Reverse Social Engineering: Building Digital Immunity Against Online Drug Promotion

Samah Bechka

Department of Psychology, Educational Sciences, and Speech-Language Pathology, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Batna 1, Algeria
Laboratory of Psychological Applications in the Penal Environment
Email: samah. bechka@ univ-batna.dz

Abstract:

This research paper addresses the growing phenomenon of online drug promotion through digital platforms that employ encryption and disguised advertisements targeting youth. It proposes a practical framework for building digital immunity based on reverse social engineering by deconstructing the psychological and technical mechanisms that underpin such promotion. The methodology relies on multi-level digital content analysis and the use of psychological inoculation techniques within an integrative model that combines qualitative analysis and case studies in virtual environments, supported by data from the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime and the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs. The expected results contribute to identifying psychological and technical vulnerabilities in promoters' strategies, constructing a measurement model for the effectiveness of digital immunity mechanisms, and developing proactive and applicable digital awareness tools. The study concludes with specific practical recommendations enabling educational and health sectors to manage the risks of digital drug promotion and emphasizes the necessity of institutional integration between academic and field efforts to ensure effective implementation.

Keywords: Reverse social engineering, digital immunity, online drug promotion, psychological inoculation, digital content analysis.

1- Introduction:

Amidst the accelerating digital transformation, drug trafficking has expanded into cyberspace, exploiting social media platforms, the dark web, encrypted messaging applications, and covert marketing strategies targeting youth (UNODC, 2023; EMCDDA, 2015). Recent UN and European reports document this shift by tracking the systematic use of digital tools to facilitate supply, distribution, and targeting.

In this context, reports from the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA, 2015; EMCDDA, 2023) reveal a radical transformation in illicit marketing strategies: promotional networks have transitioned from traditional methods to employing advanced digital techniques, including disguised/encrypted advertisements, private chat rooms, and electronic intermediary platforms operating behind legal façades.

In the face of these challenges, there is an urgent need for smarter awareness strategies capable of keeping pace with evolving promotional tactics. Research on psychological inoculation demonstrates

its effectiveness in developing cognitive immunity against misleading content (van der Linden, 2022), while the information disorder framework highlights the need to move from single-message campaigns to multilayered responses combining both research-based and field approaches (Wardle & Derakhshan, 2017).

From this perspective, the research paper raises the following questions:

1. How can the "reverse social engineering" model be applied to deconstruct the psychological and technical strategies used in online drug marketing?

2. To what extent are the mechanisms of "psychological inoculation" and "pattern disruption" effective in building digital resilience among youth against hidden drug promotion platforms and messages?

3. How can educational and mental health institutions design proactive digital awareness programs that utilize this framework to strengthen young people's ability to resist such targeting attempts?

2- Theoretical Framework:

2.1- The Psychological–Behavioral Level:

2.1.1- Psychological Inoculation Theory

The Psychological Inoculation Theory suggests that controlled prior exposure to counterarguments establishes cognitive "antibodies" that reduce susceptibility to later persuasion attempts, in a manner analogous to medical vaccination (Compton & Pfau, 2005; Banas & Rains, 2010).

Experimental studies have supported this approach; models based on games and simulations have demonstrated the ability to enhance resistance to online misinformation (Roozenbeek & van der Linden, 2019; Basol et al., 2020). Furthermore, a recent meta-review confirms that psychological inoculation is among the most effective interventions in combating the spread of false information (van der Linden, 2022).

Applying this perspective to the fight against online drug promotion, digital awareness programs can be designed around psychological inoculation by creating interactive simulations that consciously expose users to covert promotional tactics, providing "preemptive doses" of counterarguments to disrupt common persuasion techniques in illicit marketing. In addition, assessment tools can be developed to measure changes in cognitive immunity acquired among young populations.

2.1.2- Motivation–Resistance Theory:

The Motivation-to-Resist approach—used here as a descriptive concept within the framework of psychological inoculation—offers a practical perspective for enhancing intrinsic motivation to counter misleading messages. It strengthens pre-existing cognitive "antibodies" and improves critical responsiveness to subsequent persuasion attempts (Banas & Rains, 2010; van der Linden, 2022). This approach aligns with recent evidence demonstrating the effectiveness of individual interventions that build cognitive skills and decision-making rules to mitigate the impact of manipulative tactics on digital platforms (Kozyreva et al., 2024).

In the context of online drug promotion, this framework enables the design of "inoculative" content that enhances youth motivation to resist and reduces reliance on superficial cues and emotional

appeals. Psychological-linguistic analysis of promotional messages identifies three main strategies exploiting psychological vulnerabilities:

(1) false emotional association by linking drugs with positive feelings or promises,

(2) social normalization through expressions such as "everyone does it," and

(3) pseudo-scientific justification based on unreliable claims or citations (Kozyreva et al., 2024; Wardle & Derakhshan, 2017).

These tactics are activated across social media platforms and digital intermediary channels, as documented in recent European reports (EMCDDA, 2023).

A pre-registered experiment by Lewandowsky & Yesilada (2021) demonstrated that watching a short "inoculative" video introducing misinformation cues before exposure to extremist content significantly reduced participants' agreement with such messages, decreased perceived credibility (p < .001), and lowered their intention to share them compared to the control group (p = .015).

Kozyreva et al. (2024), in their review on the "toolbox of individual interventions," emphasize that designing cognitive antibodies must begin with an accurate diagnosis of the audience's cognitive and emotional vulnerabilities. Tailoring messages by demographic and psychological traits, delivering them swiftly and across multiple media channels, enhances the preventive impact against misinformation. Accordingly, it is recommended to design preemptive inoculation "doses" targeted by demographic, psychological, and contextual variables, accompanied by short-term testing to adjust tone and medium, and continuous updates to address emerging threats (Kozyreva et al., 2024; Banas & Rains, 2010).

The meta-analysis by Banas & Rains (2010) further confirms a robust effect of psychological inoculation in increasing resistance to persuasive influences across multiple contexts.

At the strategic level, the evidence suggests a multilayered framework for countering online drug promotion, comprising:

(1) prevention through early school-based psychological inoculation programs and interactive simulation content;

(2) regulatory and technical measures to limit accessibility and dissemination on digital platforms; and

(3) referral and therapeutic support pathways for affected groups (UNODC, 2023; EMCDDA, 2023; Wardle & Derakhshan, 2017).

In applied practice, the World Health Organization provides practical tools for detecting and reporting misleading content on digital platforms (WHO, n.d.), while the Global Digital Health Framework 2020–2025 outlines principles for designing and operationally integrating multi-component awareness interventions (WHO, 2021). Accordingly, systematic evaluation is recommended without relying on unverified digital claims using pre/post measurements and controlled field experiments. Key performance indicators should include reduced agreement with misleading messages, decreased perceived credibility, and lower sharing intentions, in addition to platform-level metrics such as reach and completion rate.

2.2- The Technical–Communicative Level:

2.2.1- Uses and Gratifications Theory:

The Uses and Gratifications Theory provides a framework for understanding the motivations behind young people's use of digital platforms. It views the audience as active agents who selectively choose media to satisfy cognitive, social, and identity-related needs, rather than as passive receivers (Katz, Blumler, & Gurevitch, 1973). In modern digital environments, the literature expands this framework to include motivations related to interactivity, agency, and gratifications derived from the specific affordances of the internet explaining why certain groups may be drawn even to harmful content when it fulfills specific needs (Sundar & Limperos, 2013; Stafford, Stafford, & Schkade, 2004).

In the context of online drug promotion, analysis based on the Uses and Gratifications Theory identifies five central psychological needs that may drive some youth toward these platforms:

1. Identity and Belonging: Promotional groups may create a false sense of belonging and social recognition (Katz, Blumler, & Gurevitch, 1973; Sundar & Limperos, 2013; Stafford, Stafford, & Schkade, 2004).

2. Escape from Pressure: Content centered on relief and escapism becomes appealing during moments of distress or helplessness (Sundar & Limperos, 2013; Stafford et al., 2004).

3. Self-Realization / Social Image: The display of an artificial sense of "success" enhances impression management and the pursuit of status among peers (Sundar & Limperos, 2013; EMCDDA, 2023).

4. Knowledge / Information: The presentation of misleading "educational" content uses superficial credibility cues (scientific language, visuals) to increase persuasiveness (Katz et al., 1973; Wardle & Derakhshan, 2017; Kozyreva et al., 2024).

5. Entertainment: Integrating promotional messages into entertainment content, games, and short-form media platforms maximizes exposure and attention (Sundar & Limperos, 2013; EMCDDA, 2023).

Conceptual Framework:

2-1- Reverse Social Engineering (Reverse Social Engineering Framework):

2-1-1- Causal analysis level (Deep Causality Model) (UNODC, 2023):

Reverse social engineering is used as a practical lens to understand online drug promotion through a multi-level causal analysis:

- **Structural–economic:** digital divides and the platform/dark-web economy enable supply and targeting via digital channels (UNODC, 2023; EMCDDA, 2015; EMCDDA, 2023).

- **Psychological–social**: fragility of identity, belonging, and escape, with the audience acting as agents who select media to satisfy needs, which requires prior cognitive inoculation against misleading messages (Katz, Blumler, & Gurevitch, 1973; Sundar & Limperos, 2013; van der Linden, 2022).

-**Technical–regulatory**: governance and platform gaps (private rooms, encrypted applications, digital intermediation) that facilitate stratified drug markets (EMCDDA, 2023; UNODC, 2023).

The use of reverse social engineering is proposed as an operational lens to craft a package of multi-level interventions:

- **Structural Inoculation:** target high-exposure groups using digital risk indicators, and link prevention to local economic/educational empowerment that supports behavioral alternatives on platforms (UNODC, 2023; EMCDDA, 2023).

- **Psychological Resilience:** supportive virtual spaces grounded in social-emotional learning, and preemptive psychological inoculation programs via short content/simulations that strengthen cognitive "antibodies" and reduce susceptibility. (Compton & Pfau, 2005; Banas & Rains, 2010; Roozenbeek & van der Linden, 2019; Basol et al., 2020; van der Linden, 2022).

- **Technical Disruption**: proactive pattern-detection monitoring tools, regulatory and platform measures to reduce access and spread, and clear user reporting channels. (EMCDDA, 2023; UNODC, 2023; WHO, n.d.).

Although no meta-analyses provide precise quantitative evidence for the overall effectiveness of this integrated package, the review by Kozyreva et al. (2024) offers a "toolbox" of individual interventions emphasizing the importance of personalization, timing, and multimodality. The impact is measured through short-term and field indicators: decreased agreement with persuasive messages, reduced perceived credibility, and lowered intention to share after brief inoculation doses (Kozyreva et al., 2024; Lewandowsky & Yesilada, 2021), in addition to platform-based indicators such as reach and reporting rate (WHO, 2021).

2-1-2- Strategic Intervention Level (From Digital Empowerment to Digital Immunity):

The digital empowerment approach proposes shifting the user's role from a passive recipient to an active digital agent through two integrated pillars:

• **Psychological Pillar:** Enhancing self-efficacy, agency, and social responsibility, while employing psychological inoculation to strengthen cognitive "antibodies" against misleading messages (van der Linden, 2022; Banas & Rains, 2010; Roozenbeek & van der Linden, 2019; Basol et al., 2020).

• **Technical/Participatory Pillar**: Developing empowerment tools based on participatory design and digital health guidelines to organize reporting and prevention mechanisms on platforms (WHO, 2021; EMCDDA, 2023; Kozyreva et al., 2024).

The implementation architecture is embodied in three integrated operational layers:

- **Smart Tools**: Reporting and monitoring platforms supported by adjustable machine learning systems that activate standardized reporting pathways (EMCDDA, 2023; WHO, 2021).

- **Participatory Analysis:** Network analysis and predictive modeling to detect patterns and diffusion trajectories within digital environments (EMCDDA, 2023).

- **Smart Response:** Platform-based and regulatory measures ensuring real-time responsiveness and adaptation to emerging threats, with clear referral channels (UNODC, 2023; EMCDDA, 2023; WHO, 2021).

-**Intended Outcome:**

A community level digital immunity that fuses psychological depth with technological innovation, measured through cognitive behavioral indicators (reduced agreement with misleading messages, decreased perceived credibility, and lower sharing intentions after brief inoculation doses) and

platform-based procedural indicators (Lewandowsky & Yesilada, 2021; Kozyreva et al., 2024; WHO, 2021).

2.1.3- Procedural Level (Graduated Response Framework):

The Graduated Response Framework is understood as a multi-level prevention package that integrates individual, educational/community, and procedural interventions:

 - **Individual Layer:** Short psychological inoculation doses that build cognitive "antibodies" and reduce susceptibility to misleading content, supported by theoretical and experimental evidence (Compton & Pfau, 2005; Banas & Rains, 2010; Roozenbeek & van der Linden, 2019; Basol et al., 2020; van der Linden, 2022; Lewandowsky & Yesilada, 2021).

  -**Family/School and Community Layer:** Structured digital prevention and awareness programs within schools and communities, with clear reporting and referral channels when needed (UNODC, 2023; EMCDDA, 2023; WHO, 2021).

-**Technical/Regulatory Layer:** Platform-based and regulatory measures for monitoring, response, and limiting dissemination, employing proactive detection tools and procedural control policies (EMCDDA, 2023; UNODC, 2023; WHO, 2021).

- **Proactive Supportive Layer (Predictive/Adaptive):** Adapting messages and intervention tools through rapid assessment, personalization, and multimodality — in line with the "individual interventions toolbox" (Kozyreva et al., 2024).

- **Framework Outcome:**

An integrated prevention system that reduces agreement with misleading messages, lowers perceived credibility and intention to share them, and measures its impact through short-term cognitive–behavioral and procedural indicators (Lewandowsky & Yesilada, 2021; WHO, 2021).

1- Addressing the First Question: Applying "Reverse Social Engineering" to Deconstruct Online Drug Marketing Strategies:

The application is based on three interrelated stages:

- **Multi-level Causal Diagnosis:** This stage identifies the digital supply and mediation channels (social platforms/dark web/encrypted applications) and the demand drivers within platform-based environments (UNODC, 2023; EMCDDA, 2015; EMCDDA, 2023). It also reveals the psycho-social motives that are re-exploited in the messages (identity/belonging, escape, knowledge/utility, entertainment), in accordance with the Uses and Gratifications Theory and the Information Disorder Framework (Katz, Blumler, & Gurevitch, 1973; Sundar & Limperos, 2013; Stafford, Stafford, & Schkade, 2004; Wardle & Derakhshan, 2017).

- **Generation of Customized Cognitive "Antibodies" through Short Psychological Inoculation Doses (text/video/simulation):** These are delivered prior to exposure and uncover common manipulation techniques (false emotional association, social normalization, misleading "scientific" justification), while adapting the messages to the target group and context (Compton & Pfau, 2005; Banas & Rains, 2010; Roozenbeek & van der Linden, 2019; Basol et al., 2020; van der Linden, 2022; Kozyreva et al., 2024).

-Technical–Regulatory Disruption: This involves providing clear reporting pathways and establishing platform-based tracking systems to limit reach and dissemination, in line with digital health and legislative operational principles (WHO, 2021; EMCDDA, 2023; UNODC, 2023).

The impact is measured through decreased agreement with the messages, reduced perceived credibility and intention to share after the intervention, along with practical platform indicators (reporting/spread/reach) (Lewandowsky & Yesilada, 2021; WHO, 2021; Kozyreva et al., 2024).

To make this framework operational, the following steps can be implemented:

The study adopts a preregistered experimental design: the protocol is registered prior to data collection, specifying the hypotheses, outcomes, and analysis plan; participants are then randomly assigned to intervention and control groups to measure the causal effect of the intervention, alongside a pre/post protocol to assess the immediate, short-term effect. Participants receive short "inoculation doses" (text/video/simulation) that reveal common promotional techniques prior to exposure, derived from the psychological inoculation framework and the cognitive-antibody matrix (Banas & Rains, 2010; van der Linden, 2022; Roozenbeek & van der Linden, 2019; Basol et al., 2020). Primary indicators are preregistered: agreement with messages, perceived credibility, and intention to share, using validated scales plus measures of manipulation and attention (Lewandowsky & Yesilada, 2021). These are complemented by procedural, platform-level indicators aligned with digital-health guidelines: reach, reporting rate, and content diffusion (WHO, 2021; EMCDDA, 2023; UNODC, 2023). Data are analyzed using linear/mixed models with reporting of effect sizes and corrections for multiple comparisons, alongside field A/B analyses where feasible (Kozyreva et al., 2024). The plan adheres to ethics, privacy, and risk-minimization requirements, with intervention materials, analysis code, and de-identified data versions made available post-publication.

4- Addressing the second question: How effective are "psychological inoculation" and "pattern disruption" in building digital immunity for youth?

Young people's susceptibility increases in fast, highly manipulable platform environments; therefore, we adopt a dual defensive framework to build measurable digital immunity: a pre-exposure preventive layer that reduces susceptibility via psychological inoculation mechanisms, and an in-spread suppressive layer that slows and limits reach through pattern disruption. Impact is measured on two integrated levels: cognitive–behavioral (reduced agreement with messages, lower perceived credibility, decreased intention to share) and platform-procedural (reduced reach and diffusion, higher reporting rate, slowed time-to-peak). In this sequence, we set the stage for a coherent account showing how the two layers—preventive, then platform-based—work together to convert fleeting exposure into sustained immunity.

As for psychological inoculation , digital immunity among youth is built early through brief "doses" that alert them to manipulation techniques before exposure and then provide preemptive refutation (forewarning + refutational preemption). This activates cognitive "antibodies" that reduce momentary susceptibility. The effect is well-documented both theoretically and experimentally, supported by meta-analyses showing a stable medium effect across multiple contexts (Compton & Pfau, 2005; Banas & Rains, 2010). Experimental simulations, games, and short field interventions with young cohorts have demonstrated reduced agreement with misleading messages, lower perceived credibility, and decreased intention to share compared to control groups (Roozenbeek & van der Linden, 2019; Basol et al., 2020; van der Linden, 2022; Lewandowsky & Yesilada, 2021). Recent literature also proposes a "design toolbox" emphasizing personalization according to audience traits, timely delivery

before the informational peak, and multimodal formats (text/video/simulation) to create stronger and more measurable effects (Kozyreva et al., 2024).

Regarding pattern disruption, it represents a platform-level or regulatory layer operating in parallel during content diffusion by introducing deliberate micro-adjustments in design and algorithms that slow down propagation and reduce reach rather than deleting content outright. They act as "information speed bumps": some target the interface and user behavior, while others alter ranking and network diffusion to cut promotional chains and decelerate their dynamics (e.g., confirmation windows before sharing, repost limits within short time frames, downranking suspicious content, diversifying feeds, and facilitating reporting pathways).

These mechanisms align with digital-health guidelines that advocate evidence-based, real-time, and procedural interventions reducing reach and spread of high-risk content without infringing legitimate freedom of expression (WHO, 2021; EMCDDA, 2023; UNODC, 2023). They also reflect the applied design recommendations noted by Kozyreva et al. (2024), whose impact is assessed through procedural platform indicators such as reduced reach and diffusion, higher reporting rates, and slower time-to-peak—complementing cognitive-behavioral indicators like decreased agreement with misleading messages, reduced perceived credibility, and lower intention to share or repost after intervention compared to controls, along with improved accuracy in distinguishing misleading from reliable content and increased self-efficacy in resisting misinformation (Banas & Rains, 2010; Basol et al., 2020; Compton & Pfau, 2005; Lewandowsky & Yesilada, 2021; Roozenbeek & van der Linden, 2019; van der Linden, 2022).

From the above, the relationship between "psychological inoculation" and "pattern disruption" becomes evident: the former reduces susceptibility before exposure, while the latter decreases both the dose and speed of diffusion during spread. Together, they generate a synergistic and measurable effect, reflected in improved cognitive–behavioral indicators (agreement, perceived credibility, intention to share) alongside enhanced procedural platform indicators (reach, diffusion, time-to-peak). This dual impact is supported by experimental evidence and guiding frameworks (Banas & Rains, 2010; Roozenbeek & van der Linden, 2019; WHO, 2021; EMCDDA, 2023; UNODC, 2023; Kozyreva et al., 2024).

5- Addressing the third question: Designing proactive digital awareness programs for educational and mental-health institutions.

5-1. Foundational principles (Why / on what basis?):

- Reverse social engineering to understand digital supply and mediation channels (platforms, dark web, encrypted apps) and identify points of deconstruction (UNODC, 2023; EMCDDA, 2015; EMCDDA, 2023).
- Psychological inoculation to build cognitive "antibodies" that precede exposure and reduce agreement/credibility/intention to share (Compton & Pfau, 2005; Banas & Rains, 2010; Roozenbeek & van der Linden, 2019; Basol et al., 2020; van der Linden, 2022; Lewandowsky & Yesilada, 2021).
- *Uses and Gratifications to link the intervention to youth motives (identity/escape/knowledge/entertainment) (Katz, Blumler, & Gurevitch, 1973; Sundar & Limperos, 2013; Stafford, Stafford, & Schkade, 2004).
- Information disorder to guide the dismantling of tactics (false emotional association / normalization / "scientific" justification) (Wardle & Derakhshan, 2017).

- Digital health framework to design reporting channels and enforcement mechanisms (WHO, 2021; WHO, n.d.).
- Individual-interventions toolbox for personalization, rapid timing, and multimodality (Kozyreva et al., 2024).

5-2. Program structure (What do we do?):

Short inoculation modules (text/video/game-based simulations) that surface the rumor before exposure and are tailored by segment and context (Compton & Pfau; Banas & Rains; Roozenbeek & van der Linden; Basol et al.; van der Linden; Kozyreva et al.).

- Interactive simulation platforms (private-room scenarios / covert ads / pseudo-scientific claims) to provide a safe, measurable experience (Roozenbeek & van der Linden; Basol et al.; Lewandowsky & Yesilada).
- Clear, procedural reporting channels (illustrative forms, platform policy, referrals) within school and health environments (WHO; EMCDDA; UNODC).
- Capacity-building for stakeholders (teachers / specialists / peers / administrators) via concise training plans and ready-to-use implementation guides (WHO; EMCDDA; UNODC).
- Platform-level disruption (access/spread/mediation measures) aligned with regulatory policies (EMCDDA; UNODC; WHO).

5-3. Implementation plan (How do we apply it?):

Implementation Plan (How do we apply it?)

- **Baseline Phase:** Conduct a rapid diagnosis by mapping channels, audiences, and vulnerabilities (duration: two weeks) (UNODC; EMCDDA).
- **Second Phase:** Produce targeted inoculation content "3 to 5 short doses" for each audience segment accompanied by interactive simulations (Compton & Pfau; Banas & Rains; Kozyreva et al.).
- **Third Phase:** School/health and platform dissemination through short classroom schedules, brief awareness modules, and easy reporting dashboards (WHO; EMCDDA).
- **Fourth Phase**: Iteration and rapid improvement by adjusting messages using A/B testing based on measurement outcomes (Kozyreva et al.).

5-4. Measurement and Evaluation (How do we demonstrate impact?):

- **Core Cognitive–Behavioral Indicators**: Decrease in message agreement, decline in perceived credibility, and reduction in sharing intention after short inoculation doses (Lewandowsky & Yesilada, 2021; van der Linden, 2022; Banas & Rains, 2010).
- **Procedural Platform Indicators:** Reporting rate, diffusion/reach, and response time in accordance with the digital health framework (WHO, 2021; EMCDDA, 2023; UNODC, 2023).
- **Analysis Design**: Pre/post and random assignment where applicable, using linear/mixed models, effect size reporting, and multiple-comparison corrections; short A/B field experiments to optimize personalization, timing, and modality (Kozyreva et al., 2024).
  5-5. Ethical and Governance Controls:
  Ethical approvals, privacy protection, and redaction of sensitive content are ensured, with intervention materials, analytical codes, and encrypted datasets made available post-publication (WHO, 2021).

Conclusion:
This study demonstrates that combining reverse social engineering and psychological inoculation within a multi-level causal framework offers a practical pathway to building digital immunity among youth and reducing the effectiveness of online drug promotion.

At the theoretical level, the paper aligns a well-established preventive approach with an understanding of uses and gratifications motives within platform environments.

At the practical level, it proposes a set of actionable interventions (including short, tailored inoculation content, clear reporting channels, and regulatory platform measures for disruption and containment).

The study employs testable impact metrics (decreased message agreement, reduced perceived credibility), and lower sharing intention alongside operational indicators such as (reach, diffusion, and reporting rate). These facilitate replicability and comparative evaluation across school, health, and platform contexts.

The findings underscore the need for longitudinal research, field A/B testing, and mixed-method analyses to assess the sustainability and transferability of effects across platforms and populations, while maintaining ethical standards and open-access sharing of materials and analytical scripts post-publication.

In essence, digital empowerment is the path, and digital immunity is the outcome —and when preventive approaches converge with platform-level disruption and rigorous evaluation, educational and health institutions gain an adaptable, evidence-based model to confront online drug promotion with confidence and efficacy.

References:

-European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA). (2015). *The internet and drug markets* (Trendspotter study). Publications Office of the European Union. https://www.euda.europa.eu/publications/technical-reports/internet-drug-markets_en

-European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA). (2023). *European Drug Report 2023: Trends and developments*. https://www.euda.europa.eu/publications/european-drug-report/2023_en

-United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). (2023). *World Drug Report 2023: Use of the dark web and social media for drug supply* (Booklet 3, Chapter 7). https ://www.unodc.org/res/WDR-2023/WDR23_B3_CH7_darkweb.pdf

-World Health Organization (WHO). (2021). *Global strategy on digital health 2020–2025*. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240020924

-World Health Organization (WHO). (n.d.). *How to report misinformation online*. Retrieved October 31, 2025, from https://www.who.int/campaigns/connecting-the-world-to-combat-coronavirus/how-to-report-misinformation-online

-Banas, J. A., & Rains, S. A. (2010). A meta-analysis of research on inoculation theory. *Communication Monographs, 77*(3), 281–311. https://doi.org/10.1080/03637751003758193

-Basol, M., Roozenbeek, J., & van der Linden, S. (2020). Good news about bad news: Gamified inoculation boosts confidence and cognitive immunity against fake news. *Journal of Cognition, 3*(1), 1–22. https ://doi.org/10.5334/joc.91

-Compton, J., & Pfau, M. (2005). Inoculation theory of resistance to influence at maturity: Recent progress in theory development and application and suggestions for future research. *Annals of the International Communication Association, 29*(1), 97–146. https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.2005.11679045

-Katz, E., Blumler, J. G., & Gurevitch, M. (1973). Uses and gratifications research. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 37*(4), 509–523. https ://doi.org/10.1086/268109

-Kozyreva, A., Lorenz-Spreen, P., Herzog, S. M., Ecker, U. K. H., Lewandowsky, S., Hertwig, R., *et al.* (2024). Toolbox of individual-level interventions against online misinformation. *Nature Human Behaviour, 8*(6), 1044–1052. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-024-01881-0

- Lewandowsky, S., & Yesilada, M. (2021). Inoculating against the spread of Islamophobic and radical-Islamist disinformation. *Cognitive Research : Principles and Implications, 6*, 57. https ://doi.org/10.1186/s41235-021-00323-z

-Roozenbeek, J., & van der Linden, S. (2019). Fake news game confers psychological resistance against online misinformation. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 5*, 65. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-019-0279-9

-Stafford, T. F., Stafford, M. R., & Schkade, L. L. (2004). *Determining uses and gratifications for the Internet. Decision Sciences, 35*(2), 259–288. *https://doi.org/10.1111/j.00117315.2004.02524.x*

-Sundar, S. S., & Limperos, A. M. (2013). Uses and grats 2.0: New gratifications for new media. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 57*(4), 504–525. https ://doi.org/10.1080/08838151.2013.845827

-van der Linden, S. (2022). Misinformation: Susceptibility, spread, and interventions to immunize the public. *Nature Medicine, 28*, 460–467. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-022-01713-6

-Wardle, C., & Derakhshan, H. (2017). *Information disorder: Toward an interdisciplinary framework for research and policy making* (DGI(2017)09). Council of Europe. https://edoc.coe.int/en/media/7495-information-disorder-toward-an-interdisciplinary-framework-for-research-and-policy-making.html