

Psychology Today

Dear Editorial Staff,

I have enjoyed your publication for many years until the past few. This is because a one-sided commentary has developed on the very sensitive subject of internet pornography as a compulsive or addictive behaviour. The removal of the Comments Section under certain posts by psychologists such as David Ley has left readers with a biased, untested and wrong statement about the true state of the science in this area. This is quite simply negligent and deeply unprofessional.

It is a sad indictment of *Psychology Today* that it fails to keep up with the changes in the field of psychology itself. It is the psychology departments of leading universities such as the University of Cambridge where many of the groundbreaking developments in the understanding of internet pornography as a behavioural addiction are taking place. It is the work of top scientists like Valerie Voon or Paula Banca using fMRI machines that takes this important subject out of the arena of petty politics into the real world of clinically-tested harms. Such an aberration means the journal itself is practically useless as medium for educating professionals and the public alike in one of the most important emerging public health crises today.

If you choose to ignore the petition and do not change the current editorial direction, I will have no choice but actively to dissuade people from subscribing to it. I hope you will consider the importance of fairness in good journalism and not be dilatory in opening up the channels of fair comment to those who are able to counter misleading statements about the state of science. If your staff members are being bullied by more seasoned contributors, please consider enlisting the help of senior journalists with sufficient academic rigor to act as proper arbiters in areas of deep controversy such as this.