

# ***Controversy and Mechanism Analysis of the Association Between Social Media Use and Symptoms of Body Dysmorphic Disorder in Adolescents***

**Yanuo Wang**

*Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology & Neuroscience, King's College London, London, The United Kingdom*

*wyn13580959186@163.com*

**Abstract.** Adolescence is a sensitive period for identity formation and peer evaluation. Teenagers are exposed to idealised and digitally altered content that perpetuates limited standards of attractiveness due to the growth of image-centric platforms like Instagram, TikTok, and Snapchat. Body Dysmorphic Disorder (BDD), affecting about 2.2% of adolescents, involves a persistent preoccupation with perceived flaws and is linked to depression, anxiety, and social withdrawal. This study examines the available data and makes the case that appearance-focused behaviours, such as obsessive feedback monitoring, filter dependence, and selfie editing, are more responsible for the link between social media and BDD than overall screen time. It highlights a “filter paradox”: beautification tools can provide short-term relief while increasing long-term vulnerability by widening the gap between the “digital self” and the “mirror self.” By combining cognitive-behavioral models, social comparison, and objectification, we suggest a mechanism through which exposure to idealized imagery promotes self-objectification, upward comparison, and biases attention towards perceived flaws, all of which reinforce safety behaviours and sustain symptoms. By highlighting variations in samples, measurements, and overlooked modifiers, we resolve contradictory results. Platform-level disclosures, algorithmic diversity, and therapeutic approaches aimed at promoting digital safety behaviours are among the ramifications. We list the top goals for studies that focus on mechanisms and test BDD specifically.

**Keywords:** Adolescents, Social Media, Body Dysmorphic Disorder (BDD), Self-Objectification, Filter Paradox

## **1. Introduction**

Adolescence represents a critical stage of identity formation in which young people become increasingly sensitive to how others see them. This period coincides with the rapid expansion of visual social media platforms, such as Instagram, TikTok and Snapchat, that encourage constant engagement with appearance-based content. According to surveys, almost 90% of teenagers in industrialised nations use at least one of these platforms every day, with an average exposure time of several hours [1]. The images encountered are rarely neutral. They are curated, digitally enhanced

and presented alongside visible markers of approval such as likes and comments. This environment creates a cultural context in which appearance is closely monitored and compared.

Body Dysmorphic Disorder (BDD) is characterized by persistent and intrusive preoccupation with perceived flaws in appearance that are either minor or invisible to others. The disorder is not rare. According to population-based research, around 2.2% of teenagers fit the diagnostic requirements [2]. Symptoms are often accompanied by depression, anxiety and functional impairment [3]. This review examines social media's impact on body dysmorphic disorder (BDD), focusing on how its visual and evaluative nature may exacerbate risks. It integrates social comparison, objectification, and cognitive-behavioral models, addressing the "filter paradox": self-presentation tools may initially reduce anxiety but ultimately worsen dysmorphic concerns.

## 2. Social media as a risk factor for BDD

### 2.1. Platform characteristics

Image-based platforms differ from earlier forms of digital communication because they privilege faces and bodies. Posts that are visually appealing are given priority by algorithms, which frequently exposes users to highly idealised or modified information repeatedly [4]. Evaluations of one's body and attractiveness are altered by even little differences in "Instagram versus reality" photos [5]. Quantified systems of feedback reinforce these effects. The number of likes, comments and followers is a public scorecard that signals approval or rejection. Peer endorsement alters teenagers' visual evaluation and activates reward-related brain networks, according to experimental and neuroimaging studies [6]. This design transforms appearance into a social currency, intensifying self-monitoring and comparison.

Importantly, repeated exposure to these dynamics can do more than shape momentary self-perceptions. Constant pressure to maintain a flawless look may jeopardise the psychological stability of teenagers who are still developing their capacity to regulate their thoughts and emotions. When self-worth becomes closely tied to digital approval, vulnerabilities such as anxiety and dysmorphic concerns are more likely to emerge. Over time, these symptoms can interfere with concentration, academic performance, and everyday social functioning. In critical instances, an unremitting fixation on perceived imperfections has the potential to disturb sleep patterns, curtail engagement in various pursuits, and amplify detachment from social counterparts, collectively exacerbating the susceptibility to enduring detriments in both academic progress and overall well-being.

### 2.2. Appearance-focused behaviors

Teenagers' real online activities have a greater impact on the risk of social media use than does the amount of time they spend on it. Feelings of inadequacy and upward social comparisons are fostered by passively perusing appearance-heavy feeds [4,7]. Posting and editing selfies are examples of active behaviours that might momentarily increase confidence while also teaching users to see themselves from the outside. This change is consistent with the self-objectification concept [8]. Compulsive checking of likes, deleting posts with low engagement and endlessly experimenting with filters resemble digital equivalents of the repetitive checking behaviors seen in BDD [4]. The reliance on digital filters is particularly worrisome as it exacerbates the discrepancy between an individual's curated online persona and their actual offline appearance. Clinical case studies have documented instances of adolescents seeking cosmetic surgery to emulate their filtered images [9].

Video communication platforms add another dimension, as the constant self-view during calls heightens awareness of flaws, sometimes called the “Zoom effect” [10].

### 2.3. Synthesis

These features suggest that visual platforms amplify vulnerabilities by reinforcing external beauty standards, encouraging constant comparison and rewarding digital self-enhancement. The interaction of design affordances with adolescent developmental sensitivity creates conditions that can strengthen the cycle of dysmorphic concern. Notably, the underlying processes bear a resemblance to those previously associated with BDD, encompassing attentional bias, negative evaluation, and ritualistic behaviors aimed at rectifying perceived flaws[4,7].

## 3. Research controversies

### 3.1. Evidence of associations

Meta-analyses confirm that social media use is associated with body image disturbance, but the magnitude of association depends on how use is defined. More substantial effects emerge for appearance-related behaviors, such as editing and comparison, than for general online time [7]. Emerging research with a specific focus on symptomatology associated with Body Dysmorphic Disorder suggests a heightened vulnerability among individuals characterized by elevated perfectionism or investment in appearance [9]. This evidence supports a targeted account in which specific behaviors, not overall duration, predict risk.

### 3.2. Null or minimal findings

Conversely, extensive surveys and longitudinal studies frequently indicate negligible correlations when exposure is quantified merely as cumulative online duration [11]. These findings are significant but not necessarily contradictory. They highlight the problem of insensitive measurement. Hours alone cannot capture the nuances of how adolescents engage with platforms. When researchers operationalize use in terms of appearance-focused practices, effects reappear with greater clarity.

### 3.3. Non-linear patterns

Another line of research suggests a non-linear relationship. Moderate users sometimes report better outcomes than very low or high users, a pattern consistent with the “Goldilocks hypothesis” [12]. Although BDD studies are specifically limited, this pattern cautions against linearly interpreting results. It suggests that the dose of use interacts with the type of use and individual susceptibility.

### 3.4. Explaining discrepancies

Discrepancies in the literature can be traced to four main factors. First, sample composition matters. Clinical or high-risk groups tend to show more potent effects than general community samples. Second, the measures used shape results. Instruments that capture editing, comparison or compulsive checking yield more potent effects than global time-use measures. Third, the mode of engagement plays a role. Passive online engagement correlates more strongly with adverse effects, whereas proactive, supportive digital interactions may mitigate potential risks [13]. Fourth,

moderators such as perfectionism and gender can amplify or attenuate effects [9]. Reliable assessment also requires appropriate tools. The BDD-YBOCS-A, as an instance, has undergone validation for adolescent populations, offering a more granular assessment of symptom severity [14]. Lastly, empirical assessments, such as eye-tracking investigations, demonstrate attentional preferences for perceived flaws in individuals diagnosed with BDD [15]. When these factors are considered, the apparent inconsistencies across studies become more intelligible.

## **4. Mechanistic integration**

### **4.1. Social comparison**

Social comparison theory has long emphasized the influence of evaluating oneself relative to others. On social media, the stream of idealized images magnifies opportunities for upward comparison. Studies have consistently shown that using social media for comparison is associated with adverse body image consequences, with image and video-centric platforms exacerbating this effect [16]. A meta-analysis confirms a robust association between online comparison and body image concerns [17]. For adolescents prone to perfectionism, frequent comparison may transform ordinary appearance monitoring into dysmorphic preoccupation.

### **4.2. Self-objectification**

Self-objectification theory provides a complementary lens. Continuous evaluation by others fosters the internalization of an observer's perspective. Instead of experiencing the body subjectively, adolescents learn to monitor how they appear to others. Social media accelerates this process by making evaluation immediate and visible. Likes, comments and view counts quantify the degree of approval. Empirical evidence suggests that self-objectification serves as a mediating variable in the relationship between maladaptive social media engagement and body image dissatisfaction, whereas health-promoting behaviors, such as regular exercise, may mitigate these adverse effects [18]. Objectification magnifies self-criticism and increases the likelihood of obsessive scrutiny for those already vulnerable.

### **4.3. Cognitive-behavioral maintenance**

Cognitive-behavioral models of BDD describe a cycle in which biased attention to perceived flaws triggers negative appraisals, leading to safety behaviors such as mirror checking, camouflage or avoidance. These behaviors forestall disconfirmation, thereby sustaining skewed perceptions [18]. Eye-movement analysis corroborates the assertion that those afflicted with Body Dysmorphic Disorder exhibit attentional biases toward perceived morphological flaws, thereby impeding configural face processing [15]. Social media replicates and intensifies this cycle by continually presenting new opportunities for comparison and reinforcement of rituals, such as repeated photo editing or post deletion.

### **4.4. Integrated framework**

An integrated model can be summarized as follows: exposure to idealized imagery triggers upward comparison [16, 17], which fosters self-objectification [18]. This orientation heightens attentional bias toward perceived flaws [15], motivating safety behaviors [18]. Platform structures reinforce these behaviors and maintain dysmorphic symptoms. The framework generates testable predictions:

appearance-focused behaviors should be stronger predictors of BDD severity than general screen time, self-objectification should mediate observed associations, and interventions targeting attention or safety behaviors should reduce symptoms without reducing overall use.

## 5. The filter paradox

One of the most striking features of contemporary social media is the widespread use of digital filters and editing tools. These technologies allow adolescents to modify skin texture, facial proportions or body contours with minimal effort. At first glance, these instruments might seem innocuous or even beneficial. Enhanced self-portraits have the potential to boost self-assurance when posting and garner increased positive responses [8]. However, these immediate advantages engender a predicament. As reliance on digital augmentation increases, the disparity between the curated online persona and the authentic self widens. This divergence progressively diminishes contentment with one's unenhanced identity [9].

Clinical observations confirm this trajectory. Some adolescents avoid situations where they cannot control their image, while others seek cosmetic interventions to reproduce filtered appearances. Repeated reliance on editing recalibrates internal standards of what one should look like. Neuroimaging data indicates that recurrent interaction with idealized facial representations has the potential to modulate neural processing of one's own visage, thereby diminishing acceptance of inherent, unedited features [16]. This paradox illustrates how tools designed to relieve appearance anxiety can ultimately entrench and exacerbate it. Therefore, understanding the filter paradox is central to explaining how digital practices sustain dysmorphic concerns.

## 6. Implications and future directions

### 6.1. Practical implications

The findings reviewed here carry implications for both platform design and clinical intervention. On the platform side, transparency could be improved by adding filter-use labels. Empirical studies indicate that these disclosures diminish the perceived authenticity of manipulated images and alleviate comparative biases [17]. Recommendation algorithms could also be adjusted to promote greater diversity in body types and to reduce the prominence of highly edited content. Additional design features, such as options to hide like counts, may weaken reinforcement loops that sustain compulsive monitoring. Clinically, therapists working with adolescents should routinely assess social media habits. Incorporating digital behavior mapping into cognitive-behavioral therapy has the potential to assist patients in pinpointing stimuli, engaging in unfiltered exposure exercises, and inhibiting compulsive behaviors like removing content or monitoring engagement metrics [18].

### 6.2. Research priorities

Future research should refine measurement by developing scales specific to BDD-related social media behaviors, such as editing frequency, reliance on filters and compulsive engagement checking. Intervention studies are needed to test whether modifying these behaviors produces measurable symptom reductions. Neuroimaging work could investigate whether repeated enhancement alters face-processing networks or neural responses to one's image. Finally, researchers should clarify thresholds that distinguish adaptive impression management from pathological dependence. Establishing these thresholds would provide practical guidance for clinicians, educators and policy makers.

## 7. Conclusion

Social media has become an unavoidable part of adolescent life, but its effects on BDD are not captured by simple measures of time spent online. Empirical data consistently demonstrates that behaviors centered on appearance, such as photo manipulation, employing filters, engaging in comparative analysis, and habitually monitoring one's digital presence, constitute the most prominent risk factors. Integrating theories of social comparison, self-objectification and cognitive-behavioral maintenance provides a coherent framework for understanding how these behaviors sustain dysmorphic symptoms. The filter paradox highlights the central tension: digital tools that promise relief in the moment may reinforce vulnerability over time. Therefore, effective prevention and treatment must focus on the specific behaviors and contingencies that maintain symptoms rather than general exposure alone.

## References

- [1] Rideout, V., & Fox, S. (2018). Digital health practices, social media use, and mental well-being among teens and young adults in the U.S., Common Sense Media.
- [2] Rief, W., Buhlmann, U., Wilhelm, S., Borkenhagen, A., & Brähler, E. (2006). The prevalence of body dysmorphic disorder: A population-based survey. *Psychological Medicine*, 36(6), 877–885. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291706007264>
- [3] Phillips, K. A., Menard, W., Fay, C., & Weisberg, R. B. (2005). Demographic characteristics, phenomenology, comorbidity, and family history in 200 individuals with body dysmorphic disorder. *Psychosomatics*, 46(4), 317–325. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.psy.46.4.317>
- [4] Veale, D., & Riley, S. (2001). Mirror, mirror on the wall: The psychopathology of mirror gazing in body dysmorphic disorder. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 39(12), 1381–1393. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0005-7967\(00\)00102-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0005-7967(00)00102-9)
- [5] Tiggemann, M., & Anderberg, I. (2020). Social media is not real: The effect of “Instagram vs reality” images on women’s social comparison and body image. *New Media & Society*, 22(12), 2183–2199. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444819888720>
- [6] Sherman, L. E., Greenfield, P. M., Hernandez, L. M., & Dapretto, M. (2018). Peer influence via Instagram: Effects on brain and behavior in adolescence and young adulthood. *Child Development*, 89(1), 37–47. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12838>
- [7] Saiphoo, A. N., & Vahedi, Z. (2019). A meta-analytic review of the relationship between social media use and body image disturbance. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 101, 259–275. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2019.07.028>
- [8] McLean, S. A., Paxton, S. J., Wertheim, E. H., & Masters, J. (2015). Photoshopping the selfie: Selfie editing and body dissatisfaction in adolescent girls. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 48(8), 1132–1140. <https://doi.org/10.1002/eat.22449>
- [9] Gupta, S., Arora, S., Sinha, P., Chaudhary, R., & Gupta, A. (2023). Social media use and body dysmorphic symptoms: The mediating role of perfectionism. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*, 69(5), 908–916. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00207640221145219>
- [10] Sanzari, C. M., Petrucci, F., & Canale, N. (2023). The impact of social media use on body image and disordered eating: A comparison between 2015 and 2022 student samples. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1270933. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1270933>
- [11] Orben, A., & Przybylski, A. K. (2019). The association between adolescent well-being and digital technology use. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 3(2), 173–182. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-018-0506-1>
- [12] Przybylski, A. K., & Weinstein, N. (2017). A large-scale test of the Goldilocks hypothesis: Quantifying the relations between digital-screen use and the mental well-being of adolescents. *Psychological Science*, 28(2), 204–215. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797616678438>
- [13] Verduyn, P., Ybarra, O., Résibois, M., Jonides, J., & Kross, E. (2017). Do social network sites enhance or undermine subjective well-being? A critical review. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, 11(1), 274–302. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sipr.12033>
- [14] Monzani, B., Fallah, D., Rautio, D., Gumpert, M., Jassi, A., Fernández de la Cruz, L., Mataix-Cols, D., & Krebs, G. (2022). Psychometric evaluation of the Yale-Brown Obsessive-Compulsive Scale modified for Body Dysmorphic

Disorder for adolescents (BDD-YBOCS-A). *Child Psychiatry & Human Development*, 54(6), 1799–1806. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10578-022-01376-x>

- [15] Greenberg, J. L., Reuman, L., Hartmann, A. S., Kasarskis, I., & Wilhelm, S. (2014). Eye-tracking reveals selective attention to appearance-related stimuli in body dysmorphic disorder. *Journal of Psychiatric Research*, 53, 38–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychires.2014.02.014>
- [16] Ryding, F. C., & Kuss, D. J. (2020). The use of social networking sites, body image dissatisfaction, and body dysmorphic disorder: A review of the literature. *Psychology of Popular Media Culture*, 9(4), 412–435. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ppm0000241>
- [17] Bonfanti, R. C., Taylor, L., Garman, A. N., & Fuller-Tyszkiewicz, M. (2025). The association between social comparison in online environments and body image concerns: A meta-analysis. *Body Image*, 52, 101841. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2025.101841>
- [18] Veale, D. (2004). Advances in a cognitive behavioural model of body dysmorphic disorder. *Body Image*, 1(1), 113–125. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1740-1445\(03\)00009-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1740-1445(03)00009-3)