

The Minefield of Autism Therapy Games

Games to teach autistic kids social skills: a market and efficacy verdict

Scott Pierce

Founder, Left Join Studio

September 2026

// TL;DR

- **The founder's premise (there's an untapped market) is half-right and half-wrong.** The market is real (autism therapy ~\$2.33B in 2024; autism digital therapeutics ~\$1.14B in 2024) but it is not "untapped." It is a crowded field littered with failures. Akili, the FDA-authorized flagship, collapsed from a ~\$1B valuation to a \$34M fire-sale in July 2024.
- **The skeptic's objection is the more scientifically correct one.** Research strongly supports that autistic kids gravitate to games for predictability and escape, and the defining failure of drill-style social-skills games is that on-screen skills don't transfer to real human interaction (the "generalization problem"). Turning a preferred medium into overt therapy also risks undermining intrinsic motivation (the overjustification effect).
- **Net verdict:** A game-as-drill product that "trains neurotypical behaviors" is likely to fail both commercially and clinically. The version with a fighting chance is a **game-as-social-venue** (Minecraft/Roblox-style multiplayer practice with real peers), co-designed with autistic people, framed as decoding "neurotypical communication as a second language" rather than fixing the child, and sold B2B to schools and clinics. Even then the evidence base is thin and the ethics contested.

// The Market Is Real but Treacherous

- **Prevalence:** CDC's ADDM Network (MMWR, published April 15, 2025, using 2022 surveillance data) puts autism at 1 in 31 US 8-year-olds (3.2%), up from 1 in 36 (2.7%) in the 2020 data and 1 in 150 in 2000. Large and growing addressable population.
- **Market size:** The autism therapy market was valued at USD 2.33B in 2024 (Data Bridge Market Research, projecting USD 3.89B by 2032 at 6.6% CAGR). The narrower "digital therapeutics for autism" segment was ~USD 1.14B in 2024 (Growth Market Reports, projecting ~USD 4.87B by 2033 at 19.7% CAGR). Treat these vendor CAGRs as directional marketing projections, not audited figures.

- **The cautionary tale, Akili/EndeavorRx:** First FDA De Novo-cleared video-game therapeutic (June 2020, for ADHD ages 8–12). Went public via SPAC in 2022 at a ~\$1B valuation. Could not get payers to reimburse EndeavorRx; cut ~30% of staff in January 2023, another 40% in September 2023, pivoted to over-the-counter (EndeavorOTC), and was acquired by Virtual Therapeutics in July 2024 for ~\$34M (\$0.4340/share; 88.2% of shares tendered). The clearest evidence that even FDA authorization does not solve the business model. Payer coverage is the wall.

/// Who's alive and how they pay

- **Floreo (VR):** Raised a \$10M Series A (2022, led by Tenfore Holdings, with the Autism Impact Fund, Felton Group and Disability Opportunity Fund). FDA Breakthrough Device designation December 2023. Business model is B2B: schools, ABA clinics (partnership with Goldman Sachs-backed Center for Social Dynamics), and managed-care pilots (CareSource/Arkansas Support Network). Leans on a CPT III code (0770T, effective January 2023) for VR therapy. Coach-mediated (a therapist or teacher drives a tablet while the child is in the headset), not solo play.
- **Mightier (biofeedback games for emotional regulation, not social skills):** Boston Children's Hospital spinout, ~\$29–30M raised total (Series B \$17M in 2020, Sony Innovation Fund). B2C subscription (~\$99 one-time + \$19–35/mo) plus B2B to clinics, employers, and health plans. Reached 50,000+ families.
- **Social Cipher (Ava):** SEL narrative game for neurodivergent youth 10–15. ~50% neurodivergent team, autistic CEO (Vanessa Gill), LEGO Foundation backing. B2B to schools and therapy centers (200+ sites). Explicitly neurodiversity-affirming framing.
- **Secret Agent Society (SAS):** Espionage-themed CBT/social-skills program with a computer-game component; strong evidence base (below); sold to clinics and schools with practitioner training on a royalty model.
- **The Transporters:** Emotion-recognition animation (now delivered via app); strong efficacy evidence; effectively a legacy academic product.

- **Autcraft:** Community Minecraft server (not a company), founded 2013 by Stuart Duncan; ~20,000 registered players as of early 2026, ~1,000 unique monthly. Demonstrates the pull of the game-as-venue model but monetizes via donations, not a business.

Who pays, in reality: Selling B2C to parents is hard (subscription fatigue, skepticism). Schools buy via SEL and special-ed budgets and IEP goals but have long, slow sales cycles. Clinics and ABA providers buy tools that fit reimbursement. Insurance and Medicaid reimbursement for a digital social-skills game is largely unproven. Akili proved that FDA clearance does not equal payer coverage.

// Efficacy: Real but Narrow, with a Fatal Generalization Problem

On-screen skills improve; real-world transfer often doesn't. This is the central, repeated finding:

- Grynspan et al. 2014 meta-analysis (*Autism*): overall effect of technology-based interventions $d = 0.47$ (CI 0.08–0.86), near-medium, but with a *negative* correlation between intervention duration and effect size.
- Whyte, Smyth & Scherf 2015 (*JADD*): participants “often show little evidence of the ability to generalize such learning to novel, everyday social communicative interactions.”
- Soares et al. 2021 (*J Technology in Behavioral Science*): technological SST (Hedges' $g = 0.93$) statistically comparable to face-to-face SST ($g = 0.81$), but based on only 4 technology trials, described by the authors as “preliminary.”
- Tang et al. 2019 serious-game meta-analysis: only 45% average integration of serious-game design principles; better game design specifically moderated *distant* generalization (the hard part), while close generalization ($g = 0.68$) was easier.
- Sandgreen et al. 2021 (*JADD*): 19 studies, overall $d = 0.32$ (small effect), with very high heterogeneity.
- Nuance: Carruthers et al. 2020 (*Autism Research*) disputes a blanket “autism generalization deficit,” finding 8 of 9 RCTs showed at least some

generalization, but these were mostly in-person, caregiver-mediated early interventions, not solo screen drills.

Emotion-recognition trainers work for what they train. The Transporters (Golan/Baron-Cohen 2010; replicated by Gev et al. 2017; Chan et al. 2024 app version) reliably improves emotion recognition, generalizing to novel characters and situations. That is recognizing emotions on faces, not real-time reciprocal conversation. FaceSay (Hopkins et al. 2011, $N=49$ RCT; Rice et al. 2015, $N=31$ RCT) improved affect recognition, mentalizing, and some social skills.

The best game-based evidence is Secret Agent Society. Multiple RCTs; Beaumont et al. 2021 parent-directed RCT ($N=70$) showed gains over an active control on parent- and teacher-rated social skills with large effect sizes maintained at follow-up; developer materials cite 76% of children making clinically meaningful shifts in the first UQ RCT. Critically, SAS is *not* pure solo screen time. It combines the game with parent and therapist coaching and group practice. The active ingredient is the human-mediated practice.

Game-as-social-venue (Minecraft) is the most conceptually promising. Studies show Minecraft lets autistic students socialize in a strengths-based way (Stone 2025, *JORSEN*); therapeutically-applied Minecraft groups create low-stakes real peer practice (F1000Research 2023); pilots adapt the PEERS curriculum into Minecraft. The game is a *context* for real social interaction rather than a drill, which directly attacks the generalization problem because the practice partners are real humans.

PEERS is the gold-standard curriculum. UCLA program (Laugeson/Frankel), multiple RCTs (2012 adolescents; 2015 young adults), cross-culturally validated in 150+ countries, caregiver-assisted, gains maintained at follow-up. It works precisely because it pairs didactic teaching with real-world homework and caregiver coaching, not gamification. No fully gamified PEERS with equivalent evidence exists.

// The Critique: The Skeptic Is on Firm Ground

Why autistic kids like games: the escape/predictability hypothesis is research-supported. Studies (e.g.,

Frontiers 2022; PubMed 2021 gaming-motivations brief report) find autistic traits predict greater video-game use via a preference for predictable, rule-bound environments; escapism and social motivation are the strongest predictors of play time; games “provide the illusion of sharing a social world without partaking in one.” This is precisely the skeptic’s thesis, and it undercuts the founder’s “games are a great teaching medium” framing.

Turning play into training risks backfiring. The overjustification effect (Lepper, Greene & Nisbett 1973, *JPSP*) showed that making an intrinsically enjoyed activity an explicit means to an external reward reduces intrinsic interest; the expected-reward preschoolers’ later voluntary engagement roughly halved. The authors warned specifically that token-economy and contractual reward systems “may backfire for at least those children initially interested in the activities.” The “chocolate-covered broccoli” problem (coined by Brenda Laurel, 2001) is a well-known edutainment failure mode. Tang et al. 2018 documented the exact tension: autistic youth emphasized fun; professionals emphasized skill generalization.

The masking/neurodiversity critique is serious and well-evidenced. Meta-analyses and reviews (Hull et al. 2021, *Molecular Autism*; multiple 2024–2026 systematic reviews) link camouflaging and masking (performing neurotypical behavior) to anxiety, depression, autistic burnout, and suicidality. The double-empathy problem (Milton 2012) reframes social difficulty as a two-way mismatch rather than a one-way deficit, with experimental support from Crompton and Sason. Autistic-led advocacy (ASAN, AWN Network) and much of the community criticize ABA-style approaches that train kids to suppress natural behavior (stimming, eye-contact avoidance). A product that “conditions kids to perform neurotypical behaviors” walks straight into this.

The counter-view is also legitimate. Impaired social skills are frequently the biggest practical challenge

for autistic people; isolation, bullying, and unemployment are real harms. Many autistic people want concrete help with specific self-selected skills (job interviews, making friends). Modern products increasingly frame this as teaching “neurotypical communication as a second language” (bidirectional understanding) rather than “fixing,” and involve autistic people in design (Social Cipher, Autcraft).

// Adjudication: Who Is More Right?

On the **narrow factual claims**, the skeptic wins most exchanges:

1. *Why autistic kids like games*: The skeptic is correct. Predictability, escape, and reduced social demand is the dominant research explanation.
2. *Whether drill-training transfers*: The skeptic’s doubt is correct. The generalization problem is the defining weakness of the entire category.
3. *Whether making games therapeutic could “ruin” them*: Supported in principle by the overjustification and edutainment-rejection literature.

But the founder is not simply wrong:

1. *A market exists*. Yes, sizeable and growing, with real institutional buyers.
2. *Games can help*. Yes, for narrow skills (emotion recognition) and especially as social venues; effect sizes are real (roughly $d \approx 0.47$ up to $g \approx 0.6-0.9$ depending on design and human mediation).
3. The founder’s errors are (a) the **premise that the space is “untapped”**, when it is heavily populated and littered with failures, and (b) the **design instinct** of game-as-drill to “condition neurotypical behavior,” which is both the least effective approach and the one most likely to trigger the neurodiversity backlash and the motivational backfire the skeptic predicts.

The single most important design insight: Across the strongest evidence (SAS, PEERS, Minecraft groups), the active ingredient is *human-mediated, in-context practice*, not the software. The game is a delivery vehicle or a venue; it is not the therapy. Solo screen drills produce screen skills.

// Recommendations

If the founder proceeds, a staged plan:

1. **Reframe the product first.** Drop “train neurotypical behaviors” and “condition the kids.” Adopt an explicitly neurodiversity-affirming frame: teaching *optional, self-selected* skills and “decoding neurotypical communication as a second language,” bidirectional (also educate neurotypical peers and teachers). This is both more ethical and more marketable to today’s buyers. Kill-switch: if interviews with autistic teens and adults reject the framing, stop.
2. **Choose game-as-social-venue over game-as-drill.** Build a moderated multiplayer environment (Minecraft/Roblox-style) where the game is the *context* for real peer interaction with light structured challenges and a human facilitator, not a solo emotion-matching drill. This directly attacks the generalization problem, the category’s #1 killer.
3. **Co-design with autistic people and clinicians from day one.** Autistic developers and consultants (à la Social Cipher, Autcraft) plus a PEERS- or SAS-informed clinical advisor. Embed generalization mechanisms: parent and teacher coaching, real-world homework, spaced practice, and in-context feedback.
4. **Go to market B2B, not B2C.** Sell to schools (SEL budgets, IEP goals) and ABA/therapy clinics as a facilitator-mediated tool. Do not bet the company on insurance or Medicaid reimbursement or FDA digital-therapeutic status early. Akili proved that path burns cash and still fails on payers. Consider FDA and reimbursement only after commercial traction plus an RCT.
5. **Generate your own evidence.** The category’s credibility gap is real-world transfer. Fund at least a pilot with a *real-world* (not on-screen) social outcome measure and a follow-up timepoint. Benchmark: if you can’t show generalization to untrained settings, you have the same product that failed before.

/// Thresholds that should change the plan

- Kids disengage once it “feels like therapy”: you’ve hit chocolate-covered broccoli. Increase intrinsic integration or pivot to a pure venue model.
- Schools won’t pay and parents churn: the unit economics that killed peers apply to you. Reconsider viability.
- Autistic advocates publicly oppose the framing: reputational risk in this community is severe. Return to step 1.

// Caveats

- Market-size and CAGR figures come from commercial market-research vendors and should be treated as directional, not authoritative. (The CDC prior comparison figure of 1 in 36 is from 2020 surveillance data reported in 2023, not from 2023 data.)
- The efficacy literature has pervasive quality issues: small samples, weak or active controls, heavy reliance on parent-report outcomes, publication bias, and few measures of real-world generalization. Effect sizes vary widely by design and mediation.
- The generalization literature is genuinely mixed (Carruthers 2020 is more optimistic than Whyte 2015 / JMIR 2021); the safe reading is that transfer is possible but hard and depends on human mediation.
- The overjustification effect is real but its magnitude and boundary conditions are debated (Deci/Koestner/Ryan 1999 supportive; Cameron & Pierce 2001 skeptical).
- “Chocolate-covered broccoli” is a design-community concept, not a controlled empirical finding; the closest empirical anchors are intrinsic-integration research (Habgood & Ainsworth 2011) and end-user preference studies (Tang 2018).
- Company funding figures are as of the cited reporting dates and may have changed.