Abstract

Most individuals will gamble during their lifetime, yet only a select few will develop a gambling disorder. Gray's Reinforcement Sensitivity Theory holds promise for providing insight into gambling disorder etiology and symptomatology as it ascertains that neurobiological differences in reward and punishment sensitivity play an important role in an individual's affect and motives. The aim of the study was to assess a mediational pathway, which included patients' sex, personality traits, reward and punishment sensitivity, and gambling-severity variables. The Sensitivity to Punishment and Sensitivity to Reward Questionnaire, the South Oaks Gambling Screen, the Symptom Checklist-Revised, and the Temperament and Character Inventory-Revised were administered to a sample of gambling disorder outpatients (N=831) attending a specialized outpatient gambling disorder unit. Sociodemographic variables were also recorded. A structural equation model found that both reward and punishment sensitivity were positively and directly associated with increased gambling severity, sociodemographic variables, and certain personality traits while also revealing a complex mediational role for these dimensions. To this end, the Sensitivity to Punishment and Sensitivity to Reward Questionnaire could be a useful tool for gaining a better understanding of different gambling disorder phenotypes and developing tailored interventions.

Keywords: gambling disorder; sensitivity to reward; sensitivity to punishment; Gray's Reinforcement Sensitivity Theory; path analysis; personality.

Introduction

Gambling is a common activity across all societies and cultures and acts as little more than a form of entertainment for the vast majority of people, with different studies showing that between 70% -90% of the adolescent and adult population occasionally gamble (Abbott et al. 2004; Blinn-Pike et al. 2010; Gupta and Derevensky 1998). However, for 1.5% of the adult population, gambling is a disorder with serious consequences (Becoña 2009). For example, problem gambling rates in the European Union have been found to range from 0.3% to 3.1% (Planzer et al. 2014). Gambling Disorder (GD) is defined as persistent and recurrent problematic gambling behavior leading to clinically significant impairment or distress (American Psychiatric Association 2013). Epidemiological studies indicate that GD is more frequent in men than in women and that problem gambling behavior usually begins in adolescence or early adulthood (commonly with a later onset in women) (Cunningham-Williams et al. 1998; Welte et al. 2002). In order to improve treatment interventions, a better understanding of the mechanisms underpinning GD is essential.

GD is frequently associated with dysfunctional personality dimensions that often predate the emergence of GD pathology (Shenassa et al. 2012; Slutske et al. 2012). Individuals with GD are consistently characterized as highly impulsive and show temperament traits such as high novelty seeking, which is characterized by the desire to explore and approach potential rewards (Janiri et al. 2007). Nonetheless, high harm avoidance (shy, fearful behavior, with the tendency to avoid perceived punishment) has also been described in patients with GD (Lobo et al. 2014; Moragas et al. 2015). These apparently opposing traits have led to the development of distinct models to define patient profiles according to the different motivations that give rise to gambling behavior (e.g., emotionally vulnerable vs. antisocial impulsive gamblers) (Blaszczynski and Nower 2002; Moragas et al. 2015), and raises the question whether gambling behavior may be adaptive in certain cases and used to mitigate the responses caused by the trials one must face in daily life (Williams et al. 2012).

Gray's Reinforcement Sensitivity Theory postulates that personality traits can be understood according to the sensitivity of brain systems that respond to punishment and reward. In its original form, this theory asserted that punishment sensitivity regulated responses to stimuli perceived as potentially dangerous, thereby leading individuals to their avoidance. On the other hand, reward sensitivity directed behavior towards appetitive stimuli that provide immediate compensation (Gray 1970; Gray 1982; Torrubia and Tobeña 1984; Torrubia et al. 2001). The Sensitivity to Punishment and Sensitivity to Reward Questionnaire (SPSRQ) (Torrubia et al. 2001) is a widely used instrument for assessing reward and punishment sensitivity levels. This questionnaire is consistent with Gray's Reinforcement Sensitivity Theory in that it deals with sensitivity to specific cues instead of a more generalized notion of sensitivity to reward and punishment. It's worth noting that Gray's Reinforcement Sensitivity Theory has undergone numerous revisions and that new systems, including the fight-flight-freeze-system (FFFS) (Corr and Poropat 2016; Gray and McNaughton 2000;

3

McNaughton and Corr 2008; McNaughton and Corr 2004), have also been added to this framework. These systems have been proposed to play a mediating role in determining behavioral output, though the SPSRQ does not factor in these new constructs, but rather treats reward and punishment sensitivity as independent pathways.

High reward sensitivity has been associated with a wide range of psychopathologies including alcohol abuse (van Hemel-Ruiter et al. 2015), bipolar spectrum disorder (Alloy et al. 2012), eating disorders (Farmer et al. 2002), substance use (Boog et al. 2013), and behavioral addictions (Dong et al. 2013; Lawrence et al. 2014). In the specific context of gambling, reward and punishment processing play a pivotal role in deciding whether to reject a gamble or to "chase one's losses". Numerous studies have demonstrated that individual differences in punishment and reward sensitivity are linked to gambling problems (Balodis et al. 2014; Gaher et al. 2015; Mackillop et al. 2014). For example, Wardell et al. (2015) found in a community sample of problem gamblers that both punishment and reward sensitivity were related to gambling problems via enhancement/winning motives and negative-affect motive pathways, respectively. These findings dovetail with other research in substance abuse showing that individuals with high reward sensitivity are inclined to seek out the rewarding effects of substances (Franken and Muris 2006), while individuals with high punishment sensitivity are driven to use substances as means of enhancing mood being that they are more liable to have negative emotions (Voigt et al. 2009). Furthermore, high reward sensitivity has been found to undermine treatment seeking in problem gamblers (Sztainert et al. 2014).

Much neuroimaging research to date has sought to identify how shared symptom clusters in gambling disorder and substance use (craving, withdrawal, loss of control, etc.) may be related to dysfunctional neural circuitry (Potenza 2013). Theories on behavioral addiction underscore the importance of the mesolimbic system and the prefrontal cortex in reward sensitivity, with alterations in the former being associated with cue reactivity and craving, and the latter with poorer executive functioning characterized by diminished inhibition control (van Holst et al. 2010). Functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) studies with GD patients have repeatedly found evidence of hyperactivity in the ventral striatum during the anticipation of monetary reward and uphold the concept of future delayed rewards being overrun by eagerness to maximize immediate compensation in these patients (Quester and Romanczuk-Seiferth 2014).

To the best of our knowledge, no studies have thus far examined the complex interactions between reward and punishment sensitivity, personality traits, and GD severity in a treatment-seeking population. More specifically, the mediating role of reward and punishment sensitivity in individuals with certain personality traits and gambling behavior has yet to be explored. Some research in community samples have suggested that punishment sensitivity might have a protective role from developing problem gambling, yet its association with gambling severity in GD patients remains unknown (Gaher et al. 2015). Thus, in this study we aimed to assess punishment and reward sensitivity levels in treatment-seeking GD patients, and to explore the clinical, personality, and sociodemographic differences between

patients with high and low levels of punishment and reward sensitivity. We also sought to explore the mediating role of punishment and reward sensitivity in the association between novelty seeking, harm avoidance – two personality dimensions highly linked to addictive behaviors – and gambling severity via path analysis.

Our first hypothesis was that high reward and punishment sensitivity scores would be strongly associated with GD severity. Secondly, as our previous research on personality traits in GD patients has described a phenotype of patients with high harm avoidance who are responsive to negative reinforcement (Alvarez-Moya et al. 2010; Moragas et al. 2015), we hypothesized that punishment sensitivity would mediate the association between harm avoidance and GD severity in our path analysis. Thirdly, we hypothesized that our path analysis would identify a mediating role for reward sensitivity between novelty seeking and GD severity, being that other research has found high levels of both reward sensitivity and novelty seeking to be linked to impulsivity-related components in GD (Mackillop et al. 2014).

Methods

Participants

A sample of 831 GD patients who were attending our Unit between 2011 and 2014 was considered. All the patients were consecutive referrals for assessment and treatment and were diagnosed according to DSM-5 criteria. The sample was predominantly male (91.5% men, $n = 760$) and the majority of the individuals were of community origin (94.7%, $n= 787$). The mean age of the sample was 42.5 years (SD=13.1) and the mean age of onset was 37.9 years (SD=14.1). Most patients did not have a secondary-school level of education (57.3%), did not have a partner (41.5% single, n=345; 13.2% divorced-separated, n=110) and were tobacco consumers (59.9%, n=498), abused alcohol (15.9%, n=132) and/or other substances (9.3%, n=77). (Table 1 includes additional demographic information about the sample). The Hospital Ethics Committee approved the study, and informed signed consent was obtained from all participants.

--Insert Table 1--

Clinical Measures

DSM5 criteria (APA 2000)

Patients were diagnosed with pathological gambling if they met DSM-5 criteria (APA 2013).. It should be noted that with the release of this new taxonomy, , the term pathological gambling used in the DSM-IV-TR (APA 2000) has been replaced with GD. DSM diagnostic criteria were determined via a semi-structured, face-to-face interview conducted by the Unit's clinical staff.

South Oaks Gambling Screen (SOGS) (Lesieur and Blume 1987)

The original diagnostic questionnaire uses 20 items to assess cognitive, emotional, and behavioral aspects related to problem gambling by measuring severity of gambling activity (responses ranging from 0 to 20) and discriminates between non-problem gambling (from 0 to 2), light problem gambling (from 3 to 4) and problem gambling (from 5 on 20, with higher scores being indicative of greater gambling severity). A Spanish version of the questionnaire was used (Echeburúa et al. 1994) and it that has demonstrated evidence of reliability, including good temporal stability (test-retest r = .98) and internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha = .94).

Symptom Checklist- Revised (SCL-90-R) (Derogatis 1994)

This is a 90-item self-report questionnaire designed to measure psychological distress and psychopathology. It explores 9 dimensions or psychopathological profiles: somatization, obsession-compulsion, interpersonal sensitivity, depression, anxiety, anger-hostility, phobic anxiety, paranoid ideation, and psychoticism. In addition, it includes three global indices, which are a Global Severity Index (GSI), to measure overall psychological distress; a Positive Symptom Distress Index (PSDI), to measure the intensity of symptoms and a Positive Symptom Total (PST), to measure self-reported symptoms. Spanish validation of this scale (González de Rivera 2001) showed good internal consistency with Cronbach's alphas between .81 and .90.

Sensitivity to Punishment and Sensitivity to Reward Questionnaire (SPSRQ) (Torrubia et al. 2001)

The SPSRQ is a 48-item self-report questionnaire that contains 24 questions about sensitivity to reward and 24 about sensitivity to punishment with a dichotomous (yes/no) response format and the score for each scale is a summation of the affirmative responses. The magnitude of the score indicates the level of sensitivity to reward and sensitivity to punsihment. In this study, three group were considered and compared: normal-group (T-score under 60), subclinical (T-score between 60 and 70) and clinical (T-score higher than 70). Both scales demonstrated good internal consistency (sensitivity to punishment, α=.81 to .83; sensitivity to punishment, α=.73 to .76) and the SPSRQ showed acceptable reliability and validity. This questionnaire is based on the original version of Gray's Reinforcement Sensitivity Theory and does not include the less clearly defined Fight-flight-freeze-system, which has been proposed to be activated by the presence of aversive stimuli in order to promote fight or escape behavior. Various revisions and competing theories have incorporated findings from different areas in psychology and neuroscience to attempt to elucidate the interplay of these systems (Corr and Poropat 2016; Gray and McNaughton 2000; McNaughton and Corr 2008; McNaughton and Corr 2004), though these issues will not be addressed as they are beyond the scope of this article.

Temperament and Character Inventory-Revised (TCI-R) (Cloninger 1999)

This questionnaire consists of 240 items that assessed personality traits according to 7 personality factors. They are divided into four for temperament and three for character. The temperamental traits are sensation seeking, harm avoidance, reward dependence and persistence and the character traits are self-direction, cooperation and self-

transcendence. The different personality dimensions have demonstrated adequate reliability-validity in the Spanish population (Gutiérrez-Zotes et al. 2004) with Cronbach's alphas between .77 and .84.

Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT) (Saunders et al. 1993)

This test was developed as a simple screening method for excessive alcohol consumption. The AUDIT consists of 10 questions about the level of consumption, symptoms of dependence, and alcohol-related consequences. Internal consistency has been found to be high, and rest-retest data have suggested a high reliability (0.86) and a sensitivity of around 0.90. Specificity in different settings and for different criteria averages 0.80 or more (Martínez 1999). The suggested cutoffs are 1–7 for low alcohol use, 8–15 for alcohol abuse, and equal to and over 16 for risk of alcohol dependence.

Other socio-demographic and clinical variables.

Additional demographic, clinical, and social/family variables related to gambling were measured using a semi-structured face-to-face clinical interview described elsewhere (Jiménez-Murcia et al. 2006; Jiménez-Murcia et al. 2007). The gambling behavior variables covered included the number of previous treatment attempts, the type of problem gambling, the age of onset of gambling behavior and of gambling-related problems, the average monetary investment in a single episode of gambling, the maximum amount bet in a single episode, and the total amount of accumulated debts. In addition, the interview explored some maintaining factors such as gambling to chase one's losses or to avoid negative emotional states, magical thinking and the illusion of control, ritualistic behavior, the characteristics of the last gambling

Procedure

Patients were assessed by trained and licensed psychologists and psychiatrists, with more than 15 years of experience assessing and treating GD patients, in order to gather information regarding gambling behavior, psychopathology and personality traits via a semi-structured face-to-face interview. Sociodemographic and additional clinical information was also taken, and patients individually completed questionnaires required for this study (taking approximately two hours) before initiating outpatient treatment.

Statistical analysis

Analyses were carried out and figures were created with Stata13 for Windows. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) adjusted for the covariates: patients' sex and age, and compared the means of clinical measures between patients who were split into sensitivity to reward and sensitivity to punishment normal, subclinical and clinical groups. Polynomial contrasts in ANOVA assessed the presence of linear and/or quadratic trends. Partial correlation coefficients, also adjusted for sex

7

and age, measured the association between sensitivity to punishment and sensitivity to reward raw scores and clinical measures ($|R|>.30$ was considered high effect size). The Simes-Bonferroni method is used to control Type-I error due to multiple comparisons (Simes 1986). It is included into the Familywise error rate stepwise procedures, and offers a more powerful test than the classical Bonferroni correction.

Structural equation modeling (SEM) tested the mediation model between personality traits, sensitivity to reward and sensitivity to punishment levels and gambling level (SOGS-total score), through path analysis. SEM constitutes an extension of multiple regression modeling that can be used for both confirmatory and exploratory modeling, with the aim to estimate the magnitude and significance of hypothesized causal connections into a set of variables (von Oertzen 2010). Path analysis is used in this study as a case of SEM with exploratory aims, with the advantage (compared to classical regression models) to allow the inclusion of multiple relationships among a set of variables, including meditational associations. Participants' sex and age were included in the pathways as covariates. The maximum-likelihood estimation (MLE) method of parameter estimation was used and goodness-of-fit was evaluated using standard statistical measures (Bentler 1990): the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), Bentler's Comparative Fit Index (CFI), the Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), and the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR). Adequate model fit was considered non-significant by χ^2 tests and if the following criteria were met: RMSEA<.08, TLI>.9, CFI>.9 and SRMR<.1. The global predictive capacity of the model was measured by the coefficient of determination (CD).

Results

Sensitivity to reward and sensitivity to punishment levels

Table S1 (see supplementary material) includes clinical variables of the study sample. Table 2 describes the prevalence of sensitivity to reward and sensitivity to punishment scores (normal, subclinical and clinical) for the total sample, and for the stratum defined by sex and age. Statistical differences were found by comparing men and women (a higher proportion of women had subclinical and clinical scores) and age groups (the higher the age, the higher the proportion of patients with subclinical and clinical scores).

--Insert Table 2--

Association between reward and punishment sensitivity and clinical measures

Table 3 contains the distribution and comparison of means (adjusted for sex and age) in clinical measures for the normal-subclinical-clinical sensitivity to reward and sensitivity to punishment groups. A positive linear trend was found in the sensitivity to punishment group with respect to gambling severity (measured with the DSM-5 total criteria and the

SOGS-total score) and psychopathology symptoms (SCL-90-R scores); the higher the sensitivity to punishment score, the higher the gambling severity and psychopathology symptom levels. In terms of personality profiles, a positive linear trend was found between harm avoidance and self-transcendence, and sensitivity to punishment. A negative linear trend was found for reward dependence, self-directedness and cooperativeness, and sensitivity to punishment. No significant associations were found between reward punishment sensitivity and alcohol consumption.

With respect to sensitivity to reward, the same linear trend was obtained, but quadratic trends were also significant for many other clinical measures, in the sense that differences between normal and subclinical groups were higher than differences between subclinical and clinical groups.

--Insert Table 3--

Table 4 includes the partial correlation coefficients, adjusted for sex and age, measuring the association between the sensitivity to reward and sensitivity to punishment raw scores and the clinical variables analyzed in the study. Sensitivity to punishment levels positively correlated with all SCL-90-R scales, and with TCI-R harm avoidance scores. Sensitivity to punishment was also negatively associated with TCI-R self-directedness scores. Sensitivity to reward positively correlated with gambling levels (total DSM-5 criteria and SOGS-total score), SCL-90-R scores (except for somatization, phobic anxiety and PSDI scales) and TCI-R novelty seeking scores. Sensitivity to reward negatively correlated with TCI-R self-directedness and cooperativeness scores.

--Insert Table 4--

Mediational model for personality traits, reward and punishment sensitivity levels and gambling levels

Table S2 (supplementary material) includes the correlation-matrix for the variables considered for the pathway. Fig. 1 shows the standardized coefficients of the SEM, adjusted for sex and age, testing the mediational pathways between personality traits, sensitivity to reward and sensitivity to punishment levels and gambling level (DSM-5 total criteria). This model obtained an adequate goodness-of-fit: RMSEA=.030, CFI=.997, TLI=.984 and SRMR=.019. The global predictive capacity was moderate (CD=.12).

Novelty seeking and harm avoidance were positively and directly associated with the total gambling level (the higher the TCI-R scores, the higher the SOGS-total score). Sensitivity to reward and sensitivity to punishment also positively correlated with gambling severity. The testing of the mediational role of sensitivity to reward and sensitivity to punishment in the relationship between personality and gambling level showed that: a) sensitivity to punishment levels mediated between harm avoidance and the gambling severity (the higher scores for this personality trait predicted higher sensitivity to punishment scores, and higher sensitivity to punishment levels correlated with higher gambling severity); b) sensitivity to punishment did not mediate between novelty seeking and DSM-5 total criteria; and c) sensitivity to reward mediated between novelty seeking and gambling severity (higher scores in this personality trait

were associated with higher sensitivity to reward scores, and higher sensitivity to reward predicted higher gambling severity); d) in the same line, sensitivity to reward mediated between harm avoidance and gambling level.

--Insert Figure 1--

Discussion

The present study assessed the effects of punishment and reward sensitivity, personality traits and sociodemographic characteristics on gambling severity levels and overall psychopathology. Keeping with our first hypothesis, heightened punishment and reward sensitivity were both positively associated with gambling problems. As expected, we also found associations between novelty seeking and reward sensitivity, and between harm avoidance and punishment sensitivity. Likewise, our Structural Equation Model (SEM) revealed that punishment and reward sensitivity have a mediating role between specific personality traits and total gambling severity.

Reward sensitivity was positively associated with gambling severity and is consistent with other findings on gambling disorder (Balodis et al. 2014; Gaher et al. 2015), as well as with an array of other behavioral and substance addictions (Dissabandara et al. 2014; Dong et al. 2013; Wardell et al. 2011). Within the context of gambling, those with high reward sensitivity may be especially drawn to the accumulation of anticipation while betting, regardless of whether the economical or social outcomes are positive. This dysfunctional response to reward in gamblers has recently been given neurobiological support by a study using the blockade of D2-receptors with sulpiride, which found impaired reward versus punishment learning in controls, but not in gamblers (Janssen et al. 2015). Likewise, sub-clinical and clinical levels of reward sensitivity were strongly associated with greater overall psychopathology. The cross-sectional nature of this study does not allow us to determine whether high levels of reward sensitivity is a risk factor for psychological symptomatology or alternatively, if the patients' reported psychopathology is a consequence of their gambling behavior (Jauregui et al. 2016).

 High punishment sensitivity was also predictive of greater gambling severity and psychological distress and is indicative of the existence of both positive and negative reinforcement motives in GD. Individuals with high levels of punishment sensitivity report greater irritability and alterations in accurately perceiving events in everyday life, thus possibly subserving gambling motivations (Hundt et al. 2013; Wardell et al. 2015). Findings related to punishment sensitivity so far have been inconsistent, with some studies suggesting that high levels of punishment sensitivity might lead to the use of gambling as a form of experience escapism and avoidance motivation (MacLaren et al. 2015), whereas others have found that moderate levels of punishment sensitivity have a protective effect which reduces the incitation of problem behaviors (Jonker et al. 2014). Our results showing that increased severity is associated with both

high sensitivity to punishment and high sensitivity to reward is consistent with other research showing wide-ranging symptomatology among both clinical and non-clinical groups with high levels of both of these traits (Hundt et al. 2013; Loxton and Dawe 2001). Given these findings, clarification for the heterogeneity of motivations supporting gambling disorder is needed.

Significant differences in punishment and reward sensitivity levels were found between sexes with women being more likely to exhibit both clinical punishment and reward sensitivity levels. Previous studies suggest that the personality profile of women with GD is characterized by introspective features and inhibition which leads to the use of gambling as a means to regulate negative affective states (Granero et al. 2009; Smith et al. 2015). Consequently, the presence of greater punishment sensitivity scores in women with GD, which implies the enactment of evasive behavior when facing threateningly perceived stimuli, is in line with this notion. Likewise, higher clinical and subclinical reward sensitivity scores, that is to say the search for immediate reward, in women than in men with GD could be associated with higher impulsivity within a specific subgroup of women (Loxton et al. 2008). In this sense, numerous studies have demonstrated that GD is a heterogonous disorder in which different subtypes can be identified depending upon the extent to which a series of biopsychosocial risk factors intervene (Alvarez-Moya et al. 2010; Blaszczynski and Nower 2002; Susana Jiménez-Murcia et al. 2013; Ledgerwood and Petry 2010). From this explicative model, a endophenotype of women presenting high levels of comorbidity and emotional distress has been identified (Suomi et al. 2014). This endophenotype is characterized by dysfunctional personality traits (impulsivity, thoughtlessness, pessimism, apprehension and poor social integration) and elevated GD severity, which can even lead to criminal behavior as a consequence of gambling problems (Granero, Penelo, Stinchfield, Fernández-Aranda, et al. 2014).

As described in other research, our results showed that higher clinical and subclinical punishment and reward sensitivity scores were linked to older age (Subramaniam et al. 2015; Tse et al. 2012). Age is understood to be a strong moderator of both the course and the evolution of GD (Granero, Penelo, Stinchfield, Fernandez-Aranda, et al. 2014). Though there is still a lack of consensus among GD clinicians and researchers, some have posited that older individuals with GD present severity levels similar to their younger counterparts (Ariyabuddhiphongs 2011). Nonetheless, other researchers have found GD to be more severe in younger samples (Fattore et al. 2014; Granero, Penelo, Stinchfield, Fernandez-Aranda, et al. 2014; Jiménez-Murcia et al. 2010; Kessler et al. 2008), suggesting that being less than 29 years of age could be a risk factor for developing GD (Johansson et al. 2009). This discrepancy between results could be explained by the age of GD onset, which has been shown to be relevant in the prognosis of GD (Jiménez-Murcia et al. 2015). As such, an older patient with an earlier onset of gambling problems is more likely to present higher GD severity, with this protracted behavior being more likely to lead to greater disturbances in the patient's personal life, as well as greater comorbidity (Burge et al. 2004; Tse et al. 2013). A clear distinction can be found in the case of older individuals who

begin gambling later in life as a result of age-specific stressors (e.g. retirement, the loss of loved ones). These individuals tend to use gambling as a means to escape negative emotions but do not display high impulsivity levels or novelty seeking to the same extent as younger gamblers (Clarke 2008).

There is a paucity of studies linking GD with punishment and reward sensitivity, and personality traits such as novelty seeking and harm avoidance. Even so, it has been established in other populations that harm avoidance is predictive of BIS whereas novelty seeking is predictive of BAS (Mardaga and Hansenne 2007). In the same vein, our SEM found both a direct and indirect association between higher novelty seeking scores and GD severity. While some studies have found no correlation between punishment sensitivity and GD severity (O'Connor et al. 2009), our results showed that both harm avoidance and punishment sensitivity were linked to higher gambling levels. Nonetheless, other studies have postulated that a certain degree sensitivity to punishment could have a protective role in the development of addictive behaviors, such as alcohol use (Jonker et al. 2014). Interpretation of this finding should take into consideration the fact that distinct GD profiles have previously been described, and that these could be explained by our SEM model. One profile could be described as being more novelty seeking, more impulsive, and as using gambling for the sake of immediate reward, whereas the other profile uses gambling as a coping strategy and presents higher harm avoidance traits (Moragas et al. 2015).

While this study has its strengths, there are some caveats that should be highlighted. Despite the large size of our study sample, women were still less represented than men (as is usual in clinical GD samples), meaning that some gender differences may not have been detected due to a lack of statistical power. In addition, all data used in this study were collected from individuals who were voluntarily attending GD treatment services, and for this reason, the generalizability of our results to community populations should be tested in future studies. Finally, given that previous literature has described the existence of unique GD phenotypes, associations of overall punishment and reward sensitivity scores with clinical variables may be unable to entirely describe these differences. Future research should investigate other possible mechanisms contributing to these relationships.

In conclusion, the SPSRQ has the potential to become a helpful tool for better understanding the motivational phenotypes of gambling disorder and their interwoven psychopathological and psychosocial factors. Future research should examine whether this instrument can be applied for the early detection of gambling problems, or even GD, as well as for distinguishing different GD patient clusters while taking personality, psychopathological and sociodemographic variables into account. The creation of such profiles could potentially strengthen preventative interventions and aid in personalizing treatment interventions.

Ethical approval

All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards.

References

Abbott, M. W., Williams, M. M., & Volberg, R. A. (2004). A prospective study of problem and regular nonproblem gamblers living in the community. *Substance use & misuse*, *39*(6), 855–84.

Alloy, L. B., Bender, R. E., Whitehouse, W. G., Wagner, C. a, Liu, R. T., Grant, D. a, et al. (2012). High Behavioral Approach System (BAS) sensitivity, reward responsiveness, and goal-striving predict first onset of bipolar spectrum disorders: a prospective behavioral high-risk design. *Journal of abnormal psychology*, *121*(2), 339–51. doi:10.1037/a0025877

Alvarez-Moya, E. M., Jiménez-Murcia, S., Aymamí, M. N., Gómez-Peña, M., Granero, R., Santamaría, J., et al. (2010). Subtyping study of a pathological gamblers sample. *Canadian journal of psychiatry. Revue canadienne de psychiatrie*, *55*(8), 498–506.

American Psychiatric Association. (2000). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition, Text Revision (DSM-IV-TR)*. *Text* (Vol. 1). doi:10.1176/appi.books.9780890423349

American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition*. *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders 4th edition TR*.

Ariyabuddhiphongs, V. (2011). Older Adults and Gambling: A Review. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*, *10*(2), 297–308. doi:10.1007/s11469-011-9325-6

Balodis, S. R. S., Thomas, A. C., & Moore, S. M. (2014). Sensitivity to reward and punishment: Horse race and EGM gamblers compared. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *56*(1), 29–33. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2013.08.015

Becoña, E. (2009). Spain. In G. Meyer, T. Hayer, & M. Griffiths (Eds.), *Problem gambling in Europe. Challenges, prevention, and interventions.* (Springer., pp. 281–298). New York.

Bentler, P. M. (1990). Comparative fit indexes in structural models. *Psychological Bulletin*, *107*(2), 238–246. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.107.2.238

Blaszczynski, A., & Nower, L. (2002). A pathways model of problem and pathological gambling. *Addiction (Abingdon, England)*, *97*(5), 487–99.

Blinn-Pike, L., Worthy, S. L., & Jonkman, J. N. (2010). Adolescent gambling: a review of an emerging field of research. *The Journal of adolescent health : official publication of the Society for Adolescent Medicine*, *47*(3),

223–36. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2010.05.003

Boog, M., Goudriaan, A. E., van de Wetering, B. J. M., Deuss, H., & Franken, I. H. a. (2013). The concepts of rash impulsiveness and reward sensitivity in substance use disorders. *European addiction research*, *19*(5), 261–8. doi:10.1159/000346178

Burge, A. N., Pietrzak, R. H., Molina, C. A., & Petry, N. M. (2004). Age of gambling initiation and severity of gambling and health problems among older adult problem gamblers. *Psychiatric services (Washington, D.C.)*, *55*(12), 1437–9. doi:10.1176/appi.ps.55.12.1437

Clarke, D. (2008). Older adults' gambling motivation and problem gambling: a comparative study. *Journal of gambling studies / co-sponsored by the National Council on Problem Gambling and Institute for the Study of Gambling and Commercial Gaming*, *24*(2), 175–92. doi:10.1007/s10899-008-9090-z

Cloninger, C. R. (1999). *The temperament and character inventory-revised.* (Center for.). St. Louis, MO.

Corr, P. J., & Poropat, A. E. (2016). Personality assessment and theory. In *The Wiley Handbook of Personality Assessment* (Wiley.). London.

Cunningham-Williams, R. M., Cottler, L. B., Compton, W. M., & Spitznagel, E. L. (1998). Taking chances: problem gamblers and mental health disorders--results from the St. Louis Epidemiologic Catchment Area Study. *American journal of public health*, *88*(7), 1093–6.

Derogatis, L. (1994). *SCL-90-R. Cuestionario de 90 síntomas. [SCL-90-R. 90-Symptoms Questionnaire]* (TEA Edicio.). Madrid.

Dissabandara, L. O., Loxton, N. J., Dias, S. R., Dodd, P. R., Daglish, M., & Stadlin, A. (2014). Dependent heroin use and associated risky behaviour: The role of rash impulsiveness and reward sensitivity. *Addictive Behaviors*, *39*(1), 71–76. doi:10.1016/j.addbeh.2013.06.009

Dong, G., Hu, Y., & Lin, X. (2013). Reward/punishment sensitivities among internet addicts: Implications for their addictive behaviors. *Progress in neuro-psychopharmacology & biological psychiatry*, *46*, 139–45. doi:10.1016/j.pnpbp.2013.07.007

Echeburúa, E., Báez, C., Fernández, J., & Páez, D. (1994). Cuestionario de juego patológico de South Oaks (SOGS): Validación española. [South Oaks Gambling Screen (SOGS): Spanish validation]. *Análisis Modific Cond*, (20), 769–91.

Farmer, R. F., Nash, H. M., & Field, C. E. (2002). Disordered eating behaviors and reward sensitivity. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry*, *32*(4), 211–219. doi:10.1016/S0005-7916(01)00036-2

Fattore, L., Melis, M., Fadda, P., & Fratta, W. (2014). Sex differences in addictive disorders. *Frontiers in neuroendocrinology*, *35*(3), 272–84. doi:10.1016/j.yfrne.2014.04.003

Franken, I. H. a, & Muris, P. (2006). BIS/BAS personality characteristics and college students' substance use. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *40*(7), 1497–1503. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2005.12.005

Gaher, R. M., Hahn, A. M., Shishido, H., Simons, J. S., & Gaster, S. (2015). Associations between sensitivity to punishment, sensitivity to reward, and gambling. *Addictive behaviors*, *42*, 180–4. doi:10.1016/j.addbeh.2014.11.014

González de Rivera, J. (2001). *Versión Española del 90 Symptoms Check List Revised (SCL-90-R)* (TEA edicio.). Madrid.

Granero, R., Penelo, E., Martínez-Giménez, R., Alvarez-Moya, E., Gómez-Peña, M., Aymamí, M. N., et al. Sex differences among treatment-seeking adult pathologic gamblers. *Comprehensive psychiatry*, *50*(2), 173–80. doi:10.1016/j.comppsych.2008.07.005

Granero, R., Penelo, E., Stinchfield, R., Fernández-Aranda, F., Aymamí, N., Gómez-Peña, M., et al. (2014). Contribution of illegal acts to pathological gambling diagnosis: DSM-5 implications. *Journal of addictive diseases*, *33*(1), 41–52. doi:10.1080/10550887.2014.882730

Granero, R., Penelo, E., Stinchfield, R., Fernandez-Aranda, F., Savvidou, L. G., Fröberg, F., et al. (2014). Is pathological gambling moderated by age? *Journal of gambling studies / co-sponsored by the National Council on Problem Gambling and Institute for the Study of Gambling and Commercial Gaming*, *30*(2), 475–92. doi:10.1007/s10899-013-9369-6

Gray, J. A. (1970). The psychophysiological basis of introversion-extraversion. *Behaviour research and therapy*, *8*(3), 249–266. doi:10.1016/0005-7967(70)90069-0

Gray, J. A. (1982). *The neuropsychology of anxiety: An inquiry into the functions of the septal–hippocampal system.* (Oxford Uni.). Oxford.

Gray, J., & McNaughton, N. (2000). *The neuropsychology of anxiety: An enquiry into the functions of the septo-hippocampal system (2nd ed.)* (Oxford Uni.). Oxford, England.

Gupta, R., & Derevensky, J. L. (1998). Adolescent Gambling Behavior: A Prevalence Study and Examination of the Correlates Associated with Problem Gambling. *Journal of gambling studies / co-sponsored by the National Council on Problem Gambling and Institute for the Study of Gambling and Commercial Gaming*, *14*(4), 319–345.

Gutiérrez-Zotes, J., Bayón, C., Montserrat, C., Valero, J., Labad, A., Cloninger, C., & Fernández-Aranda, F. (2004). Temperament and Character Inventory Revised (TCI-R). Standardization and normative data in a general population sample. *Actas Españolas de Psiquiatria*, (32), 8–15.

Hundt, N. E., Brown, L. H., Kimbrel, N. A., Walsh, M. A., Nelson-Gray, R., & Kwapil, T. R. (2013). Reinforcement sensitivity theory predicts positive and negative affect in daily life. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *54*(3),

350–354. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2012.09.021

Janiri, L., Martinotti, G., Dario, T., Schifano, F., & Bria, P. (2007). The Gamblers' Temperament and Character Inventory (TCI) personality profile. *Substance use & misuse*, *42*(6), 975–984. doi:10.1080/10826080701202445

Janssen, L. K., Sescousse, G., Hashemi, M. M., Timmer, M. H. M., Ter Huurne, N. P., Geurts, D. E. M., & Cools, R. (2015). Abnormal modulation of reward versus punishment learning by a dopamine D2-receptor antagonist in pathological gamblers. *Psychopharmacology*, *232*(18), 3345–53. doi:10.1007/s00213-015-3986-y

Jiménez-Murcia, S., Álvarez-Moya, E. M., Granero, R., Neus Aymami, M., Gómez-Peña, M., Jaurrieta, N., et al. (2007). Cognitive–behavioral group treatment for pathological gambling: analysis of effectiveness and predictors of therapy outcome. *Psychotherapy Research*. doi:10.1080/10503300601158822

Jiménez-Murcia, S., Alvarez-Moya, E. M., Stinchfield, R., Fernández-Aranda, F., Granero, R., Aymamí, N., et al. (2010). Age of onset in pathological gambling: clinical, therapeutic and personality correlates. *Journal of gambling studies / co-sponsored by the National Council on Problem Gambling and Institute for the Study of Gambling and Commercial Gaming*, *26*(2), 235–48. doi:10.1007/s10899-009-9175-3

Jiménez-Murcia, S., Aymamí-Sanromà, M., Gómez-Peña, M., Álvarez-Moya, E., & Vallejo, J. (2006). *Protocols de tractament cognitivoconductual pel joc patològic i d'altres addiccions no tòxiques.* (Hospital U.). Barcelona, Spain.

Jiménez-Murcia, S., Granero, R., Moragas, L., Steiger, H., Israel, M., Aymamí, N., et al. (2015). Differences and similarities between bulimia nervosa, compulsive buying and gambling disorder. *European eating disorders review : the journal of the Eating Disorders Association*, *23*(2), 111–8. doi:10.1002/erv.2340

Jiménez-Murcia, S., Granero, R., Stinchfield, R., Fernández-Aranda, F., Penelo, E., Savvidou, L. G., et al. (2013). Typologies of young pathological gamblers based on sociodemographic and clinical characteristics. *Comprehensive psychiatry*, *54*(8), 1153–60. doi:10.1016/j.comppsych.2013.05.017

Johansson, A., Grant, J. E., Kim, S. W., Odlaug, B. L., & Götestam, K. G. (2009). Risk factors for problematic gambling: a critical literature review. *Journal of gambling studies / co-sponsored by the National Council on Problem Gambling and Institute for the Study of Gambling and Commercial Gaming*, *25*(1), 67–92. doi:10.1007/s10899-008-9088-6

Jonker, N. C., Ostafin, B. D., Glashouwer, K. A., van Hemel-Ruiter, M. E., & de Jong, P. J. (2014). Reward and punishment sensitivity and alcohol use: the moderating role of executive control. *Addictive behaviors*, *39*(5), 945–8. doi:10.1016/j.addbeh.2013.12.011

Kessler, R. C., Hwang, I., LaBrie, R., Petukhova, M., Sampson, N. A., Winters, K. C., & Shaffer, H. J. (2008). DSM-IV pathological gambling in the National Comorbidity Survey Replication. *Psychological medicine*, *38*(9), 1351–60.

doi:10.1017/S0033291708002900

Lawrence, L. M., Ciorciari, J., & Kyrios, M. (2014). Relationships that compulsive buying has with addiction, obsessive-compulsiveness, hoarding, and depression. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, *55*(5), 1137–1145. doi:10.1016/j.comppsych.2014.03.005

Ledgerwood, D. M., & Petry, N. M. (2010). Subtyping pathological gamblers based on impulsivity, depression, and anxiety. *Psychology of addictive behaviors : journal of the Society of Psychologists in Addictive Behaviors*, *24*(4), 680–8. doi:10.1037/a0019906

Lesieur, H. R., & Blume, S. B. (1987). The South Oaks Gambling Screen (SOGS): a new instrument for the identification of pathological gamblers. *The American journal of psychiatry*, *144*(9), 1184–8.

Lobo, D. S. S., Quilty, L. C., Martins, S. S., Tavares, H., Vallada, H., Kennedy, J. L., & Bagby, R. M. (2014). Pathological gambling subtypes: A comparison of treatment-seeking and non-treatment-seeking samples from Brazil and Canada. *Addictive Behaviors*, *39*(7), 1172–1175. doi:10.1016/j.addbeh.2014.03.006

Loxton, N. J., & Dawe, S. (2001). Alcohol abuse and dysfunctional eating in adolescent girls: the influence of individual differences in sensitivity to reward and punishment. *The International journal of eating disorders*, *29*(4), 455–62.

Loxton, N. J., Nguyen, D., Casey, L., & Dawe, S. (2008). Reward drive, rash impulsivity and punishment sensitivity in problem gamblers. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *45*(2), 167–173. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2008.03.017

Mackillop, J., Miller, J. D., Fortune, E., Maples, J., Lance, C. E., Campbell, W. K., & Goodie, A. S. (2014). Multidimensional examination of impulsivity in relation to disordered gambling. *Experimental and clinical psychopharmacology*, *22*(2), 176–85. doi:10.1037/a0035874

MacLaren, V., Ellery, M., & Knoll, T. (2015). Abnormal modulation of reward versus punishment learning by a dopamine D2-receptor antagonist in pathological gamblers. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *73*, 24–28.

Mardaga, S., & Hansenne, M. (2007). Relationships between Cloninger's biosocial model of personality and the behavioral inhibition/approach systems (BIS/BAS). *Personality and Individual Differences*, *42*, 715–722.

Martínez, J. (1999). *Validación de los cuestionarios breves: AUDIT, CAGE y CBA, para la detección de los problemas relacionados con el consumo de bebidas alcohólicas en atención primaria.* (Consejería.). Sevilla.

McNaughton, N., & Corr, P. J. (2004). A two-dimensional neuropsychology of defense: fear/anxiety and defensive distance. *Neuroscience and biobehavioral reviews*, *28*(3), 285–305. doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2004.03.005

McNaughton, N., & Corr, P. J. (2008). The neuropsychology of fear and anxiety: A foundation for reinforcement sensitivity theory. In *The Reinforcement Sensitivity Theory of Personality* (Cambridge ., pp. 44–94). Cambridge.

Moragas, L., Granero, R., Stinchfield, R., Fernández-Aranda, F., Fröberg, F., Aymamí, N., et al. (2015). Comparative

analysis of distinct phenotypes in gambling disorder based on gambling preferences. *BMC psychiatry*, *15*, 86. doi:10.1186/s12888-015-0459-0

O'Connor, R. M., Stewart, S. H., & Watt, M. C. (2009). Distinguishing BAS risk for university students' drinking, smoking, and gambling behaviors. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *46*(4), 514–519. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2008.12.002

Planzer, S., Gray, H. M., & Shaffer, H. J. (2014). Associations between national gambling policies and disordered gambling prevalence rates within Europe. *International journal of law and psychiatry*, *37*(2), 217–29. doi:10.1016/j.ijlp.2013.11.002

Potenza, M. N. (2013). Neurobiology of gambling behaviors. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology*, *23*(4), 660–667. doi:10.1016/j.conb.2013.03.004

Quester, S., & Romanczuk-Seiferth, N. (2014). Brain Imaging in Gambling Disorder. *Current addiction reports, 2(3)*. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/?term=Brain+Imaging+in+Gambling+Disorder.+Current+addiction+reports. Accessed 7 September 2015

Saunders, J. B., Aasland, O. G., Babor, T. F., de la Fuente, J. R., & Grant, M. (1993). Development of the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT): WHO Collaborative Project on Early Detection of Persons with Harmful Alcohol Consumption--II. *Addiction (Abingdon, England)*, *88*(6), 791–804.

Shenassa, E. D., Paradis, A. D., Dolan, S. L., Wilhelm, C. S., & Buka, S. L. (2012). Childhood impulsive behavior and problem gambling by adulthood: a 30-year prospective community-based study. *Addiction (Abingdon, England)*, *107*(1), 160–8. doi:10.1111/j.1360-0443.2011.03571.x

Simes, R. J. (1986). An improved bonferroni procedure for multiple tests of significance. *Biometrika*, *73*(3), 751–754. doi:10.1093/biomet/73.3.751

Slutske, W. S., Moffitt, T. E., Poulton, R., & Caspi, a. (2012). Undercontrolled Temperament at Age 3 Predicts Disordered Gambling at Age 32: A Longitudinal Study of a Complete Birth Cohort. *Psychological Science*, *23*(5), 510–516. doi:10.1177/0956797611429708

Smith, D., Battersby, M., & Harvey, P. (2015). Does gender moderate the subjective measurement and structural paths in behavioural and cognitive aspects of gambling disorder in treatment-seeking adults? *Addictive behaviors*, *48*, 12–8. doi:10.1016/j.addbeh.2015.04.001

Subramaniam, M., Wang, P., Soh, P., Vaingankar, J. A., Chong, S. A., Browning, C. J., & Thomas, S. A. (2015). Prevalence and determinants of gambling disorder among older adults: a systematic review. *Addictive behaviors*, *41*, 199–209. doi:10.1016/j.addbeh.2014.10.007

Suomi, A., Dowling, N. A., & Jackson, A. C. (2014). Problem gambling subtypes based on psychological distress,

alcohol abuse and impulsivity. *Addictive behaviors*, *39*(12), 1741–5. doi:10.1016/j.addbeh.2014.07.023

Sztainert, T., Wohl, M. J. A., McManus, J. F., & Stead, J. D. H. (2014). On being attracted to the possibility of a win: reward sensitivity (via gambling motives) undermines treatment seeking among pathological gamblers. *Journal of gambling studies / co-sponsored by the National Council on Problem Gambling and Institute for the Study of Gambling and Commercial Gaming*, *30*(4), 901–11. doi:10.1007/s10899-013-9394-5

Torrubia, R., Ávila, C., Moltó, J., & Caseras, X. (2001). The Sensitivity to Punishment and Sensitivity to Reward Questionnaire (SPSRQ) as a measure of Gray's anxiety and impulsivity dimensions. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *31*(6), 837–862. doi:10.1016/S0191-8869(00)00183-5

Torrubia, R., & Tobeña, A. (1984). A scale for the assessment of "susceptibility to punishment" as a measure of anxiety: preliminary results. *Personality and Individual Differences*. doi:10.1016/0191-8869(84)90078-3

Tse, S., Hong, S.-I., & Ng, K.-L. (2013). Estimating the prevalence of problem gambling among older adults in Singapore. *Psychiatry research*, *210*(2), 607–11. doi:10.1016/j.psychres.2013.06.017

Tse, S., Hong, S.-I., Wang, C.-W., & Cunningham-Williams, R. M. (2012). Gambling behavior and problems among older adults: a systematic review of empirical studies. *The journals of gerontology. Series B, Psychological sciences and social sciences*, *67*(5), 639–52. doi:10.1093/geronb/gbs068

van Hemel-Ruiter, M. E., de Jong, P. J., Ostafin, B. D., & Wiers, R. W. (2015). Reward sensitivity, attentional bias, and executive control in early adolescent alcohol use. *Addictive behaviors*, *40*, 84–90. doi:10.1016/j.addbeh.2014.09.004

van Holst, R. J., van den Brink, W., Veltman, D. J., & Goudriaan, A. E. (2010). Brain imaging studies in pathological gambling. *Current psychiatry reports*, *12*(5), 418–25. doi:10.1007/s11920-010-0141-7

Voigt, D. C., Dillard, J. P., Braddock, K. H., Anderson, J. W., Sopory, P., & Stephenson, M. T. (2009). BIS/BAS scales and their relationship to risky health behaviours. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *47*(2), 89–93.

von Oertzen, T. (2010). Power equivalence in structural equation modelling. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, *63*(2), 257–272. doi:10.1348/000711009X441021

Wardell, J. D., O'Connor, R. M., Read, J. P., & Colder, C. R. (2011). Behavioral approach system moderates the prospective association between the behavioral inhibition system and alcohol outcomes in college students. *Journal of studies on alcohol and drugs*, *72*(6), 1028–36.

Wardell, J. D., Quilty, L. C., Hendershot, C. S., & Bagby, R. M. (2015). Motivational pathways from reward sensitivity and punishment sensitivity to gambling frequency and gambling-related problems. *Psychology of addictive behaviors : journal of the Society of Psychologists in Addictive Behaviors*, *29*(4), 1022–30.

Welte, J. W., Barnes, G. M., Wieczorek, W. F., Tidwell, M.-C., & Parker, J. (2002). Gambling participation in the U.S.-

-results from a national survey. *Journal of gambling studies / co-sponsored by the National Council on Problem Gambling and Institute for the Study of Gambling and Commercial Gaming*, *18*(4), 313–37.

Williams, A. D., Grisham, J. R., Erskine, A., & Cassedy, E. (2012). Deficits in emotion regulation associated with pathological gambling. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *51*, 223–238. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8260.2011.02022.x

Tables

Table 1. Sample demographics and descriptives (N=831).

Age (years-old); *mean (SD)*		42.49	(13.1)
Age of onset (years-old); *mean (SD)*		37.89	(14.1)
Gender; *n(%)*	*Males*	760	(91.5%)
	Females	71	(8.5%)
Origin; *n(%)*	*Spain*	787	(94.7%)
	Other	44	(5.3%)
Education level; *n(%)*	*Primary*	476	(57.3%)
	Secondary	286	(34.4%)
	University	69	(8.3%)
Civil status; *n(%)*	*Single*	345	(41.5%)
	Married - together	376	(45.2%)
	Divorced - separated	110	(13.2%)
Employment status; *n(%)*	*Employed*	396	(47.7%)
Previous consultations due to GD; *n(%)*		166	(20.0%)
Tobacco use; *n(%)*		498	(59.9%)
Number of cigarettes/day; *mean (SD)*		11.2	(12.3)
Alcohol use; *n(%)*	*Low*	687	(82.7%)
	Abuse	132	(15.9%)
	Risk of dependence	12	(1.4%)
Other substance use; *n(%)*		77	(9.3%)

SD: standard deviation. GD: Gambling Disorder

Table 2. Prevalence (%) of participants into clinical ranges for sensitivity to punishment and sensitivity to reward.

| | Total | Sex | | | | Age groups (years-old) | | | | |
| | | Female | Male | | | 18-35 | 36-55 | 55-70 | | |
	$N=831$	$n=71$	$n=760$	$\chi^2(df=2)$	p	$n=254$	$n=421$	$n=156$	$\chi^2(df=4)$	p
Punishment										
Normal	76.8	60.6	78.3	15.74	<.001	84.3	72.7	75.6	15.48	.004
Subclinical	19.1	28.2	18.3			13.8	21.4	21.8		
Clinical	4.1	11.3	3.4			2.0	5.9	2.6		
Reward										
Normal	75.5	45.1	78.3	51.68	<.001	83.9	70.5	75.0	15.55	.003
Subclinical	16.2	26.8	15.3			11.4	19.2	16.0		
Clinical	8.3	28.2	6.4			4.7	10.2	9.0		

Clinical ranges: normal = T-score under 60, subclinical = T-score between 60 and 70, clinical = T-score above 70.

22

Table 3. ANOVA comparison of clinical variables based on sensitivity to punishment, sensitivity to reward, and clinical group.

	Sensitivity to punishment					Sensitivity to reward				
	Means (adjusted)			*Polynomial trends (*p*)		Means (adjusted)			*Polynomial trends (*p*)	
	Normal	Subclin.	Clinical	Linear	Quadr.	Normal	Subclin.	Clinical	Linear	Quadr.
	n=638	*n*=159	*n*=34			*n*=627	*n*=135	*n*=69		
Number total of gamblers	1.52	1.48	1.28	.487	.834	1.51	1.56	1.30	.309	.448
Maximum bets (euros)	1280.6	781.6	1404.9	.907	.834	1289.4	706.1	1235.8	.907	.532
Mean bets (euros)	155.3	95.0	96.4	.907	.845	156.5	88.1	108.6	.815	.728
Cumulate debts (euros)	13719.9	6462.1	7276.7	.907	.845	13746.7	7507.7	5731.2	.815	.847
Alcohol (AUDIT: total)	4.19	4.16	5.33	.211	.325	4.20	4.00	5.00	.264	.297
SOGS: total score	9.72	11.15	11.14	**.016**	.128	9.68	11.41	10.76	**.012**	**.002**
DSM-5: total criteria	6.58	7.41	7.74	**.002**	.330	6.54	7.50	7.62	**.001**	.065
SCL-90: Somatization	0.85	1.37	1.80	**<.001**	.656	0.83	1.42	1.56	**<.001**	**.020**
SCL-90: Obsess./compulsive	1.01	1.69	2.12	**<.001**	.274	1.00	1.67	1.94	**<.001**	**.028**
SCL-90: Interp. sensitivity	0.90	1.71	2.15	**<.001**	.116	0.89	1.67	2.03	**<.001**	**.028**
SCL-90: Depressive	1.44	2.05	2.48	**<.001**	.424	1.42	2.06	2.30	**<.001**	**.044**
SCL-90: Anxiety	0.91	1.61	1.87	**<.001**	.116	0.90	1.62	1.77	**<.001**	**.010**
SCL-90: Hostility	0.85	1.32	1.27	**.007**	.113	0.85	1.33	1.27	**<.001**	**.014**
SCL-90: Phobic anxiety	0.39	0.95	1.55	**<.001**	.736	0.39	0.88	1.37	**<.001**	.977
SCL-90: Paranoid Ideation	0.88	1.38	1.60	**<.001**	.227	0.86	1.37	1.54	**<.001**	.058
SCL-90: Psychotic	0.82	1.44	1.69	**<.001**	.116	0.81	1.42	1.63	**<.001**	**.028**
SCL-90: GSI score	0.97	1.58	1.94	**<.001**	.206	0.95	1.58	1.80	**<.001**	**.020**
SCL-90: PST score	44.40	62.31	69.10	**<.001**	.116	44.13	61.82	66.38	**<.001**	**.014**
SCL-90: PSDI score	1.81	2.19	2.40	**<.001**	.335	1.80	2.21	2.30	**<.001**	**.028**
TCI-R: Novelty seeking	108.9	109.4	104.4	.081	.362	109.0	109.1	107.1	.325	.675
TCI-R: Harm avoidance	98.2	113.8	122.4	**<.001**	.362	97.9	113.7	118.8	**<.001**	**.007**
TCI-R: Reward dependence	99.9	97.2	94.8	**.050**	.960	100.0	97.3	95.7	**.030**	.768
TCI-R: Persistence	108.1	108.4	107.1	.808	.873	108.3	108.3	106.1	.457	.768
TCI-R: Self-directedness	132.4	118.0	111.8	**<.001**	.362	132.8	118.4	113.2	**<.001**	.121
TCI-R: Cooperativeness	133.5	127.3	126.8	**.049**	.362	133.6	126.9	127.9	**.023**	.121
TCI-R: Self-Transcendence	61.7	65.5	69.6	**.008**	.960	61.8	64.9	67.7	**.006**	.931

**p-values* includes the Bonferroni-Simes correction for multiple statistical comparisons. Bold: significant contrast.

Results adjusted for sex and age covariates.

Table 4. Association of sensitivity to reward and sensitivity to punishment levels with clinical variables (N=831).

	Punishment	Reward
Number total of gamblers	-.02	.09
Maximum bets (euros)	-.03	-.01
Mean bets (euros)	-.04	-.01
Cumulate debts (euros)	.00	.07
Alcohol use-abuse (AUDIT: total)	.06	.13
SOGS: total score	.19	**.35**
DSM-5: total criteria	.26	**.36**
SCL-90: Somatization	**.35**	.22
SCL-90: Obsess./compulsive	**.45**	**.30**
SCL-90: Interp. sensitivity	**.51**	**.30**
SCL-90: Depressive	**.43**	**.30**
SCL-90: Anxiety	**.44**	**.30**
SCL-90: Hostility	**.30**	**.30**
SCL-90: Phobic anxiety	**.43**	.20
SCL-90: Paranoid Ideation	**.36**	**.34**
SCL-90: Psychotic	**.43**	**.30**
SCL-90: GSI score	**.48**	**.31**
SCL-90: PST score	**.48**	**.33**
SCL-90: PSDI score	**.35**	.26
TCI-R: Novelty seeking	-.05	**.35**
TCI-R: Harm avoidance	**.60**	.04
TCI-R: Reward dependence	-.18	.03
TCI-R: Persistence	-.07	.27
TCI-R: Self-directedness	**-.47**	**-.42**
TCI-R: Cooperativeness	-.24	**-.33**
TCI-R: Self-Transcendence	.15	.28

Bold: good effect size ($|R|>.30$). Partial correlation adjusted for sex and age covariates.

Figures

Fig. 1. Structural equation model.

Standardized coefficients obtained from the mediational model for TCI-R personality traits, SPSRQ raw scores and gambling severity (SEM results adjusted for sex and age covariates). Continuous line: significant coefficient. Dashed line: non-significant coefficient (N=831).

Table S1 (supplementary). Descriptives for the clinical variables of the study (*n*=831).

	Mean	SD
Sensitivity to punishment	11.89	5.60
Sensitivity to reward	11.30	4.96
Number total of gamblers	1.50	0.94
Maximum bets (euros)	1190.2	5184.2
Mean bets (euros)	141.4	844.1
Cumulate debts (euros)	12067.6	107967.2
Alcohol (AUDIT: total)	4.24	4.83
SOGS: total score	10.05	3.33
DSM-5: total criteria	6.78	2.12
SCL-90: Somatization	0.99	0.85
SCL-90: Obsess./compulsive	1.19	0.87
SCL-90: Interp. sensitivity	1.11	0.88
SCL-90: Depressive	1.60	0.93
SCL-90: Anxiety	1.09	0.87
SCL-90: Hostility	0.96	0.88
SCL-90: Phobic anxiety	0.55	0.76
SCL-90: Paranoid Ideation	1.00	0.83
SCL-90: Psychotic	0.98	0.80
SCL-90: GSI score	1.13	0.75
SCL-90: PST score	48.88	21.71
SCL-90: PSDI score	1.91	0.62
TCI-R: Novelty seeking	108.85	13.90
TCI-R: Harm avoidance	102.19	16.85
TCI-R: Reward dependence	99.19	14.24
TCI-R: Persistence	108.11	21.83
TCI-R: Self-directedness	128.79	21.22
TCI-R: Cooperativeness	132.00	17.38
TCI-R: Self-Transcendence	62.78	15.12

SD: standard deviation.

Table S2 (supplementary). Correlation matrix for the variables considered in the SEM.

		2		3		4		5	
		R	*p*	R	*p*	R	*p*	R	*p*
1	Sensitivity to punishment	.271	<.001	.247	<.001	-.081	.022	.610	<.001
2	Sensitivity to reward			.368	<.001	.378	<.001	.015	.665
3	DSM-5: total criteria					.335	<.001	.221	<.001
4	TCI-R: Novelty seeking							-.090	.011
5	TCI-R: Harm avoidance								