waters, S., & Ballou, N. (2020). The prevalence
- of loot boxes in mobile and desktop games. *Addiction*, 115(9), 1768–1772.
- 707 https://doi.org/10.1111/add.14973
- 708 35. Xiao, L. Y. (forthcoming). Breaking Ban: Belgium's ineffective gambling law
- regulation of video game loot boxes. *Collabra: Psychology*.
- 710 https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/hnd7w
- 711 36. International Age Rating Coalition (IARC). (2022). How the International Age
- 712 Rating Coalition Works. https://www.globalratings.com/how-iarc-works.aspx
- 713 37. USK (Unterhaltungssoftware Selbstkontrolle). (2022). What are the age
- 714 categories? *Unterhaltungssoftware Selbstkontrolle*. https://usk.de/en/the-
- 715 usk/faqs/age-categories/
- 38. USK (Unterhaltungssoftware Selbstkontrolle). (2022, December 14). In-Game-
- 717 Käufe, Chats und Lootboxen: USK erweitert Prüfkriterien—Unterhaltungssoftware
- Selbstkontrolle [In-game purchases, chats and loot boxes: USK expands test criteria].
- 719 https://usk.de/usk-pressemitteilung-umsetzung-neues-jugendschutzgesetz/
- 39. USK (Unterhaltungssoftware Selbstkontrolle). (2022). Games and apps in the
- 721 IARC system. *Unterhaltungssoftware Selbstkontrolle*.
- https://usk.de/en/home/age-classification-for-games-and-apps/games-
- 723 and-apps-in-the-iarc-system/

- 40. Xiao, L. Y. (2022). Drafting Video Game Loot Box Regulation for Dummies: A
- 725 Chinese Lesson. *Information & Communications Technology Law*, 31(3), 343–381.
- 726 https://doi.org/10.1080/13600834.2022.2088062
- 727 41. H.B. 2727, 29th Leg., Reg. Sess. (Haw. 2018), (2018) (testimony of Hawaii House of
- 728 Representatives).
- 729 www.capitol.hawaii.gov/session2018/bills/HB2727\_HD1\_.HTM
- 730 42. *S.B.* 3025, 29th *Leg.*, *Reg. Sess.* (*Haw.* 2018), (2018) (testimony of Hawaii Senate).
- 731 www.capitol.hawaii.gov/session2018/bills/SB3025\_SD1\_.HTM
- 732 43. H.B. 2943, 102nd Leg., Reg. Sess. (Ill. 2021), (2021) (testimony of Illinois House of
- 733 Representatives).
- https://www.ilga.gov/legislation/billstatus.asp?DocNum=2943&GAID=16&
- GA=102&DocTypeID=HB&LegID=131847&SessionID=110
- 736 44. Petticrew, M., Douglas, N., Knai, C., Durand, M. A., Eastmure, E., & Mays, N.
- 737 (2016). Health information on alcoholic beverage containers: Has the alcohol
- industry's pledge in England to improve labelling been met? *Addiction*, 111(1),
- 739 51–55. https://doi.org/10.1111/add.13094
- 45. Hiilamo, H., Crosbie, E., & Glantz, S. A. (2012). The evolution of health warning
- labels on cigarette packs: The role of precedents, and tobacco industry
- strategies to block diffusion. *Tobacco Control*, 23(1), e2.
- 743 https://doi.org/10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2012-050541
- 46. Newall, P. W. S., Walasek, L., Ludvig, E., & Rockloff, M. (2022). Nudge versus
- sludge in gambling warning labels. In Behavioural Science & Policy (Vol. 8,
- 746 Issue 1, pp. 17–23). https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/gks2h
- 747 47. International Age Rating Coalition (IARC). (2022). For Developers.
- 748 https://www.globalratings.com/for-developers.aspx

749 48. Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport (UK). (2022, July 17). Government 750 response to the call for evidence on loot boxes in video games. GOV.UK. 751 https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/loot-boxes-in-video-752 games-call-for-evidence/outcome/government-response-to-the-call-for-753 evidence-on-loot-boxes-in-video-games 754 49. Carter, J. (2022, September 15). Roblox game Adopt Me ends Netherlands service due to loot boxes. Game Developer. https://www.gamedeveloper.com/pc/-i-755 756 roblox-i-game-i-adopt-me-i-ends-netherlands-service-due-to-loot-boxes 757 50. Entertainment Software Rating Board (ESRB). (2022). Search ESRB Game Ratings. 758 ESRB Ratings. https://www.esrb.org/search/ 759 51. Entertainment Software Rating Board (ESRB). (n.d.). Recently Rated Games [Time 760 Frame limited to Past Year on 22 September 2022]. ESRB Ratings. Retrieved 22 761 September 2022, from 762 https://web.archive.org/web/20220922134745/https://www.esrb.org/searc 763 h/?searchKeyword=&platform=All%20Platforms&rating=E%2CE10%2B%2C 764 T%2CM%2CAO&descriptor=All%20Content&pg=1&searchType=All&ieleme 765 nt[]=all 766 52. Pan European Game Information (PEGI). (2022). Search results. 767 https://pegi.info/search-pegi 768 53. Pan European Game Information (PEGI). (2022, September 22). Search results [All 769 games with the 'In-game Purchases' content descriptor on 22 September 2022]. 770 https://web.archive.org/web/20220922140803/https://pegi.info/search-771 pegi?q=&age%5B%5D=&descriptor%5B%5D=In-772 Game+Purchases&publisher=&platform%5B%5D=&release\_year%5B%5D=& 773 page=1&op=Search&form\_build\_id=form-ppAZkM4xccLXkZgBGO7\_iuZ-774 iPL MGL91u0ETZydFAw&form id=pegi search form

775	54. PCI Registered Reports. (2022). Full Policies and Procedures.
776	https://rr.peercommunityin.org/PCIRegisteredReports/help/guide_for_aut
777	hors
778	55. Roblox Corporation. (2019, July 9). Guidelines around users paying for random
779	virtual items.
780	https://web.archive.org/web/20210713091731/https://devforum.roblox.co
781	m/t/guidelines-around-users-paying-for-random-virtual-items/307189
782	56. Xiao, L. Y., Henderson, L. L., & Newall, P. W. S. (2022). Loot boxes are more
783	prevalent in United Kingdom video games than previously considered:
784	Updating Zendle et al. (2020). Addiction, 117(9), 2553–2555.
785	https://doi.org/10.1111/add.15829
786	57. Zendle, D., Cairns, P., Meyer, R., Waters, S., & Ballou, N. (2022). If everything is a
787	loot box, nothing is: Response to Xiao et al. Addiction, 117(9), 2555–2556.
788	https://doi.org/10.1111/add.15976
789	58. Karhulahti, VM., Moshirnia, A., Macey, J., & Chin, J. M. (2022). Has the "ban" of
790	loot boxes eliminated them from Belgian mobile games? Peer Community in
791	Registered Reports, 1. https://rr.peercommunityin.org/articles/rec?id=168
792	59. Ministry of Higher Education and Science (Denmark). (2014). Danish Code of
793	Conduct for Research Integrity. https://ufm.dk/en/publications/2014/the-
794	danish-code-of-conduct-for-research-integrity