

I support efforts encouraging the *Psychology Today* editorial board to reconsider their stance toward data, articles and clinical reports which validate the existence of process addictions related to sexuality.

I was one of the researchers who helped carry out the DSM-5 clinical field trial which assessed the validity of 'hypersexual disorder' as a diagnostic term. Our results were published in the *Journal of Sexual Medicine* in 2012. We found that the criteria for hypersexual disorder accurately reflected the presenting problem among patients as determined by structured diagnostic interviews carried out by blinded raters, the Hypersexual Behavior Inventory, Sexual Compulsivity Scale, and Hypersexual Behavior Consequences Scale.

Additionally, as a clinician who has practiced for over 16 years, I have seen the impact and symptomology of compulsive sexual behavior in a wide range of clients spanning a diverse segment of society.

There exists a growing, international body of reputable data supporting such presentations. It is misleading to not have a psychological journal such as *Psychology Today* inform readers of such data and experiences.

I support the inclusion of contrary data, as well. This is part of the scientific process.

Please reconsider your position to reflect the work of many fine scholars, clinicians, and researchers -- as well as a growing body of individuals who find it incredibly invalidating to have their challenges dismissed as "religious worries" or stemming from "moral disapproval.'

Sincerely,

A concerned clinician, researcher & *Psychology Today* reader