

# Review of: "The Integrated Metatheoretical Model of Addiction: Towards an Architectonic of a Metatheory of Addiction"

Jia-Min Xu

**Potential competing interests:** The author(s) declared that no potential competing interests exist.

## Comments:

The author has constructed the IMMA in a logical way by highlighting the conceptual lenses of the 8pp. It is an interesting theoretical work. Here are some suggestions.

Theories can be classified as metatheories, grand theories, middle range and practice theory, though there are some slight differences in different disciplines. Metatheory is the theory of theory that focuses on broad issues such as the philosophical perspectives of theory development, analyzes the purpose and kind of theory, proposes the criteria most suited for evaluating theory and so on. The author uses the "metatheoretical model" in this paper. To reduce the confusion of readers, I would like to see more introduction about the classification of theories and the reason why the term "metatheoretical model" is chosen.

On page 2 paragraph 2, the author states that "A paradigm shift is urgently needed in the field of addiction because, while the institutions of global health have expended vast resources over the past couple of centuries to control addiction to drugs, alcohol, and hundreds of other habits and pursuits, the flood of addiction has continued to deepen and spread." What is the main contribution of your current work to the paradigm-shifting in the theory development of addiction?

On page 9, the author describes: "What is additional needed for a comprehensive and integrative framework of addiction is the application of integral enactment theory" and "In the next section I will provide an overview of the application of integral enactment theory in the development of an integrative and comprehensive metatheory of addiction." Please add some statements between these two sentences to more tightly connect the "integral enactment theory" and "integral metatheory" which you plan to construct.

The concept "enactment" is cited by the author before exploring the three facets of Integral Pluralism (page 9). Should the philosophical perspective behind the concept of "enactment", e.g. pragmatism be discussed? As you are developing an abstract Metatheory of Addiction, philosophies/paradigms backing up the concepts should be pointed out in my opinion.

On page 16, the author describes that "Therefore, according to NIDA the five components of a theory of addiction are Initiation, Continuation, Transition, Cessation, and Relapse, which highlights the temporal aspect of addiction." It seems

like a popular theory of addition and its main components have been firmly recognized by researchers, which is inconsistent with the “Conceptual Chaos” view highlighted in the paper.

The implication of a developed theory is very important as theories must go back to practice. The development of Practice theories/low-level theories is an overall trend in theory construction. It seems somehow complicated to apply the IMMA to develop a general theory of addiction (the usage of the IMMA in the last paragraph of the paper, page 18). I am interested in the approach of “how the IMMA can be used to develop a general theory.” Some further descriptions might be important in order to benefit more theorists and theory users.