medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Is There a Health Inequality in Gambling Related Harms? A Systematic Review

Raybould, J. N

Larkin, M

Tunney, R. J

School of Psychology, Aston University, Birmingham, UK

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

ABSTRACT

Objective: Here we present a systematic review of the existing research into gambling harms, in order to determine whether there are differences in the presentation of these across demographic groups such as age, gender, culture, and socioeconomic status, or gambling behaviour categories such as risk severity and play frequency.

Primary and Secondary Outcome Measures: Inclusion criteria were: 1) focus on gambling harms; 2) focus on harms to the gambler rather than affected others; 3) discussion of specific listed harms and not just harms in general terms. Exclusion criteria were: 1) not written in English; 2) not an empirical study (i.e. an editorial piece or letter); 3) not available as a full article.

Search: A systematic search was conducted using the Web of Science database in August 2019. Selected studies were assessed for quality using Standard Quality Assessment Criteria.

Results: Forty-Seven studies published between 2006 and 2019 met the inclusion criteria. These were categorised into thematic groups for comparison and discussion. There were replicated differences found in groups defined by age, risk severity and gambling behaviours. However, the majority of research regarding gender concluded that harm profiles were similar, or differences could be explained by confounding variables.

Conclusion: Harms appear to be dependent on specific social, demographic and environmental conditions that suggests there is a health inequality in gambling related harms. Further investigation is required to develop standardised measurement tools and to understand confounding variables and co-morbidities. With a robust understanding of harms distribution in the population, Primary Care Workers will be better equipped to identify those who are at risk, or who are showing signs of Gambling Disorder, and to target prevention and intervention programmes appropriately.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Keywords

Gambling, Gambling Disorder, Problem Gambling, Pathological Gambling, Harms, Gambling Harms, Harms Measures, Health Inequality, Risk Severity, Age, Gender, Culture, Gambling Behaviour, Online Gambling, Socioeconomic Status

INTRODUCTION

In recent years there has been an increase in gambling participation [1] and we predict that the harms resulting from gambling behaviour are not distributed evenly amongst the population. This would suggest that there is a health inequality that needs to be addressed, and therefore in conducting this review we aim to identify which individuals are most at risk, and how harms are likely to present in the general population before the point of clinical diagnosis.

The fifth edition of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-V)[2] introduced Gambling Disorder as a behavioural addiction. This is the first behavioural addiction to be included in the DSM and the condition is an increasing public health concern [3], as new accessible methods of play such as online and mobile gambling have led to an increase in gambling behaviour. For diagnosis using the DSM-V an individual must experience harmful consequences from their behaviour, so understanding the potential harms resulting from gambling is more important than ever.

There have been a number of recent Systematic Reviews completed in the field of gambling, investigating a range of ideas such as the relationship between crime and gambling disorders [4, 5], quality of life measurement tools [6], comorbidity with other conditions [7], impulsivity in gambling [8, 9], or potential interventions and harm minimisation tools [10, 11, 12, 13]. Despite this body of research, and many individual studies investigating specific gambling

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

harms, a systematic review of how harms are distributed across society hasn't yet been done. Although many studies have investigated how harms can be minimised [14, 15, 16], a complete understanding of the disease and its impact on society is dependent on understanding how harms are distributed across the population. If our intuitions are correct then this poses a health inequality that needs to be addressed.

Harms related to gambling behaviour have been found to affect all types of individual, including low and moderate risk, or sub-clinical, gamblers [17, 18, 19]. The National Strategy to Reduce Gambling Harm [20] states "An effective prevention plan must seek to identify the right mix of interventions to be applied at both the population and individual level," and so a thorough understanding of how an individual experiences harm would be beneficial in understanding gambling as a whole and developing effective interventions. It has been suggested that in order to develop effective tools for minimising harm agencies need to consider aggregate harm to individuals, rather than the estimated prevalence of problem gamblers [21]. Current estimates suggest that there are 2 million adults experiencing some level of harm from gambling [1] and a thorough understanding of how harms are presented within these individuals, and within at-risk groups, may help in identifying those at risk and targeting interventions where they are most needed.

Objective

To present a systematic review of the existing research into gambling harms, to determine whether there are differences in the presentation of these across demographic groups such as age, gender, culture, and socioeconomic status, or gambling behaviour categories such as risk severity and play frequency.

METHOD

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Search Strategy

Studies that have explored specific harms and the prevalence of these within a population were identified using a search of records held by Web of Science[22]. The database was searched on 19th August 2019 using the following criteria; (TI= ((gambl* OR problem* gambl*) AND (harm* OR negative impact* OR adverse impact* OR detrimental impact* OR negative ?ffect OR adverse ?ffect OR detrimental ?ffect OR consequences)). This yielded 180 results. Initially the search was conducted within the abstracts of studies, however this yielded 2,283 results and the first two pages of these were not relevant to the review, so a second search was restricted to titles only. Search terms were selected using 'thesaurus.com'[23] and the Oxford English Dictionary Online[24] to identify synonyms and the final criteria was developed through a trial and error process, using each synonym and a combination of Boolean terms until the most successful criteria were identified, in terms of number of studies returned, and relevance of studies returned.

Inclusion Criteria

Studies were included that discussed harms from gambling, discussed harms to the gambler, and discussed or listed a minimum of two identified harms rather than discussing harm minimisation or harms in general terms. For the purpose of this review a clinical diagnosis of Gambling Disorder, or an increased risk of diagnosis as shown by the Problem Gambling Severity Index (PGSI) or South Oaks Gambling Screen (SOGS), was considered a gambling harm.

Exclusion Criteria

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

The 180 results were screened to identify duplicates, and results that were not empirical reports, or were short articles. Letters or editorial pieces were excluded along with any results not available in English. Studies that did not discuss specific harms, did not discuss gambling, only investigated harms to others rather than the gambler, or were not available as a full article were also excluded. This left a total of 47 studies of which 17 were qualitative, 28 were quantitative, and 2 were mixed methods.

Quality Evaluation

Studies were assessed for quality (Figure 1) using the Standard Quality Assessment Criteria [25]. This measures the quality of both quantitative and qualitative research using a series of standardised questions on the key requirements for quality research. Studies which followed a mixed methods approach were evaluated in terms of the most prominent research style. Studies were coded in Excel using the guidelines set out by Kmet, Lee and Cook and coloured using a traffic light system for reviewing.

Data Analysis Plan

Study design, participant number, diagnostic measures, harms measures, groups analysed and funding source were extracted from the studies (Figure 2). The results which described harm distribution were then included and categories were identified for analysis. Studies were divided into these categories for comparison, with several studies providing results for multiple groups, and the results were summarised in brief.

For the purpose of extracting relevant comparable data harms were defined using Langham et al's[26] 73-Item checklist (Figure 3), which identifies 8 domains of harm (Table 1). Delfabbro and King[27] argue that certain items attributed as harms are incorrectly

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

labelled, for example they suggest that chasing losses, gambling to obtain more excitement, or betting above affordable means, are behaviours which lead to harm and not the harms themselves. Schellinck et al[28] also argue that borrowing money is not a harm, but is in fact a predictor for the harms, debt and relationship conflict. For the purpose of this study however, the full proposed taxonomy of harms was analysed.

The risk categories of gambling described by the PGSI and SOGS were also included as a gambling-related harm since the higher scores on these measures may predict risk of clinical diagnosis.

Table 1. Langham et al[26] Taxonomy of Harm Domains

Domain	Items Include but are not Limited to…
Financial Harms	Erosion of Savings
	Bankruptcy
Relationship Disruption, Conflict or Breakdown	Dishonest communication
	Social Isolation
Emotional or Psychological Distress	Distorted cognitions or erroneous beliefs
	Extreme distress
Decrements to Health	Reduced self-care
	Ongoing disability
Cultural Harm	Reduced engagement in cultural rituals
	Extreme cultural shame
Reduced Performance at Work or Study	Tiredness and Distraction
	Loss of Job
Criminal Activity	Vulnerability to illegal activities
	Arrest and/or conviction

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Life-course and Intergenerational Harms	Loss of life-course event i.e. marriage
	Homelessness

Patient and Public Involvement

There was no involvement from the general population or any individual with a Substance Addiction or Behavioural Addiction Disorder in this systematic review.

RESULTS

Search and Selection Results

The database search returned 180 papers for review and 4 of these were excluded as duplicates. Analysis of titles and abstracts led to a further 7 exclusions for not discussing gambling, and 25 exclusions for not discussing harms. The remaining 144 studies were reviewed in full, resulting in 30 studies being excluded for not being empirical reports, or because they were short articles, letters or editorial pieces. Studies discussing only harms to others resulted in 4 exclusions, 7 studies were unobtainable, and 11 studies were not available in English. During the full-text review studies previously thought to discuss harms were removed for briefly mentioning harm and not discussing specifics, this led to 45 more exclusions leaving 47 studies remaining for analysis.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



Figure 4. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis Chart (PRISMA)[29]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

MAIN RESULTS

Description of Included Studies

Of the 47 studies included in this review 13 used interviews, 4 used focus groups, 20 involved surveys and 11 conducted reviews. Of the 11 reviews 3 were systematic, and the remainder were narrative. Secondary data analysis was conducted in 11 of the studies, and 1 study used online forum analysis.

The most common funding bodies for this selection of studies were the Australian Ministry of Social Affairs and Health (8) and the Victorian Responsible Gambling Foundation (7). Colleges and Universities funded 3 studies, research councils and institutes funded 15, and 1 study was funded by Star City Casino in Sydney. Of the remaining 13 studies, 8 received no funding and 5 did not declare their funding status (Table 2).

Table 2. Brief Data Extraction

Study	Design	Results Categories	Funding Body
Anderson, Rempusheski and Leedy (2017)	In-Depth Interview	Other	University of Delaware
Bergh and Kuhlhorn (1994)	Interview and Case Finding	Age and Gender	Commission for Social Research
Binde (2016)	Literature Review and Interviews	Gambling Behaviour and Other	Responsible Gambling Trust UK
Breen (2011)	Interview	Age and Culture	Not Stated
Breen, Hing and Gordon (2010)	Interview and Observations	Age and Culture	Gambling Research Australia
Browne and Rockloff (2018)	Secondary Data Analysis	Risk Severity	Victorian Responsible Gambling Foundation
Browne, Goodwin and Rockloff (2018)	Online Survey	Risk Severity, Age and Gender	Victorian Responsible Gambling Foundation
Browne et al (2019)	Cross-Sectional Online Survey	Age, Gender. Gambling Behaviour and Socioeconomic Status	Alberta Gambling Research Institute
Canale, Vieno and Griffiths (2016)	Secondary Data Analysis	Age, Gender and Gambling Behaviour	None
Castren et al (2018)	Secondary Data Analysis	Age, Gender, Gambling Behaviour and Online vs. Offline Gambling	The Ministry of Social Affairs and Health, Helsinki
Currie et al (2006)	Secondary Data Analysis	Age, Gender, Culture, Gambling Behaviour and	Alberta Gaming Research Institute

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Results Categories	Funding Body
		Socioeconomic Status	
Delfabbro and King (2017)	Review of Current Research	Risk Severity	None
Delfabbro and King (2019)	Review of Current Research	Risk Severity	None
Estevez et al (2015)	Survey	Age	International Contest ONCE of Research on Responsible Gambling
Ferrara, Franceschini and Corsello (2018)	Narrative Review	Age, Gender, Culture, Socioeconomic Status and Other	None
Fulton (2019)	Literature Review and In-Depth Interview	Online vs. Offline Gambling	Irish Research Council (RPG) and Social Protection Research Innovation Awards (SPRIA)
Gainsbury, Abarbanel and Blaszczynski (2017)	Online Survey	Online vs. Offline Gambling	Several gambling industries have funded each researcher but funding for this study is not stated
Goh, Ng and Yeoh (2016)	In-Depth Interview and 4-Point Scale	Gender and Culture	National Council on Problem Gambling Singapore and the Humanities and Social Sciences research grant
Hing et al (2014)	Survey	Culture	Australian Research Council
Hubert and Griffiths (2018)	Online Survey	Age	None
Jeffrey et al (2019)	Retrospective Survey and Secondary Data Analysis	Other	Victorian Responsible Gambling Foundation and New Zealand Ministry of Health
Kolandai-Matchett et al (2017)	Focus Groups	Culture	New Zealand Ministry of Health
Langham et al (2017)	Secondary Data Analysis	Other	Victorian Responsible Gambling Foundation, Grant VRGF1-13
Langham et al (2016)	Literature Review, Focus Group, Interview, and Forum Analyses	Used in Data Analysis Plan	Victorian Responsible Gambling Foundation
Larsen, Curtis and Bjerregaard (2013)	Cross-Sectional Survey	Age and Other	None
Lee, Chung and Bernhard (2014)	Online Survey	Gender, Gambling Behaviour and Socioeconomic Status	Not Stated
Li et al (2017)	Retrospective Study	Risk Severity	Victorian Responsible Gambling Foundation
Lloyd et al (2016)	Online Survey	Risk Severity, Age, Gambling Behaviour and Socioeconomic Status	Responsibility in Gambling Trust and the Economic and Social Research Council
May-Chahal et al (2017)	Cross-Sectional Survey	Other	Economic and Social Research Council
McCarthy et al (2019)	Narrative Review	Gender and Culture	None
Pitt et al (2017)	Semi-Structured Interview	Age	Australian Research Council Discovery Grant on Sports Wagering
Raisamo et al (2013)	Secondary Data Analysis and Survey	Age, Gender and Gambling Behaviour	Finnish Foundation for Alcohol Studies and the Ministry of Social Affairs and Health

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Results Categories	Funding Body
Raisamo et al (2015)	Secondary Data Analysis and Telephone Survey	Risk Severity, Age, Gender and Gambling Behaviour	Ministry of Social Affairs and Health, Helsinki
Rawat et al (2017)	Health State Valuation - Vignettes	Risk Severity	Not Stated
Ricijas, Hundric and Huic (2016)	Survey	Gender	Not Stated
Rintoul, Deblaquiere and Thomas (2017)	Observations, Semi-Structured In-Depth Interviews and Focus Groups	Risk Severity	Commonwealth Government of Australia
Ronzitti et al (2016)	Clinical Interview and Self-Administered Survey	Age and Gambling Behaviour	None
Salonen, Alho and Castren (2017)	Secondary Data Analysis	Gender	Ministry of Social Affairs and Health, Helsinki
Salonen et al (2018)	Secondary Data Analysis and Cross-Sectional Online Survey	Risk Severity and Age	Ministry of Social Affairs and Health - Appropriation of the Lotteries Act
Samuelsson, Sundqvist and Binde (2018)	Semi-Structured Interview	Gambling Behaviour	Public Health Agency of Sweden
Schellinck et al (2015)	Focus Group and Telephone Survey	Risk Severity – Used in Data Analysis Plan	Victoria Gambling Research Panel
Shannon, Anijoul and Blaszczynski (2017)	Literature Review, Case Note Review and Discussion with Professionals	Risk Severity	South Australian Independent Gambling Authority
Skaal et al (2016)	Survey	Risk Severity and Socioeconomic Status	South African National Responsible Gambling Foundation
Splevins et al (2010)	Self-Administered Survey	Gender	Star City Casino
Tu, Gray and Walton (2014)	Secondary Data Analysis and Interview	Socioeconomic Status	Ministry of Health
Wardle et al (2019)	Systematic Rapid Review	Culture	King's College London and London School of Tropical Hygiene and Medicine Interdisciplinary Research Fund
Yani-de-Soriano, Javed and Yousafzai (2012)	Literature Review and Online Survey	Online vs. Offline Gambling	Cardiff Business School, Cardiff University

Risk Severity

Twelve studies include data on risk severity, which is the measure of behaviour that puts someone at risk of developing a problem with gambling or developing Gambling Disorder. Rintoul, Deblaquiere and Thomas[30] found that venues looked for signs of problem gambling behaviour such as ‘shouting at the machine or other people in the venue’, appearing depressed, being withdrawn or emotional, excessive sweating, extended play and continuing

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

to gamble with the winnings. In 34 hours they observed these signs in all venues and concluded that risk factors for the behaviour included multiple machine use at one time and withdrawing money several times at the venue.

In academic research the risk of developing Gambling Disorder is most frequently measured using the Problem Gambling Severity Index (PGSI), a component of the Canadian Problem Gambling Index [31], which categorises an individual as low risk or non-problem (0 score), moderate risk (1-2 score), high risk (3-7 score), or a problem gambler (8+ score). Shannon, Anijoul and Blaszcynski[32] found that the PGSI reliably correlated with 48 indicators of harm. These harm indicators were compiled using data from a scoping literature review, clinical case notes in a treatment setting, and a cohort of seven specialist clinicians.

Many of the studies looking into risk severity are focused on gathering evidence of the Prevention Paradox. This describes a situation where the majority of cases of a disease come from a population at low or moderate risk of that disease. In the case of gambling this means the majority of harms are found within the low to moderate risk gamblers, and the minority is found within high risk or problem gamblers.

In one study the prevalence of harm across non-problem (PGSI), or non-pathological (SOGS), gamblers was twice that of problem gamblers in their participant sample [21]. Browne and Rockloff[18] found that only 10% of financial harms across the study population were in the problem gambling or pathological gambling groups, and that more than 50% of cases where someone sold their belongings to fund their gambling were in recreational or low risk gamblers. In contrast to this they found that more than 50% of social deviance harms are found within problem gamblers, and the remaining categories of harm were evenly distributed across the severity groups.

Evidence of the prevention paradox was found by several other studies [19, 33, 34], though it was also found that the highest severity harms were generally only found in the problem

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

gambling groups, as defined by the PGSI. Skaal et al[35] found psychological distress was only associated with problem gambling and Lloyd et al[36] found that self-harm thoughts were associated with problem gambling. Rawat et al[19] found that problem gamblers show similar disability weights to those of Bipolar Disorder or alcohol dependence, whereas the low risk group show disability weights equal to moderate anxiety. Disability weights are a health-related measure of quality of life using a ratio scale between 0 and 1, representing ideal health and death. These estimates further suggest that although the majority of harms may be found in the lower risk groups, the more severe harms are only prevalent within problem gambling groups.

Li et al[37] found that selling personal items, absence from work or study, reduced performance, poor sleep and extreme distress had the highest correlation with PGSI categories. They also found that reduced spending on essential expenses, absence from work or study, feelings of worthlessness, increased relationship conflict, and feeling like an outcast were the most effective discriminators between the low and high-risk groups.

Shannon, Anijoul and Blaszcynski[32] found that across both a clinical and non-clinical sample the lowest reported harms were substance use, suicide, bankruptcy, and education problems. They found that the distribution of averaged harm scores was consistent across both samples, excluding reduced savings and decreased happiness, suggesting that psychological and financial harms are the most significant. The most common gambling harms found represented negative impacts on general quality of life and psychological well-being, however the mean level of harm for the 15 most common indicators in the community sample was less than one empirically defined unit.

Despite these results there has been some criticism of the PGSI as a measure of gambling behaviour. The Victorian Responsible Gambling Foundation[38] categorises the PGSI groups as non-problem gambling, low risk, moderate risk and problem gambling,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

which is distinctly different to the categories used in these studies. Delfabbro and King[39] argued that harms cannot be confidently attributed to gambling in the low risk group, as some studies consider individuals who score a 0 on the PGSI as low risk, rather than no risk. They also argue that harms are not appropriately scaled, citing that "suicide is not equal to shame," and that when controlling for severity low risk categories show very few harms. However, they did find that in financial harm categories the items they considered as more severe, such as selling belongings, were present in the low risk groups. This may be due to the less affluent socioeconomic status of the low risk category, and that it is hard to confidently attribute these financial harms to gambling.

Age

Eighteen studies include data on age, and several of these found that being younger was associated with a higher risk of experiencing gambling harms [40, 41, 42, 43, 33, 44]. In particular one study found that younger age groups (16-34) were at risk of dependence and social harms [45], however some studies found younger gamblers were less at risk of financial harms [46, 47], despite one suggesting that they spent more [48]. Ferrara, Franceschini and Corsello[43] found that as well as higher rates of what they label "problematic gambling", younger age groups showed a higher comorbidity with other addictions. However, Larsen, Curtis and Bjerregaard[49] found that alcohol use increased with age in lifetime problem gamblers, as defined by the DSM-IV criteria for 'pathological gambling', in opposition to the trend seen in a general population.

Two studies found that age had no impact on harm profiles [21, 34], and Lloyd et al[36] found no association between age and gambling-induced thoughts of self-harm. Pitt et al[46] found that children aged 8-16 showed little or no current harms as they were gambling at

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

home with their families, spending small amounts of pocket money, or betting with activities such as push-ups against family members.

Despite the apparent absence of harms in the youngest age groups children developed false beliefs around gambling, such as that skill can be used to win, or that it is necessary for everyone to try gambling at least once. Children were also found to understand how gambling could gain them money. In Breen[50] it was found that youth who were exposed to gambling at a young age were more likely to gamble later in life to increase their income, and that youth who missed school had reduced lifelong aspirations and reduced opportunities.

Further research is needed to understand the distribution of harms across age groups as it was found by Estevez et al[51] that sensation seeking and impulsivity were high in young gamblers. Anxiety, depression and psychoticism were partially mediated by impulsivity, and somatisation, obsessive-compulsive behaviour, interpersonal sensitivity, paranoid ideation and hostility were perfectly mediated. Hubert and Griffiths[52] found that online gamblers are more likely to be younger, and Bergh and Kuhlhorn[53] found that individuals aged 20-34 gambled for almost twice as long per session compared to participants over 35. Breen, Hing and Gordon[48] discovered that younger gamblers preferred to play poker or other card games, while Ferrara, Franceschini and Corsello[43] found that younger gamblers were more likely to be sports bettors. These additional variables could explain some of the variance in harm presentation and help to target appropriate interventions, as Ferrara, Franceschini and Corsello[43] found that 0.2-12.3% of adolescents in their study met the criteria for a diagnosis of Gambling Disorder depending upon country of residence.

Gender

Fifteen studies examined gender, and few of these found any evidence that harms affected men and women differently [53, 21, 40, 41]. Where differences were found these could be

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

explained by other factors, such as studies that show men have a higher prevalence of harms than women [42, 43, 54], being explained by men gambling more frequently than women and spending more money when gambling [45, 47, 55]. Raisamo et al[33] in particular found that although the prevalence of harms was higher in males, when controlling for frequency of play and amount spent gender was no longer a significant factor. Moreover, Splevins et al[56] found that men started gambling earlier than women and found it more exciting. This led to increased spending and therefore an increased risk of harms such as substance use and interpersonal conflicts.

Despite this some studies have suggested key differences in how gambling harms present between genders. In Singapore, Goh, Ng and Yeoh[57] reported that "tentative evidence… points to the risk of child neglect when the problem gambler is the mother." They also found that verbal abuse was most commonly displayed by males towards their mothers, but no difference was found in cases of physical abuse between genders. McCarthy et al[58] found that women were more likely to report mental health comorbidity than males, however causality is not discussed.

One key study which found an opposing result was Salonen, Alho and Castren[59] who found that while gambling was more common in young males, women displayed an increase in specific harms between 2011 and 2015 where men did not. This particular study also looked at attitudes towards gambling and found that while female attitudes were generally negative over the age of 25, male attitudes were generally positive for all but the 15-17 age range. As the study used self-report survey data these differences in attitude could have impacted how individuals reported harms.

Culture

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Ten studies include data on culture, and these are largely focused on investigating only one group, or comparing indigenous people with migrants to a society. Although direct comparison is not possible given the majority of studies found within this search some estimates, and inferences can be made.

Kolandai-Matchett et al[60] found that Pacific New Zealand people experienced gambling through collectivist cultural values, meaning that additional harm dimensions were present. Some of the listed cultural harms include a loss of belonging or isolation, shame; loss of the community's respect; disruption of trusting relationships; transference of communal responsibilities; and an overall loss of social cohesion. In a quotation from one of the interviewed participants the researchers noted that non-present or non-contributing members of the society may be excluded by the wider collective.

Breen[50] studied indigenous Australians and found that one key harm was the neglect of children when a parent gambles, and the eldest daughter would become their main care giver. They also found that many people would gamble within a group, increasing their behaviour, but they would feel shame from losses and from the potential gossip within their close community, and Breen, Hing and Gordon[48] also found that a large concern for Indigenous Australians was the spread of a harms impact throughout the community. The range of harms shown within indigenous Australian communities included gambling away their pensions, relationship issues [48], betting above their means, guilt and shame, and chasing losses [62]. And to a lesser extent financial harms like borrowing money or selling items, and health problems.

McCarthy et al[58] suggested that women from ethnic minorities, indigenous communities and specifically Maori and Pacific women in New Zealand were more vulnerable to gambling harms than European women. Ferrara, Franceschini and Corsello[43] found that non-white males were most at risk of developing a gambling problem, and, in the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

UK, Wardle et al[61] found that although migrants were less likely to gamble they were more likely to experience harms than individuals born in the country. By contrast, Currie et al[42] found that white men were more likely to report harms, and are more likely to gamble overall, with a higher frequency and higher spends.

The final study that investigated culture is that of Goh, Ng and Yeoh[57] who found that families in Singapore were at risk of acute financial harms when the problem gambler was a parent. Most households suffered double financial harms through loss of income and large debt, and when the gambler was a mother without income the father would leave employment to care for the children, resulting in an income reduction for the entire household. Goh, Ng and Yeoh also found that many people in Singapore viewed gamblers as self-centred, and siblings would often give up on them, rather than accepting problem gambling as an illness.

Gambling Behaviour

One of the most predictable influences on gambling harms is the specific gambling habits and behaviours of the individual. Twelve studies include data on gambling behaviours and several studies have agreed that a higher frequency of play, and higher amount of spending per session, leads to more harms [45, 41, 42, 47, 33, 63].

Some studies have found links between the quantity of harms and the choice of game type. Castren et al[41] found that six out of twelve game type predictors were associated with more harmful consequences, including scratch games, betting, slot machines, non-poker online games, online poker, and non-monopoly games. They found that lottery play caused the lowest number of harms, and this finding is consistent with findings reported by Currie et al[42] who found that frequency of play on lottery games did not increase the harms experienced, whereas electronic gambling machines, ticket gambling, bingo and casino games did. Ronzitti et al[44] also concluded that Fixed Odds Betting Terminals and casino

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

tables were associated with the highest scores on the PGSI, and gambling machines showed high PGSI scores compared to other methods of play, despite similar play times.

Two studies within the search looked at motivations for gambling, and although Browne et al[40] found no link between motivation of play and harms, Lee, Chung and Bernhard[55] found that excitement, escape and challenge motives were linked with positive outcomes, but financial motivation led to harms. Lloyd et al[36] also found that self-harm thoughts were associated with money as a motivator but was negatively associated with enjoyment motivations.

Online vs. Offline Gambling

As well as specific game type five studies look at the broader categories of online or offline gambling. Castren et al[41] found only a weak link between online gambling and an increase in harms, however Gainsbury, Abarbanel and Blaszcynski[14] found that online gamblers tended to have higher PGSI scores. Moreover, online gamblers were more varied in their choice of game and gambling behaviours, and in comparison to offline gamblers they showed no preference for skill-based games.

Yani-de-Soriano, Javed and Yousafzai[64] found that online gambling was associated with binge drinking, cigarette smoking and an increased risk of developing problem gambling. However, they did not find a link between online gambling and what they label as internet addiction. Huberts and Griffiths[52] also found a link between online gambling and alcohol dependence, and they discovered that online gamblers were less likely to have jobs, children and a stable relationship, leading to unemployment and less money later in life. They further found that online gamblers were less able to control impulsivity and frustration, but despite this they had fewer suicidal thoughts than offline gamblers, although actual suicide attempts were comparable in both groups.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Feelings of shame appeared to be lower in online gamblers relative to offline gamblers [65], and it was suggested that online gamblers feel less judged since their behaviours could be more secretive and private. Despite these reduced feelings of shame Fulton observed that secretive gambling increased financial harms due to the likelihood of concealed debt; and by living a double life secretive gamblers experienced increased stress, relationship conflicts, and emotional deterioration.

Socioeconomic Status

There were eight studies that examined socioeconomic factors affecting gambling harms, and the consensus appears to be that less affluent socioeconomic groups are more at risk of experiencing harms than more affluent groups. Ferrara, Franceschini and Corsello[43] found that individuals in routine socioeconomic groups were at the highest risk of developing an addiction to gambling, and Currie et al[42] concluded that participants who reported harms were more likely to be in a lower income bracket, and to have received no further education than high school.

Skaal et al[35] reported that urban residents were more likely to report psychological distress and be at a high risk of problem gambling on the PGSI. In comparison harms were associated with employment status in peri-urban areas, with unemployment doubling the risk of problem gambling. Browne et al[40] found that income and education level are indirect risk factors of harm, and Lloyd et al[36] found that gambling related thoughts of self-harm were more prevalent in the unemployed.

Lee, Chung and Bernhard[55] reported that married people with a low income are more likely to be financially motivated to gamble, and this motivation could be associated with greater harms. Lloyd et al[36], however, found no link between problem gambling and marital status.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

In an apparent contrast with other results, Tu, Gray and Walton[66] found that people in managerial or professional occupations appeared more likely to participate in gambling than people in routine occupations. However, although gambling rates in the most affluent groups dropped during times of recession, the rates within deprived communities did not, suggesting that less wealthy people may be more likely to gamble in times of economic stress. When controlling for confounding variables the most deprived groups were 4.5 times as likely to experience a gambling-related argument or money issues as people living in the least deprived areas.

Other Factors

Studies that examined unique factors affecting harms include Jeffrey et al[67] who compared gamblers with their partners and found that gamblers were more likely to report individual harms that affect themselves. They also found that gamblers identified a wider range of harms and were better at identifying harms than their partners. This suggests that as well as experiencing more harms than affected others, gamblers are more aware of those harms and therefore may be more consciously impacted. Li et al[37] also found that harms in all areas accumulated more quickly in gamblers than in affected others.

Langham et al[68] found that an individuals' sense of coherence correlated strongly with gambling harms. Sense of coherence is defined as the extent to which someone feels confident in the predictability of their environment, and that things will generally turn out as expected.

Binde[69] looked specifically at harms in the context of an individual's place of work and found that signs of a problem gambler at work included excessive talk on gambling, gambling during breaks or during work time, borrowing money from colleagues, poor work performance, lateness or absence and more. Despite this they did not compare different levels

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

of employment or types of job role that could have provided a more thorough view of gambling harms and employment.

May-Chahal et al[70] investigated harms within the British prison population and found that although the prevalence of problem gambling in terms of the PGSI was higher in prisons, the prevalence of gambling behaviour prior to incarceration was significantly lower. They found that there was no link between PGSI score and criminal career, and no statistical link between gambling and drug use, however high rate offenders in their mid-20s were 5.3 times more likely to be frequent loss chasers than other categories. May-Chahal also found that occasional gamblers were less likely to use alcohol or drugs in prison, with nearly 2/3 of the problem gambling group abstaining completely from substance use. The researchers suggest that this may be because the individuals' 'addiction needs' are being met by their gambling behaviour.

Three studies also looked at how gambling harms present within a family unit, or how an individuals' home life may impact their gambling. Anderson, Rempusheski and Leedy[71] examined senior family members and found that co-dependency within the family, where each person was expected to bail the other out, caused relationship breakdowns, stress and tension. Some participants expressed shame at spending their children's trust funds or savings, however participants also reported using the addiction model to neutralize shame and guilt. Ferrara, Franceschini and Corsello[43] and Larsen, Curtis and Bjerregaard[49] both found that an individuals' home life affected their gambling habits. Ferrara, Franceschini and Corsello stated that having separated parents increased the risk of gambling later in life, and Larsen, Curtis and Bjerregaard found that the odds of showing one or more addictive behaviours increased in households without children. Perhaps suggesting that the presence of a traditional nuclear family unit is a protective factor against gambling harms.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

DISCUSSION

The results presented here suggest that there may be a health inequality in gambling harms, as several studies have found differences in the number and types of harms reported in different social groups. Although further analysis and investigation is necessary for a complete understanding of the distribution of gambling harms in society, the results suggest that there are differences which are dependent upon several factors. Studies such as Wardle et al[61], Salonen, Alho and Castren[59] and Tu, Gray and Walton[66] pose a particular concern as there are suggestions that certain groups experience more harms even when gambling less, presenting a health inequality which needs to be understood and addressed. In particular several studies report differences between age groups, socioeconomic status, and gambling behaviour or play styles.

In applying the Standard Quality Assessment Criteria [25] we found that several studies were not robust in their quality control (Figure 2). In particular studies scoring below 0.5 on the assessment may not be an accurate representation of gambling harms, whereas studies which scored above 0.95 may present the most reliable data on harm distribution (Table 3).

Table 3. Highest and Lowest Quality Assessment Scores Using Kmet, Lee and Cook[25]

Study	Highest Quality Assessment Scores	Study	Lowest Quality Assessment Scores
Browne, Goodwin and Rockloff (2018)	1.00	Bergh and Kuhlhorn (1994)	0.39
Browne et al (2019)	1.00	Binde (2016)	0.43
Canale, Vieno and Griffiths (2016)	0.95	Delfabbro and King (2017)	0.29
Estevez et al (2015)	0.95	Delfabbro and King (2019)	0.36

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Hubert and Griffiths (2018)	0.95	Ferrara, Franceschini and Corsello (2018)	0.29
Jeffrey et al (2019)	0.95	McCarthy et al (2019)	0.46
Langham et al (2017)	1.00		
Larsen, Curtis and Bjerregaard (2013)	1.00		
Lee, Chung and Bernhard (2014)	0.95		
Lloyd et al (2016)	0.95		
Raisamo et al (2013)	0.95		
Raisamo et al (2015)	1.00		
Ricijas, Hundric and Huic (2016)	0.95		
Salonen, Alho and Castren (2017)	1.00		
Shannon, Anijoul and Blaszcynski (2017)	0.95		
Skaal et al (2016)	0.95		

The most commonly reported factor in these highly rated studies was the prevention paradox, and all studies included which discuss this found evidence in favour of the paradox. The findings showed that the majority of harm impact is found in the lower PGSI rated groups, due to the larger population numbers in these categories. However, they also found that the highest severity of harm, such as substance use or severe psychological distress, was most often found in the problem gambling group.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

All but one [59] of these high rated studies found no differences in harm presentation between genders and reported that in all age groups males gambled more often than females with higher frequency of play and higher spends. In contrast Salonen, Alho and Castren found that occasional gambling increased in women 18-24 between the years 2011 and 2015, and only females felt more harms despite men 18-24 also increasing their gambling behaviour. Any other differences in harm profile between genders has been explained by behavioural differences as the odds of reporting harm increased substantially with greater time of play and spends, and daily gamblers were significantly more likely to report all different harms when compared to other gambling groups.

All but two studies [21, 36] investigating age found significant differences across groups, with the majority of harms and dysfunctional symptomology reported in ages below 30. Online gamblers were found to be more frequently 16-20 years old and online gambling was highly associated with heavy alcohol use, and poor academic functioning.

It was also found that gambling related thoughts of self-harm were more common among the unemployed, and that individuals from urban areas were more likely to report psychological distress and increased alcohol use from gambling. In peri-urban areas employment status was associated with high scores on the PGSI and unemployed gamblers had double the odds of scoring as a problem gambler than those who were employed.

Several of these highly rated studies identified trait impulsivity as a common risk factor in gambling, and it was found that impulsivity mediated the link between harms and age or gender. Sense of coherence was also found to significantly correlate with gambling harms, with a weaker sense of coherence leading to increased harms. Along with impulsivity, sense of coherence could point to a personality type which increases the risk of harms from gambling. And evidence has shown that impulsivity is high in younger age groups, who appear to display more gambling harms than older individuals.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

The final high rated study [55] found that motivations of excitement, escape and challenge were linked to positive outcomes from gambling, whereas money as a motivator led to harmful consequences. Despite this another highly rated study [40] found that an individual's reason to gamble, or motivation, had no impact on harms and so further research is needed to confirm or deny this association.

It was stated by Susana Jiménez Murcia that, "we need to use different treatments for each sub-group of pathological gamblers" [70]. Murcia is the co-author of a study which found that there are four distinct types of gambler [71]. The team concluded that out of the four sub-types only one category of gambler suggested significant pathology, though all were compulsive with differing severity levels, comorbidity and personality profiles. Future research could investigate not only the distribution of harms across society, but also further understand these sub-types of gambler, attribute these to specific groups or personality profiles, and compare and validate the results against this previous work. This future research should also broaden the participant base as Álvarez-Moya et al only investigated self-reporting slot machine gamblers, meaning their results may not be complete, or may not be generalizable.

To conclude, our review strongly suggests that the distribution of harms in the population is affected by a number of factors and presents some key signs to identify individuals who may be at risk. However, further research is needed to fully understand gambling harms and to confirm which individuals and groups are most at risk.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Competing Interests

The authors declare no conflicts of interest in relation to this work

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

REFERENCES

1. Gambling Commission. Gambling Participation in 2018 Behaviour Awareness and Attitudes. 2019; [Available from: https://www.gamblingcommission.gov.uk/PDF/survey-data/Gambling-participation-in-2018-behaviour-awareness-and-attitudes.pdf
2. American Psychiatric Association. 5th ed. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Pub.; 2013.
3. Gambling Commission. Gambling-related harm as a public health issue. Briefing paper for Local Authorities and local Public Health providers. February 2018; [Available from: https://www.gamblingcommission.gov.uk/PDF/Gambling-related-harm-as-a-public-health-issue.pdf
4. Adolphe A, Khatib L, van Golde C, Gainsbury SM, Blaszczynski A. Crime and Gambling Disorders: A Systematic Review. J Gambl Stud. 2019;35(2):395-414.
5. Banks J, Waters J, Andersson C, Olive V. Prevalence of Gambling Disorder Among Prisoners: A Systematic Review. Int J Offender Ther Comp Criminol. 2019:306624X19862430.
6. Bonfils NA, Aubin HJ, Benyamina A, Limosin F, Luquiens A. Quality of life instruments used in problem gambling studies: A systematic review and a meta-analysis. Neurosci Biobehav Rev. 2019;104:58-72.
7. Marchetti D, Verrocchio MC, Porcelli P. Gambling Problems and Alexithymia: A Systematic Review. Brain Sci. 2019;9(8).
8. Ioannidis K, Hook R, Wickham K, Grant JE, Chamberlain SR. Impulsivity in Gambling Disorder and problem gambling: a meta-analysis. Neuropsychopharmacology. 2019;44(8):1354-61.
9. Lee RSC, Hoppenbrouwers S, Franken I. A Systematic Meta-Review of Impulsivity and Compulsivity in Addictive Behaviors. Neuropsychol Rev. 2019;29(1):14-26.
10. Quilty LC, Wardell JD, Thiruchselvam T, Keough MT, Hendershot CS. Brief interventions for problem gambling: A meta-analysis. PLoS One. 2019;14(4):e0214502.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

11. Maynard BR, Wilson AN, Labuzienski E, Whiting SW. Mindfulness-Based Approaches in the Treatment of Disordered Gambling. Research on Social Work Practice. 2015;28(3):348-62.

12. Pickering D, Keen B, Entwistle G, Blaszczynski A. Measuring treatment outcomes in gambling disorders: a systematic review. Addiction. 2018;113(3):411-26.

13. Tanner J, Drawson AS, Mushquash CJ, Mushquash AR, Mazmanian D. Harm reduction in gambling: A systematic review of industry strategies. Addiction Research & Theory. 2017;25(6):485-94.

14. Hing N, Russell AMT, Hronis A. A definition and set of principles for responsible consumption of gambling. International Gambling Studies. 2017:1-24.

15. Gainsbury SM, Abarbanel B, Blaszczynski A. Game On: Comparison of Demographic Profiles, Consumption Behaviors, and Gambling Site Selection Criteria of Esports and Sports Bettors. Gaming Law Review. 2017;21(8):575-87.

16. Harris A, Parke A, Griffiths MD. The Case for Using Personally Relevant and Emotionally Stimulating Gambling Messages as a Gambling Harm-Minimisation Strategy. Int J Ment Health Addict. 2018;16(2):266-75.

17. Shaffer HJ, LaPlante DA, LaBrie RA, Kidman RC, Donato AN, Stanton MV. Toward a syndrome model of addiction: multiple expressions, common etiology. Harv Rev Psychiatry. 2004;12(6):367-74.

18. Browne M, Rockloff MJ. Prevalence of gambling-related harm provides evidence for the prevention paradox. J Behav Addict. 2018;7(2):410-22.

19. Rawat V, Greer N, Langham E, Rockloff M, Hanley C. What is the harm? Applying a public health methodology to measure the impact of gambling problems and harm on quality of life. Journal of Gambling Issues. 2017(36).

20. Gambling Commission. Prevention and Education. *National Strategies to Reduce Gambling Harm.* 2019; [Available from: https://www.reducinggamblingharms.org/prevention-and-education.

21. Browne M, Goodwin BC, Rockloff MJ. Validation of the Short Gambling Harm Screen (SGHS): A Tool for Assessment of Harms from Gambling. J Gambl Stud. 2018;34(2):499-512.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

22. Web of Science. login.webofknowledge.com. (n.d.). [Retrieved: August 2019, from https://login.webofknowledge.com/.

23. Thesaurus.com. The world's favorite online thesaurus! (n.d.). [Retrieved August 22, 2019, from: https://www.thesaurus.com/.

24. Oxford University Press. Oxford English Dictionary. 2010; (Online 2015 ed. Vol. 3).

25. Kmet, L.M., Lee, R.C., Cook, L.S. Standard Quality Assessment Criteria for Evaluating Primary Research Papers from a Variety of Fields. Edmonton: Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research (AHFMR), HTA Initiative #13. 2004; 2.

26. Langham E, Thorne H, Browne M, Donaldson P, Rose J, Rockloff M. Understanding gambling related harm: a proposed definition, conceptual framework, and taxonomy of harms. BMC Public Health. 2016;16:80.

27. Delfabbro P, King DL. Prevention paradox logic and problem gambling: Does low-risk gambling impose a greater burden of harm than high-risk gambling? J Behav Addict. 2017;6(2):163-7.

28. Schellinck T, Schrans T, Schellinck H, Bliemel M. Construct Development for the FocaL Adult Gambling Screen (FLAGS): A Risk Measurement for Gambling Harm and Problem Gambling Associated with Electronic Gambling Machines. Journal of Gambling Issues. 2015(30):140.

29. PLoS Medicine (OPEN ACCESS) Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med. 2009; 6(7): e1000097. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed1000097

30. Rintoul A, Deblaquiere J, Thomas A. Responsible gambling codes of conduct: lack of harm minimisation intervention in the context of venue self-regulation. Addiction Research & Theory. 2017;25(6):451-61.

31. Ferris, J., Wynne, H. The Canadian Problem Gambling Index: Final Report. The Canadian Centre on Substance Abuse (CCSA). 2001.

32. Shannon K, Anjoul F, Blaszczynski A. Mapping the proportional distribution of gambling-related harms in a clinical and community sample. International Gambling Studies. 2017;17(3):366-85.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

33. Raisamo SU, Makela P, Salonen AH, Lintonen TP. The extent and distribution of gambling harm in Finland as assessed by the Problem Gambling Severity Index. Eur J Public Health. 2015;25(4):716-22.

34. Salonen AH, Hellman M, Latvala T, Castren S. Gambling participation, gambling habits, gambling-related harm, and opinions on gambling advertising in Finland in 2016 Nordic Studies on Alcohol and Drugs. 2018;35(3):215-34.

35. Skaal L, Sinclair H, Stein DJ, Myers B. Problem Gambling Among Urban and Rural Gamblers in Limpopo Province, South Africa: Associations with Hazardous and Harmful Alcohol Use and Psychological Distress. J Gambl Stud. 2016;32(1):217-30.

36. Lloyd J, Hawton K, Dutton WH, Geddes JR, Goodwin GM, Rogers RD. Thoughts and acts of self-harm, and suicidal ideation, in online gamblers. International Gambling Studies. 2016;16(3):408-23.

37. Li E, Browne M, Rawat V, Langham E, Rockloff M. Breaking Bad: Comparing Gambling Harms Among Gamblers and Affected Others. J Gambl Stud. 2017;33(1):223-48.

38. Victorian Responsible Gambling Foundation. Problem Gambling Severity Index (PGSI). [Retrieved October 2019, from: https://responsiblegambling.vic.gov.au/for-professionals/health-and-community-professionals/problem-gambling-severity-index-pgsi/. 2019.

39. Delfabbro P, King DL. Challenges in the Conceptualisation and Measurement of Gambling-Related Harm. J Gambl Stud. 2019;35(3):743-55.

40. Browne M, Hing N, Rockloff M, Russell AMT, Greer N, Nicoll F, et al. A Multivariate Evaluation of 25 Proximal and Distal Risk-Factors for Gambling-Related Harm. J Clin Med. 2019;8(4).

41. Castrén S, Perhoniemi R, Kontto J, Alho H, Salonen AH. Association between gambling harms and game types: Finnish population study. International Gambling Studies. 2017;18(1):124-42.

42. Currie SR, Hodgins DC, Wang J, el-Guebaly N, Wynne H, Chen S. Risk of harm among gamblers in the general population as a function of level of participation in gambling activities. Addiction. 2006;101(4):570-80.

43. Ferrara P, Franceschini G, Corsello G. Gambling disorder in adolescents: what do we know about this social problem and its consequences? Ital J Pediatr. 2018;44(1):146.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

44. Ronzitti S, Soldini E, Lutri V, Smith N, Clerici M, Bowden-Jones H. Types of gambling and levels of harm: A UK study to assess severity of presentation in a treatment-seeking population. J Behav Addict. 2016;5(3):439-47.

45. Canale N, Vieno A, Griffiths MD. The Extent and Distribution of Gambling-Related Harms and the Prevention Paradox in a British Population Survey. J Behav Addict. 2016;5(2):204-12.

46. Pitt H, Thomas SL, Bestman A, Daube M, Derevensky J. Factors that influence children's gambling attitudes and consumption intentions: lessons for gambling harm prevention research, policies and advocacy strategies. Harm Reduct J. 2017;14(1):11.

47. Raisamo S, Halme J, Murto A, Lintonen T. Gambling-related harms among adolescents: a population-based study. J Gambl Stud. 2013;29(1):151-9.

48. Breen HM, Hing N, Gordon A. Indigenous Gambling Motivations, Behaviour and Consequences in Northern New South Wales, Australia. International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction. 2010;9(6):723-39.

49. Larsen CV, Curtis T, Bjerregaard P. Harmful alcohol use and frequent use of marijuana among lifetime problem gamblers and the prevalence of cross-addictive behaviour among Greenland Inuit: evidence from the cross-sectional Inuit Health in Transition Greenland survey 2006-2010. Int J Circumpolar Health. 2013;72:19551.

50. Breen HM. Risk and Protective Factors Associated with Gambling Consequences for Indigenous Australians in North Queensland. International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction. 2011;10(2):258-72.

51. Estevez A, Herrero-Fernandez D, Sarabia I, Jauregui P. The impulsivity and sensation-seeking mediators of the psychological consequences of pathological gambling in adolescence. J Gambl Stud. 2015;31(1):91-103.

52. Hubert P, Griffiths MD. A Comparison of Online Versus Offline Gambling Harm in Portuguese Pathological Gamblers: An Empirical Study. Int J Ment Health Addict. 2018;16(5):1219-37.

53. Bergh C, Kuhlhorn E. Social, psychological and physical consequences of pathological gambling in Sweden. Journal of gambling studies. 1994;10(3):275-85.

54. Ricijas N, Dodig Hundric D, Huic A. Predictors of adverse gambling related consequences among adolescent boys. Children and Youth Services Review. 2016;67:168-76.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

55. Lee CK, Chung N, Bernhard BJ. Examining the structural relationships among gambling motivation, passion, and consequences of internet sports betting. J Gambl Stud. 2014;30(4):845-58.

56. Splevins K, Mireskandari S, Clayton K, Blaszczynski A. Prevalence of adolescent problem gambling, related harms and help-seeking behaviours among an Australian population. J Gambl Stud. 2010;26(2):189-204.

57. Goh ECL, Ng V, Yeoh BSA. The family exclusion order as a harm-minimisation measure for casino gambling: the case of Singapore. International Gambling Studies. 2016;16(3):373-90.

58. McCarthy S, Thomas SL, Bellringer ME, Cassidy R. Women and gambling-related harm: a narrative literature review and implications for research, policy, and practice. Harm Reduct J. 2019;16(1):18.

59. Salonen AH, Alho H, Castren S. Attitudes towards gambling, gambling participation, and gambling-related harm: cross-sectional Finnish population studies in 2011 and 2015. BMC Public Health. 2017;17(1):122.

60. Kolandai-Matchett K, Langham E, Bellringer M, Siitia PA-H. How gambling harms experienced by Pacific people in New Zealand amplify when they are culture-related. Asian journal of gambling issues and public health. 2017;7(1):5-.

61. Wardle H, Bramley S, Norrie C, Manthorpe J. What do we know about gambling-related harm affecting migrants and migrant communities? A rapid review. Addict Behav. 2019;93:180-93.

62. Hing N, Breen H, Gordon A, Russell A. Gambling harms and gambling help-seeking amongst indigenous Australians. J Gambl Stud. 2014;30(3):737-55.

63. Samuelsson E, Sundqvist K, Binde P. Configurations of gambling change and harm: qualitative findings from the Swedish longitudinal gambling study (Swelogs). Addiction Research & Theory. 2018;26(6):514-24.

64. Yani-de-Soriano M, Javed U, Yousafzai S. Can an Industry Be Socially Responsible If Its Products Harm Consumers? The Case of Online Gambling. Journal of Business Ethics. 2012;110(4):481-97.

65. Fulton C. Secrets and secretive behaviours: Exploring the hidden through harmful gambling. Library & Information Science Research. 2019;41(2):151-7.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

66. Tu D, Gray RJ, Walton DK. Household experience of gambling-related harm by socioeconomic deprivation in New Zealand: increases in inequality between 2008 and 2012. International Gambling Studies. 2014;14(2):330-44.

67. Jeffrey L, Browne M, Rawat V, Langham E, Li E, Rockloff M. Til Debt Do Us Part: Comparing Gambling Harms Between Gamblers and Their Spouses. J Gambl Stud. 2019;35(3):1015-34.

68. Langham E, Russell AMT, Hing N, Gainsbury SM. Sense of Coherence and Gambling: Exploring the Relationship Between Sense of Coherence, Gambling Behaviour and Gambling-Related Harm. J Gambl Stud. 2017;33(2):661-84.

69. Binde P. Preventing and Responding to Gambling-Related Harm and Crime in the Workplace. Nordic Studies on Alcohol and Drugs. 2016;33(3):247-65.

70. May-Chahal C, Humphreys L, Clifton A, Francis B, Reith G. Gambling Harm and Crime Careers. J Gambl Stud. 2017;33(1):65-84.

71. Anderson TL, Rempusheski VF, Leedy KN. Casino Gambling and the Family: Exploring the Connections and Identifying Consequences. Deviant Behavior. 2017;39(9):1109-19.

72. Plataforma SINC. "Four kinds of compulsive gamblers identified." ScienceDaily. ScienceDaily, 15 October 2010. <www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2010/10/101014083345.htm>.

73. Álvarez-Moya, E. M., Jiménez-Murcia, S., Aymamí, N., Gómez-Peña, M., Granero, R., Santamaría, J., Menchón, J. M., Fernández-Aranda, F. Subtyping Study of a Pathological Gamblers Sample. The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry. 2010;55(8):498-506.

APPENDICES

Figure 1. Data Extraction Table

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
Anderson, Rempusheski and Leedy (2017)	In-Depth Interview	USA - Delaware	34	Self-Identification	In-Depth Interview	Seniors (62-88 y/o)	1. Relatives' gambling increased their own gambling. Social family gambling viewed as positive until emotional vulnerability and co-dependency occurred. 2. False expectations of outcomes increased with family group gambling. Led to stress, tension and strained relationships. Those who tried to reduce gambling received complaints from family to not "abandon" them. Feigned benevolence present were winner feels obligated to share which led to strained relationships and family discord. 3. Gambling linked to mild-severe arguments or broken relationships (including divorce) and anxiety. Gamblers attempted to neutralize responsibility by	University of Delaware

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
							invoking the disease model of addiction. 4. Some said family bailed them out of debts or they were in the process of repaying their debts. Others felt their losses didn't harm families or felt no obligation to bail out. The active aging, co-dependency, and addiction models help explain this. Longest careers in gambling recalled how financial hardship unfolded over time. Reported exhausting resources in pensions, inheritances, or savings. Some spent children's trust funds or savings and felt deeply ashamed. Participants reported using the addiction model to neutralize shame.	
Bergh and Kuhlhorn (1994)	Interview and Case Finding	Sweden	42 and 63	DSM-III-R	Interview and Case Reviews	Gender Age	The most highly rated harm was financial, followed by impaired relationships and psychological problems. Amount of money spent did not correlate with age but did correlate with debt size and	The Commission for Social Research

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
							winnings. Results from both genders were similar across all harms. Younger group (20-34) spent longer gambling than 35+ years (double median).	
Binde (2016)	Literature Review and Interviews	Sweden	13	None Stated	Semi-Structured Interview	1 Security Professional 2 Addiction Professionals 5 Therapists 5 Problem Gamblers	Signs of PG in the workplace mentioned were talking a lot about gambling, gambling during breaks, inviting colleagues to join them, talking about 'sure' bets, gambling during work time, borrowing from colleagues, poor performance at work, lateness, depressed or anxious behaviour, tired and irritable, frequent toilet use, absences, decreased talks about other leisure activities, appears troubled, selling belongings, advance of pay, sudden increase in cash, tax authorities looking into their wages, poor standard in clothing or belongings (i.e. car) Embezzlement was suggested to be seen	Small writing grant from The Responsible Gambling Trust in the UK Otherwise government or public health funding

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
							when an employee refuses vacation time, repeated irregularities are found in transactions, second signatories are pressured to sign documents fast	
Breen (2011)	Interview	Australia - Queensland	108	None Stated	Thematic Analysis of Interviews	60 Indigenous 14 Non-Indigenous 14 Counsellors 20 Venue Managers	Both card and commercial gambling risk factors for harms were poverty and a reluctance to seek help. Debt accumulated fast, some gamblers didn't see why they were in debt and continued loss chasing. Financial hardship led to neglect of children, missed school, no food or new clothes. Young women became the main household carer as parents were gamblers or alcoholics. Social isolation happened as gamblers didn't have money to go out. Gamblers pooled resources to travel together but this exposed them to more gambling as if the driver is winning they have to stay and wait or if the driver loses and goes home	Not Stated

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
							they're stranded. Gamblers were ashamed and reluctant to seek help, specifically shame around losses and indigenous community gossip. Harms from card gambling were increased by learning to gamble young and missing school to gamble. Youth who learned gambling young or saw parents gambling were more likely to gamble to increase income later in life. Youth who missed school reduced lifelong aspiration and opportunity.	
Breen, Hing and Gordon (2010)	Individual and Group Interviews with Observations	Australia – New South Wales	169	None Stated	Thematic Analysis of Interviews	Indigenous Australians	Pension day led to gambling, resources were exhausted in 2-3 days. Card games most popular with women and youth, harms were individual financial losses, borrowing from others, underage gambling and lost welfare money. Commercial gambling popular with both genders of all ages. Poker more females	Gambling Research Australia

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
							and sport betting and TAB gambling more men. Poker machines had higher expenditure than TAB. Younger people tended to spend more, they were seen as having no responsibility compared to older people. Commercial harms were financial hardship, family and relationship difficulties, and the spread of negative impacts throughout the community. To a lesser extent was mental health problems and crime. Financial and family harms were cumulative, leading to more severe harms such as eviction and homelessness, domestic violence, neglect and relationship breakdown. Some interviewees spoke about depression and suicidality, and the most reported crimes were theft and ripping off employers. Gamblers also resorted to selling their items.	

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
Browne and Rockloff (2018)	Secondary Data Analysis	Multiple	1524	CSPG PGSI SOGS (4 items) DSM-IV (6 items) BBGS (2 items)	Browne's 72-Item Checklist Personal Wellbeing Index (CQLS)	Adults who Gambled in the last 6 months	Financial and emotional/psychological harms were most prevalent, and social deviance harms were the least prevalent. Only 10% of financial harms occurring are associated with PG. More than 50% of social deviance harms attributable to PG. Harms within other domains are roughly evenly distributed between PGSI categories. Relatively common and moderately severe consequences, such as increased credit card debt, and less spending on medications and food, are more likely to occur in LR. More than 50% who sold personal items are estimated to be RG. Severe consequences, such as loss of supply of utilities and significant assets, are more likely to be by MR and PG. Health, relationship, work/study, and emotional harms are more evenly	Victorian Responsible Gambling Foundation

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
							distributed among the PGSI risk categories. However only the most severe and rare harms (e.g., unhygienic living conditions) arise more frequently from PG. Social deviance does not support PP except for domestic violence, neglect of children and lowered religious connection, which were most common in RG.	
Browne, Goodwin, and Rockloff (2018)	Online Survey	Worldwide	1524	CSPG PGSI SOGS (4 items) DSM-IV (6 items) BBGS (2 items)	Browne's 72-Item Checklist Personal Wellbeing Index (CQLS)	Adults who Gambled in the last 6 months	Whilst ''Sold personal items'' had the weakest relationship with the common factor, positive responses on this item was an indication of the highest degree of gambling harm. ''Feeling distressed about my gambling'' was the most reliable indicator of gambling harm, whilst reduction of available spending money/ savings was a reliable ''early indicator'' of low to moderate levels of harm.	Victorian Responsible Gambling Foundation

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
							There was non-significant difference for gender and age. The average difference in wellbeing in households earning $15–30 k AUD and $101–$150 k is less than 5 points. Wellbeing decreases linearly with the number of harms indicated on the developed measure SGHS. Prevalence of those experiencing harm was twice that of PG (41.5 vs. 20.6%). Non-PG / Sub-Clinical gamblers also experience harms and may collectively have the greatest impact at the population level.	
Browne, Hing, Rockloff, Russel, Greer, Nicoll and Smith (2019)	Cross-Sectional Online Survey	Canada - Alberta	1174	GOES PGSI	Proximal and Distal Risk Factors GFM and	Multiple Demographics	With the exception of gender, all variables showed significant bivariate relationships to harm. Trait impulsivity was the most important risk factor followed by early gambling experiences, lack of social support, and religion. Other distal risk	Alberta Gambling Research Institute

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
					SGP SGHS		factors were not significant. Risk factors that had relatively large correlations but were not significant included: Being younger, working part time/unemployed/pensioners, not being married, having less education, and lower income. Results suggest that remaining distal factors; including age, income, and education; are correlates (indirect risk factors) of harm. Impulsivity may mediate a proportion of the relationship between age and gambling-related harm. Gambling fallacies have been found to mediate the link between religiosity and gambling problems. Motivation type did not predict harm.	
Canale, Vieno and Griffiths (2016)	Secondary Data Analysis	Britain	7756	DSM-IV Frequency	Four-Point Scale	Gender Age	Males gambled significantly more frequently and spent larger amounts of money and time than females. The	None

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
				Survey PGSI			prevalence of dependence and social harm significantly higher in males and in younger age groups (16–34 years) than older age groups (35–54 years and 55+ years). Most gambling-related harms were reported by non-high time and spend regular gamblers compared to high time and spend regular gamblers. Non-high are the majority. However the odds of reporting harm increased substantially with greater gambling volume (time and spend.) Higher individual risk to high time and spend, but higher proportion of at least one harm from low-moderate time and spend.	
Castren, Perhoniemi, Kontto, Alho and Salonen (2018)	Secondary Data Analysis	Finland	3555	PGSI SOGS	Recoded PGSI and SOGS	Finnish or Swedish mother tongue	A majority of the sample experienced either no harms or a low amount of harms. Gender did not have an effect on gambling-related harms but participants	The Ministry of Social Affairs and Health,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
						Number of game types, frequency and expenditure Demographics	older than 24 years experienced fewer harms. Gambling daily or nearly daily doubled harms and gambling several times a week increased harms significantly. Spending at least 1% of monthly income increased harms. Gambling online was statistically associated with harms, but not a strong risk factor. 6 of 12 game-type predictors associated significantly with harms. Scratch games, betting, slot machines, non-poker games online, online poker or non-monopoly increased harms. Weekly lottery games, fast-paced daily lottery games, low-paced daily lottery games, casino games, horse games or private gambling not included based on the stepwise forward method. Weekly lottery = lowest harms and non-monopoly = highest	Helsinki

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
							Most frequent harms were ‘gambling more than one intended to’ (poor self-control), ‘going back another day to win back money’ (chasing losses) and ‘feeling guilty’. Chasing losses was most typical harm in online poker and fast-paced daily lottery games. Poor self-control was most typical harm with all other game types.	
Currie, Hodgins, Wang, El-Guebaly and Wynne (2006)	Secondary Data Analysis	Canada	19012	CPGI DSM-IV NODS	CPGI	Demographics Frequency Expenditure	Individuals who reported two or more negative consequences from gambling in the last year were more likely to be male, non-Caucasian, high-school educated or lower, and have low household income. People under 40 were more likely to experience two or more consequences of gambling compared to people over 40. Risk level increases noticeably in both men and women who gamble more than once per week, spend more, and spend a higher % of their income. Risk of harm	Alberta Gaming Research Institute

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
							increases with frequency of EGM (inside and outside casinos), instant-win tickets, bingo and casino games but not from lottery plays.	
Delfabbro and King (2017)	Review of Current Research	N/A	2	PGSI	PGSI 72-Item Index	Severity (HR, MR, LR)	PGSI scores are skewed to include higher risk gamblers in the LR group. Some items included may not be harms such as chasing loss, gambling more to obtain excitement, betting above affordable means. Instead these are behaviours which lead to harm. Argued that most items in measures, such as the PGSI, are not really true measures of harm. Binary scoring ignores frequency of harms (1 = 4?)	None
Delfabbro and King (2019)	Review of Current Research	N/A	N/A	DSM-V PGSI SOGS NODS	Victorian Gambling Screen PPGM GES	Severity (HR, MR, LR) Clinical vs Non	Most common harms appeared to be psychological (worry, sleep loss, depression) and life-style changes (less leisure time, loss of savings). Least common appear to be serious harms such as suicide, bankruptcy, homelessness.	None

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
							When using degree of severity scale there did not appear to be very much harm in LR, with harms only appearing in PG. LR-MR show low-medium harms. Despite this studies show a larger proportion of harm within low-risk gamblers (prevention paradox.) This study argues that correct scaling of harm is not being used as shame is not equal in severity to suicide. However, the main harm which evidences the paradox is financial harms which shows even the more severe harms such as selling belongings in the low-category. The researchers argue that this may be due to low SES in the non-PG/low risk category and that it is hard to confidently attribute these financial harms to gambling, Particularly as many LR non-PG participants score 0 on the PGSI suggesting little to no gambling	

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
							behaviour.	
Estevez, Herrero-Fernandez, Sarabia, Jauregui (2015)	Survey	Spain	1312	Multicage-CAD-4	Multicage-CAD-4 Symptom-Checklist-90-Revised AISS	Young Clinical vs Young Non	Impulsivity showed strong correlation with gambling and symptomatology variables, whilst strength of association between gambling and sensation seeking was weak. Data confirmed young adults with pathological gambling have more dysfunctional symptomatology: anxiety, depression, hostility, obsessive–compulsive behaviour + somatization. Sensation seeking high in young gamblers and intensity more significant than novelty. Elevated scores for addictions to alcohol, drugs, videogames, and sex, and for compulsive shopping. No significant differences between groups for compulsive eating or Internet addiction. Impulsivity partially mediated anxiety, phobic anxiety, depression, and	International Contest ONCE of Research on Responsible Gambling

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
							psychoticism, and perfectly mediated somatization, obsessive–compulsive, interpersonal sensitivity, paranoid ideation, and hostility. Sensation seeking showed mediating effects at a lower significance.	
Ferrara, Franceschini and Corsello (2018)	Narrative Review	Worldwide	N/A	Multiple Dependent on Study	Multiple Dependent on Study	Adolescents	0.2-12.3% of Adolescents meet the diagnostic criteria for PG. North America rates ranged from 2.1 to 2.6 %, Oceania rates ranged from 0.2 to 4.4 %. Europe rates ranged from 0.2 to 12.3 % showing both the highest and the lowest prevalence rates. Young age, male, non-white, low SES, separated parents were the highest risk of developing PG. Sports gamblers tended to be young men with high rates of addiction comorbidity, slot machines tended to be older women with higher psychiatric comorbidity and later onset of gambling.	None

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
							PG have increased risk of alcoholism or substance use disorder, higher rates of depression, dysthymia, anxiety, panic and phobias. Anger, resentment, headaches, gastrointestinal symptoms, chronic headaches, eating disorders, impulsive behaviour, and criminality. Intimate relationships of people with gambling problems involve poor communication, relationship conflict and arguments, and consideration of separation or divorce. Family high levels of anger and conflict, low level communication, less independence, less engagement in intellectual and cultural activities, lack of commitment, little expression of emotions. This is comparable to alcoholism.	
Fulton (2019)	Literature Review and In-	Ireland	22 Pairs	None Stated	In-Depth Interview	Matched Pairs – Recovering	Debts hidden, different locations used and stealing occurred to fund the behaviour. Bills hidden from family members	Irish Research Council of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
	Depth Interview					PG and their Social Circle	causing further debts. Many participants described only seeking help once they were found out. Online technologies helped relieve some shame feelings from not having to visit a venue but the double life still led to excess stress and emotional deterioration, mood swings, irritability, relationship problems due to evasiveness, arguments and disruptive behaviour to get more alone time for gambling. Self-Perception changed with increased shame and at least one individual showed a change in perception of reality as he stole from work but refused to acknowledge this as theft.	Ireland's Research Project Grants (RPG) Social Protection Research Innovation Awards (SPRIA)
Gainsbury, Abarbanel and Blaszczynski (2017)	Online Survey	Australia	501	Activity, Frequency, Age of Onset PGSI	PGSI	Online vs Offline	E-sports bettors were significantly more varied in their gambling involvement than sports bettors and more involved with regard to daily gambling. E-sports bettors also bet on gambling activities that were entirely chance determined, rather than	Several gambling industries have funded each researcher

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
							demonstrating a preference for activities with a skill component. E-sports bettors had a significantly higher PGSI Score than sports bettors. This is consistent with previous research on Internet gambling. Therefore, it is likely that this overall gambling involvement contributes to the gambling problems rather than e-sports specifically.	but funding for this study is not stated
Goh, Ng and Yeoh (2016)	In-Depth Interview and 4-Point Scale	Singapore	105	Successful FEO Status	In-Depth Interview	Family Members who Successfully Applied for an FEO	Often a double-financial impact as the initial loss of money occurs, and then a second household member feels obligated to "bail out" the gambler. Traditional gender roles seen in Singapore families where the gambler is a mother neglect is common. Father leaving work to care for the neglected children causing further financial hardship. Family members view gambler as self-centred and family relationships become strained. Verbal abuse most common from young male	National Council on Problem Gambling Singapore and the Humanities and Social Sciences research grant

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
							gamblers who would abuse their parents, in particular mothers. Older males tended to coerce money from wives, particularly jewellery. Physical abuse equal between both men and women. Eventually siblings would give-up on the gambler completely, leading to isolation. This was also seen between Chinese fathers and their sons.	
Hing, Breen, Gordon and Russell (2014)	Survey	Australia	1259	PGSI	11-Listed Harms	Indigenous Australians	Amongst all gamblers in the past 12 months, the three most prevalent harms are betting more than they can afford to lose (49 %), feeling guilt or regret about their gambling (44 %) and chasing losses (44 %). These were followed in descending order by financial problems (38 %), feeling that they might have a problem (36 %), being criticised (34 %), needing to gamble with larger amounts of money (34 %), borrowing or selling (25 %) and, gambling causing health problems (25 %). Amongst the problem	Australian Research Council

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
							gamblers, 93.8 % indicated that they had, at least sometimes, bet more than they could afford to lose, 92.9 % reported betting with larger amounts of money to get the same feeling of excitement and 96.2 % reported chasing losses. A significantly higher proportion of moderate risk gamblers (18.0 %) had experienced gambling-related arguments within their household compared to low risk gamblers (2.8 %) and non-problem gamblers (0.9 %). Arguments and depression were the two most commonly experienced harms of those listed, indicating that both the gambler and household members were affected. PG appeared to be aware of their problem, with 96.2 % reporting that they feel they might have a problem, 94.9 % indicating gambling-induced health problems and 95.8 % indicating that other people have	

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
							suggested a problem.	
Hubert and Griffiths (2018)	Online Survey	Portugal	1599	Portuguese-SOGS	Self-Devised Likert Scale	SOGS Groups (RG, PPG, PG) Online vs. Offline	Offline gamblers (OF-G) were more likely to have jobs, children and a stable relationship than online gamblers (On-G). However On-G were younger with 50% being 16-20 y/o. On-G had higher mean scores on characteristics such as motivations to gamble and consequences. The fact that On–G were younger may indicate strong risk factors such as immaturity, identity construction, poor decision-making and problem-solving, and poor impulse control. Although On-G's appear to have a shorter duration before they become problem gamblers (i.e., 30 y/o compared to 40 and fewer suicidal thoughts, they have less control over their impulsiveness and coping with frustration, which may explain why there is the same level of On-G suicide attempts. On-G appears to be specifically	None

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
							associated with heavy alcohol use, and poor academic functioning which could then lead to being unemployed and having less money in later life.	
Jeffrey, Browne, Rawat, Langham, Li and Rockloff (2019)	Retrospective Survey and Secondary Data Analysis	Australia and New Zealand	5036	PGSI	72-Item Checklist (Au) 83-Item Checklist (NZ)	Gambler and Sig. Other	Similar number of harms across all domains experienced by spouse vs gambler. Spouses reported highest degree of harms within the emotional/ psychological, and relationship domains, whereas gamblers experienced a higher number of harms in all other domains. Gamblers were more apt to identify and report specific, direct effects of their gambling. Gamblers more likely to report harms centred on individual problems associated with lack of ability to spend or access money, being late, using work or study time to gamble, or be excluded from study, alcohol consumption, declines in	Victorian Responsible Gambling Foundation and New Zealand Ministry of Health

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
							their hygiene practices, attempted suicide, loss of sleep, and reduced physical activity, feelings of shame, worthlessness and failure, reduction of time spent tending to relationships or neglecting their responsibilities within their relationships. Spouses reported late bill payments, reduced work performance, worry or stress, distress, the desire to escape the relationship, a sense of hopelessness, and vulnerability, and increased tension, conflict, and ultimately the ending of relationships. Could be gamblers are more focused on gambling, and that they are less aware of relationship dysfunction as suggested by risk of neglect.	
Kolandai-Matchett, Langham, Bellringer and	Focus Groups	New Zealand	34	Not Applicable	Thematic Analysis	26 Pacific Professionals 8 Pacific Treatment	Pacific people experienced gambling-related harms that are common to other populations. However, the contexts were complex and multifaceted when culture-related. Collectivist values and least	New Zealand Ministry of Health

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
Siitia (2017)						Staff	distinction between family, friends and strangers. Collectivism meant harm is far-reaching and took on additional dimensions such as a loss of belonging or isolation, shame; loss of respect; disruption of trusting relationships; transference of communal responsibilities; and an overall loss of social cohesion. Quotation: non-present or non-contributing members may be excluded by the wider collective.	
Langham, Russel, Hing and Gainsbury (2017)	Secondary Data Analysis	Australia	1236	SOC-3 Scale PGSI	Langham's 73-Item Checklist	Sense of Coherence Level	SOC significantly correlated with all harm categories. Stronger SOC = fewer harms Weaker SOC = reduced spending on beneficial expenses (such as repairs and insurance) and essential expenses (such as food, medication and housing); increased negative health behaviours such as loss of sleep, reduced physical activity, and poor nutrition; and increased experiences such	Victorian Responsible Gambling Foundation, Grant VRGF1-13

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
							as stress related illnesses and episodes of depression. Feelings of distress, failure, worthlessness, hopelessness and running away significantly related for people with weak SOC, harms like shame, anger at behaviour and regret not. No significant link between SOC and attempted suicide	
Langham, Thorne, Browne, Donaldson, Rose and Rockloff (2016)	Literature Review, Focus Group, Interview, Forum Analyses	Australia - Victoria	35	None Stated	Focus Groups and Interviews	None	Harm was categorised into financial, relationship, emotional/psychological, health decrements, cultural harm, reduced work or study performance and criminal activity. Each group was separated into temporal categories of Legacy, Crisis and General Harms. Cultural and Relationship harms were found to be separate, however often occurring together due to the link between family and culture. Financial harms were most often mentioned, and often first discussed harm. Financial harms often triggered a change in behaviour or reassessment of	Victorian Responsible Gambling Foundation

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
							circumstance. The crisis threshold for financial harm is dependent on tolerance of deprivation. Relationship harm was dependent on the opinions on gambling of the other person, there was also a category of distortion such as children becoming parents' caretaker. Emotional harms were most effected by other harm categories, shame was most pervasive psychological harm. Health harms occurred even at a recreational level but are not well documented or measured. Workplace and criminal harm were linked through embezzlement and fraud. Criminality was only associated with problem gamblers, and not recreational or moderate-low level gamblers. Criminality was mostly a second-order harm used as a tool to address primary harms such as	

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
							financial loss.	
Larsen, Curtis and Bjerregaard (2013)	Cross-Sectional Survey	Greenland	2189	Lie/Bet Questionnaire (Johnson and Hammer) DSM-IV	Interviewer and Self-Report Questionnaires CAGE-C	Demographics Clinical vs. Non	Harmful alcohol use and frequent use of marijuana both associated with lifetime PG and prevalence of these was significantly higher among lifetime PG compared to non-PG. Among PG harmful use of alcohol increased with age while the opposite pattern seen in non-PG. Lifetime PG problems were more often combined with harmful alcohol use, a frequent use of marijuana or both – especially among men. More than half of men and one third of women displayed one or more addictive behaviours. Also the case in almost half of households with children. Odds ratio for finding one or more addictive behaviours in a household slightly lower in households with children compared to households without.	None
Lee, Chung and	Online	South	288	Gambling	Consequen	Online	Males more money motivated than	Not Stated

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
Bernhard (2014)	Survey	Korea		Passion Scale (Rousseau et al)	ces Checklist – Seven Point Likert Scale	Gamblers	females, married and low-income showed high tendencies towards money motivation in all groups. Motivations of excitement, escape and challenge linked to positive consequences, whereas money as a motivator led to harms and obsession. Obsessive gambling was related to anxiety and guilt. Harmonious gamblers with positive outcomes outnumbered obsessive gamblers with negative outcomes.	
Li, Browne, Rawat, Langham, Rockloff (2017)	Retrospective Study	Australia	5205	PGSI	Langham's 73-Item Checklist	Time periods of gambling	Current harms had significantly higher PGSI scores than retrospective harms. Bankruptcy, excluded study, emergency treatment, escape, actual ending, and children unsupervised indicated the most severe harm for gamblers, within the financial, work/study, health, emotional/ psychological, relationship, and other domains respectively. Reduced essential expenses, absence, worthlessness,	Victorian Responsible Gambling Foundation

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
							increased conflict, and outcast were the most effective discriminators between low and high harm level. Reduced spending was reported as the most prevalent financial harm, reduced performance, reduced sleep worries, shame, reduced time, paying money were highest in the other categories. Sold items, absence, reduced performance, reduced sleep, extreme distress, tension and 'pay money' had highest correlation with reported PGSI. Harms in all domains tended to accumulate more quickly to gamblers than to 'affected others' as gambling problems increased.	
Lloyd, Hawton, Dutton, Geddes, Goodwin and Rogers (2016)	Online Survey	Europe and North America	4125	DSM-IV Frequency	Mood Disorder Questionnaire General	Demographics	Gambling-related thoughts of self-harm more frequent in unemployed, but in contrast to non-gambling related self-harm were not associated with marital status and most frequent in males. Gambling-related acts of self-harm were	Responsibility in Gambling Trust and the Economic and Social

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
					Health Questionnaire Yes/No Self-Harm Questions CAGE Alcohol Screen PRIME-MD Patient Questionnaire 10-item Drug Abuse Screening Test		associated with unemployment, but had no relationship to gender or marital status. Age was not a significant predictor of either. Gambling-related thoughts of harm significantly associated with PG, hypomania, depression, panic and substance use but not alcoholism. NON-Gambling harm was not associated with PG but was with all other psychiatric variables, as well as alcoholism. Thoughts about self-harming due to gambling associated with PG, parental PG, years gambling, gambling for mood modification and for monetary motives, but negatively associated with gambling for enjoyment. Actual harm showed the same associations. Non-gambling self-harm significantly associated with gambling for mood modification, and inversely associated with gambling for enjoyment. Non-gambling self-harm did	Research Council

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
							not show reliable relationships with any of the other gambling-related variables.	
May-Chahal, Humphreys, Clifton, Francis and Reith (2017)	Cross-Sectional Survey	Britain	1057	PGSI	Substance Use UK Police National Offenders Data	Prisoners	Prevalence of PG higher in prison pop than gen pop. Prevalence of gambling behaviour before incarceration was significantly lower. Fraud and forgery crimes most likely to lead to gambling inside. No association found between PGSI and criminal career type. High-rate mid-20s peak offenders are 5.3x more likely, and rate chronic persisters 3.7x more likely to be frequent loss chasers who sometimes experience harms. No statistical link between gambling and drug use but non-gamblers underrepresented. Occasional gamblers more likely to abstain from alcohol and drugs. Nearly 2/3 of PG abstained and in all but unassertive gamblers the PG groups were much less likely to have used suppressants and stimulants. The researchers suggest	Economic and Social Research Council

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
							this show PGs get their addiction needs met by gambling.	
McCarthy, Thomas, Bellringer and Cassidy (2019)	Narrative Review	Worldwide	N/A	Multiple Dependent on Study	Multiple Dependent on Study	Women	Women are more likely to report comorbid anxiety and depression than men, as well as personality disorders, alcoholism, and greater psychological distress. Women from ethnic minorities and indigenous communities particularly at risk from PG and harms compared to European women. (Māori and Pacific women in New Zealand and Aboriginal Women). Many see only positive outcomes (southeast Asia) despite there being significant negative ones. Older women felt EGMs were less harmful due to the trade-off of socialness. They felt safe and welcomed in gambling environments, reporting that the benefits heavily outweighed monetary loss	None

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
							While gambling environments are social, inclusive and accessible to those of non-English speaking backgrounds, gambling behaviour has been found to significantly negatively impact several aspects of their lives. Women are also at risk of harms through others gambling behaviour.	
Pitt, Thomas, Bestman, Daube and Derevensky (2017)	Semi-Structured Interview	Australia - Melbourne	48	None Stated	Semi-Structured Interview	Children 8-16	Children seem to understand the slim chance of winning was enough incentive for some. One child believed that with EGM machines you have to continue putting in money if you lose “until you’re poor.” Most children gambled with pocket money, some gambled with “agreements” such as doing push-ups. Children mostly gambled within families through small bets and so don’t experience harms. Gives false sense of security. Children understood that if they spent	Australian Research Council Discovery Grant on Sports Wagering

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
							money on gambling they couldn't buy more valuable items (i.e. a dog, house and a car) however many were still intrigued. Some children believed gambling was almost compulsory for Australians during big events, and most could see the fun that may be felt when winning. Children didn't seem to perceive any harms other than peer pressure and financial loss. However studies have shown childhood exposure to gambling can increase the likelihood of alcoholism and cigarette use. Due to children believing sport betting was based on skill and experiencing minimal harms at such as young age through family protection they are more likely to experience harm in later life. Only children who saw harms to their parents appeared to be wary of gambling and unsure if they would try it themselves.	

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
Raisamo, Halme, Murto and Lintonen (2013)	Secondary Data Analysis and Survey	Finland	4566	Gambling Behaviour	Adolescent Health and Lifestyle Survey Harms Questions - When	Age Gender Frequency of Play	In all ages, boys gambled significantly more often than girls and an involvement in gambling increased with age. Considerably greater proportion of frequent gamblers than occasional gamblers reported harms. The most commonly reported harm among frequent gamblers was feeling guilty or shameful due to gambling followed by problems with relationships and disruptions of daily rhythm. Problems related to money appeared to be much less common among adolescents. Reported harms differed very little in age and gender however among frequent gamblers, 14–18-year-old boys reported significantly more problems with money than girls or younger age groups. The likelihood harms increased with frequency of gambling. Daily gamblers were significantly more likely to report all different harms when compared	Finnish Foundation for Alcohol Studies and the Ministry of Social Affairs and Health

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
							to other gambling groups.	
Raisamo, Makela, Salonen and Lintonen (2015)	Secondary Data Analysis and Telephone Survey	Finland	4484	PGSI Frequency	Expenditure Four-Point Likert Scale	Age Gender	Males gambled more and spent more than females. Most prevalent harms were chasing loss, increased spends, betting above means, and guilt. Prevalence of harms higher in males. Chasing loss was most prevalent in all demographic groups. Higher frequency and higher spends caused more harms. Guilty feeling was not found to be related to age. When controlling for frequency and spends gender no longer relevant to increased harms. Younger age more likely to report harms than older. Most harm found in low-medium risk (Prevention Paradox.) Males and females shared same harm profile, (order of commonality) though individual prevalence differed. Harm risk increased when weekly expenditure exceeded E21.	Ministry of Social Affairs and Health, Helsinki 2011 Gambling survey funded by the Ministry of Social Affairs and Health

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
Rawat, Browne Greer, Langham, Rockloff and Hanley (2017)	Health State Valuation - Vignettes	Australia	786	PGSI	Langham's 73-Item Checklist	Severity (LR, MR, HR)	Gamblers in LR and MR categories appear to pass on similar but slightly greater quantity of harm to others. HR/PG caused significantly more harm to others, but still less than personal harm experienced. PG showed same disability weights as moderate to severe alcohol use disorder and similar to bipolar disorder. MR similar to mild alcohol use disorder and stroke. Estimated LR as slightly less than moderate anxiety disorder. Less severe harms experienced by larger proportion of the population might be of more magnitude than the intensity of harm experienced by the small proportion. LR between 5–10 times more prevalent than PG.	Not Stated
Ricijas, Hundric	Survey	Croatia		Gambling Activities	CAGI	Male	CAGI shows half classified as social gamblers without consequences, the rest	Not Stated

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
and Huic (2016)				Scale Gambling Motive Checklist	Gambling Beliefs Scale Delinquency Self-Report Scale Two-Question Experiences Measure	Students	between occasional gamblers with low to moderate consequence, and problem gamblers with serious consequences. Found psychological consequences and loss of control, and social and financial consequences. Correlations between variables of interest all significant and in the expected direction. Different forms of consequences were associated with more risk and delinquent behaviour, more cognitive distortions related to gambling (more superstitious beliefs, more illusion of control and more incorrect perception of probabilities and chance), more motivation to gamble in order to relax, feel better, earn money and become better at gambling, more frequent gambling, more experience of winning large sums of money and a stronger drive to gamble. 24% already developed severe	

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
							psychosocial consequences related to gambling. Specifically sports betting, VLTs and virtual betting.	
Rintoul, Deblaquiere and Thomas (2017)	Observations Semi-Structured In-Depth Interviews Focus Groups	Australia - Melbourne	60			Professionals Venues Gamblers	Signs of PG for venues emphasised inappropriate social behaviours and emotional responses (signs of 'aggression' 'shouting at the machine or other people in the venue', 'appearing extremely sad or depressed', being 'withdrawn', 'emotional' or 'sweating excessively whilst using an EGM'). Also signs of intensity and duration ('extended gambling') and money seeking ('continuing to gamble with winnings'). In 34 hours signs of probable PG almost always present at all venues. Gambling fast and intensely, betting above $3 a spin, gambling through mealtimes and withdrawing cash multiple times. No observed approaches by staff, some active	Commonwealth Government of Australia

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
							encouragement such as delivering food or suggesting higher bets/continued play. Other observed PG signs were multiple machine use at one time and withdrawing money at venues multiple time.	
Ronzitti, Soldini, Lutri, Smith, Clerici and Bowden-Jones (2016)	Clinical Interview Self-Administered Survey	England	685	PGSI	Clinical Interview	Game Type	Engagement in FOBT was associated with higher PGSI score, and that relationship became more significant in the analysis of data from the 30 days prior to the assessment. Gambling on casino table games had a positive correlation with PGSI score; however, this was only true when considering 30 days data. The association between the aforementioned types of gambling and high PGSI scores may reflect that they cause more harm than others. Casino gambling was found to be less popular but more likely to cause harm. Younger participants were found to be	None

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
							potentially more at risk of harmful gambling behaviour. For a similar level of gambling involvement in terms of number of games played, gambling habits oriented toward gaming machines and (especially) FOBT were associated with higher gambling addiction severity. Some studies suggest involvement is a better disorder predictor than game type. This might not be true for machine gambling, especially higher speed and higher stakes.	
Salonen, Alho and Castren (2017)	Secondary Data Analysis	Finland		PGSI SOGS	Attitudes towards Gambling Scale PGSI and SOGS	Gender Age Region of Residence	Female attitudes were generally negative however curved more positive in ages below 25. Gambling prevalence is generally higher in young males however occasional gambling increased in women 18-24 and they felt more harms despite men 18-24 also increasing gambling behaviour. Male attitudes were generally	Ministry of Social Affairs and Health, Helsinki

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
							positive and became more-so from 2011-2015 except within ages 15-17 were weekly gambling decreased. Gambling more than one intended to chasing losses and feeling guilty were the three most common harms in both genders. Proportion of females with gambling more than one intended to, feeling guilty, feeling that one has a gambling problem, feeling like you would like to stop gambling but didn't think you could, and hiding betting slips, all increased between 2011 + 2015. However males with the items chasing losses and claiming to be winning money gambling but weren't really decreased. 2015 data showed gambling more than intended was most common harm in all age groups for both genders. Feeling guilty was second most common for women and men aged 65-74 but chasing losses was second most	

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
							common for all other males.	
Salonen, Hellman, Latvala and Castren (2018)	Secondary Data Analysis Cross-Sectional Online Survey	Finland	7305	Frequency Habits	14-item Problem and Pathological Gambling Measure (PPGM) Browne's 72-Item Checklist	7186 Gen Pop 119 Clinical	Men gambled alone more than women. Only in youngest age was it more common to gamble with familiar people than alone. No significant differences in habits between genders or age groups. Gen Pop 11% experienced at least one harm during 2016. Men more harm than women. Most typical were financial (8%) or emotional/ psychological (6%). Financial, work and studies, health problems, emotional, and other tended to decline in older group. Relationship problems did not differ. Clinical sample experienced notable amount of harm. Emotional/ psychological (88%), financial (87%), health (87%), and relationship (81%) in 2016. Men more work and study harm than women. Financial most common	Ministry of Social Affairs and Health - Appropriation of the Lotteries Act

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
							among youngest groups. In both samples most typical financial harms were reduced spending money and less money available for recreations. Emotional harm was regrets, failure, distress in gen pop and distress, regrets and anger in clinical. Health harm was loss of sleep in both. Work/study was reduced performance and gambling during work time for both samples. Overall other harms were rare in gen pop but in clinical promising to pay back money without intending to, taking money/items, and feelings of being an outcast were most common.	
Samuelsson, Sundqvist and Binde (2018)	Semi-Structured Interview	Sweden	40	PGSI	Interview	Stability and Frequency of Play	Despite the inclusion criteria 10/40 still reported 0 harms. •Stable-Low Freq = Mostly No Harms / Just shame or guilt •High Freq, moderate harm, Decreasing	Public Health Agency of Sweden

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
							use = Substantial financial loss, frustration but no severe psych harms, alcohol use, overestimating wins vs losses, gradual isolation •Periodic, moderate harm = Financial, psych, insomnia, isolation, relationship issues, low self-esteem •High freq, substantial harm Increasing use = Irrational thoughts – feeling immortal, losing "won money" better than losing "earned money," loss chasing, increasing spends PG tends to not be a stable addiction, harms such as finances and psych distress cause a period of reduced use and cycle depends on maturation, life changes and support	
Schellinck, Schrans, Schellinck and	Focus Group	Britain – London	63 374	PGSI	Health Survey 53-Item	SES Groups	Creation of a Risk Prediction Measure for Harms entitled the FLAGS-EGM. It was found to have strong potential however	Victoria Gambling Research

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
Bliemel (2015)	Telephone Survey				Questions		could not constructively measure preoccupation and obsession with gambling. Although specific harms are only briefly discussed the study may be useful in discussing what is a valid harm vs a risk of harm. For example it is suggested that borrowing money is not a harm, but is a predictor of the harms, "debt" and "relationship conflicts."	Panel
Shannon, Anijoul and Blaszczynski (2017)	Literature Review Case Note Review Discussion with Professionals	Australia	542	PGSI	48-Indicators of Harm	Clinical vs Non	Significant correlation between PGSI and the 48-Indicators of harm. In the clinical sample, the highest levels of gambling-related harm, on average, were indicated by reduced savings, followed by a sense of doing without, worry, frustration and debt. Across the same sample, on average, the lowest levels of gambling-related harm indicated were drug use, suicide, bankruptcy, self-injury and problems with	South Australian Independent Gambling Authority

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
							education. For the community sample, debt, problems with partner, feeling constrained, going out less, and decreased self-control and pride were, on average, associated with the highest level of harm. However, the mean level of harm for all 15 indicators in the community sample is less than one empirically defined unit. The distribution pattern of averaged harms scores was consistent across both samples, excluding reduced savings and decreased happiness. The findings indicate that psychological and financial harms represent the most significant effects of gambling experienced by both. The highest levels of gambling harm represent negative impacts on general quality of life and psychological well-being rather than harms at the more severe end of the spectrum.	

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
Skaal, Sinclair, Stein and Myers (2016)	Survey	South Africa - Polokwane	900	PGSI	10-Item Kessler Psychological Distress Scale Alcohol Use Identification Test	Demographics	Hazardous/harmful alcohol use associated with almost double odds of being at moderate risk and sevenfold odds of being at high risk than at no/low risk for gambling problems. Psychological distress associated with high risk for PG only. Every unit increase in K-10 score increased odds of being categorized as high risk 1.2 times. For service variables, moderate risk gamblers had almost twofold greater odds of not being aware of the helpline than LR. High risk gamblers had 60 % reduced likelihood of not being aware of gambling treatment services than low risk gamblers. Participants from urban areas more likely to report psychological distress, be high risk gamblers, and be aware of gambling services. In peri-urban and urban settings, employment status was associated with PG. Relative to employed gamblers,	South African National Responsible Gambling Foundation

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
							unemployed had two-fold greater odds of being a problem gambler. Gamblers from urban settings who were unemployed had close to 70 % diminished odds of being a problem gambler. Alcohol use was only associated with high risk gambling and strength of these associations was greatest for participants from urban settings. Psychological distress was associated with being a high risk gambler across all locations.	
Splevins, Mireskandari, Clayton and Blaszczynski (2010)	Self-Administered Survey	Australia-Sydney	252	DSM-IV-MR-J SOGS	Harm – Scale Attitudes Help-Seeking Behaviour	Secondary School Students	No females met criteria for PG. More males starting to gamble 5–11 and found first experience more exciting than females. Males more likely preoccupied with thoughts about gambling. More need to increase spends. Males more likely to report arguments about gambling. Pocket money and part-time jobs formed main source of funds, with no differences found	Star City Casino

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
							according to gambling status. PG believed more skill was required for all forms of gambling. PG more likely to have missed school. Significantly more PG sold personal property and committed illegal acts to get money. PG more likely to try risks like smoking and drugs. Ecstasy and legal drugs showed no significant difference between PG and non-PG. No significant differences in self-reported or peer-reported presence of a gambling problem showing adolescents may be less aware of the signs.	
Tu, Gray and Walton (2014)	Secondary Data Analysis Interview	New Zealand	(08) = 1608 (10) = 1740 (12) = 2672	None Stated	The Health and Lifestyles Survey The New Zealand Index of	SES Group	More affluent Socioeconomic Status individuals are more likely to gamble than less affluent individuals. However, where rates of behaviour and harms had dropped within higher status groups, they had not within lower status groups. This shows that harm is experienced differently across socioeconomic categories and that less	Ministry of Health

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
					Deprivation		affluent SES individuals may be at a higher risk of experiencing harms.	
Wardle, Bramley, Norrie and Manthorpe (2019)	Systematic Rapid Review	Worldwide	38	Multiple Dependent on Study	Multiple Dependent on Study	Migrants	Migrants were less likely to participate in gambling than non-migrants, however they were found more likely to experience harms. Migrants in New Zealand found to be more at risk of developing from low to high-risk and migrants in America and Denmark found to have same PG rates as non-migrants despite lesser engagement. Spanish migrants found to use casinos more, spend over 300 euros daily, claim to win when they lost and chase losses more. Minimal evidence of what harms are experienced and if these differ from non-migrants however Australian studies found financial harm, shame, relationship issues, suicide, mental health, isolation, and prostitution. Also discussed lack of culturally appropriate support services for	King's College London and London School of Tropical Hygiene and Medicine Interdisciplinary Research Fund

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Design	Country	N	Diagnostic Measures	Harms Measure	Group(s)	Harms Experienced	Funding
							migrants.	
Yani-de-Soriano, Javed and Yousafzai (2012)	Literature Review Online Survey	Britain	209	SOGS	K-10 Scale Dichotomous Health Survey Young's 8-Item Internet Addiction Scale	Students	PP gamblers reported highest degree of harms in all categories, including longest time spent online generally and longest time spent online gambling. No significant association between online PG and Internet addiction. Online PG significantly associated with binge drinking. No significant association found between cigarette smoking and online PG. Online gamblers have a tendency towards problem gambling, as most (60 %) displayed this. As the seriousness of the online problem gambling status increases, the harm to the physical health, mental health, social relationships and academic performance of the participants also increases.	Cardiff Business School, Cardiff University

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure 2. Kmet, Lee and Cook (2004) Research Quality Checks

Study	Criteria																					
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14								
	Study design evidence and	appropriate	selection or source of	information/input	group, if applicable)	characteristics	random allocation was	possible, was it described	blinding of investigators	was possible, was it	blinding of subjects was	possible, was it reported	and robust to	measurement /	misclassification bias?	Sample size appropriate	described/justified and	variance is reported for	Controlled for	confounding	Results reported in	sufficient detail	Conclusions supported by	the results	Total Sum	Total Possible Sum	Summary Score
Browne and Rockloff (2018)	3	3	3		3		N/A		N/A		N/A		3			2	3	3	1		3	3			19	22	0.86
Browne, Goodwin, and Rockloff (2018)	3	3	3		3		N/A		N/A		N/A		3			N/A	3	3	3		3	3			20	20	1.00
Browne, Hing, Rockloff, Russel, Greer, Nicoll and Smith (2019)	3	3	3		3		N/A		N/A		N/A		3			3	3	3	3		3	3			22	22	1.00
Canale, Vieno	3	3	3		3		N/A		N/A		N/A		3			3	3	3	2		3	3			21	22	0.95

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

and Griffiths (2016)																
Castren, Perhoniemi, Kontto, Alho and Salonen (2018)	3	3	2	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	20	22	0.91
Currie, Hodgins, Wang, El-Guebaly and Wynne (2006)	3	3	3	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	20	22	0.91
Estevez, Herrero-Fernandez, Sarabia, Jauregui (2015)	3	3	2	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	21	22	0.95
Gainsbury, Abarbanel and Blaszczynski (2017)	3	3	2	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	3	2	3	2	2	3	16	22	0.73
Hing, Breen, Gordon and	3	3	3	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	3	3	2	1	3	3	19	22	0.86

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Russell (2014)																	
Hubert and Griffiths (2018)	3	3	2	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	3	3	3	N/A	3	3	19	20	0.95
Jeffrey, Browne, Rawat, Langham, Li and Rockloff (2019)	3	3	3	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	21	22	0.95
Langham, Russel, Hing and Gainsbury (2017)	3	3	3	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	22	22	1.00
Larsen, Curtis and Bjerregaard (2013)	3	3	3	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	22	22	1.00
Lee, Chung and Bernhard (2014)	3	3	2	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	21	22	0.95
Li, Browne, Rawat, Langham, Rockloff (2017)	3	3	3	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	19	22	0.86
Lloyd, Hawton,	3	3	2	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	21	22	0.95

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Dutton, Geddes, Goodwin and Rogers (2016)																	
May-Chahal, Humphreys, Clifton, Francis and Reith (2017)	3	3	3	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	20	22	0.91
Raisamo, Halme, Murto and Lintonen (2013)	3	3	3	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	21	22	0.95
Raisamo, Makela, Salonen and Lintonen (2015)	3	3	3	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	22	22	1.00
Rawat, Browne Greer, Langham, Rockloff and Hanley (2017)	3	3	3	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	3	3	2	1	3	3	19	22	0.86
Ricijas, Hundric and Huic (2016)	3	3	2	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	21	22	0.95

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Ronzitti, Soldini, Lutri, Smith, Clerici and Bowden-Jones (2016)	3	3	2	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	19	22	0.86
Salonen, Alho and Castren (2017)	3	3	3	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	22	22	1.00
Salonen, Hellman, Latvala and Castren (2018)	3	3	2	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	3	3	3	1	3	3	17	22	0.77
Shannon, Anijoul and Blaszczynski (2017)	3	3	2	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	3	3	3	N/A	3	3	19	20	0.95
Skaal, Sinclair, Stein and Myers (2016)	3	3	2	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	21	22	0.95
Splevins, Mireskandari,	3	3	2	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	2	3	3	1	3	3	18	22	0.82

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Clayton and Blaszczynski (2010)																	
Yani-de-Soriano, Javed and Yousafzai (2012)	3	3	2	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	2	3	3	1	3	3	17	22	0.77

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Criteria																							
	1		2		3		4		5		6		7		8		9		10					
	[illegible]	[illegible]	evident and	appropriate	Context for the	study clear	[illegible]	framework /	wider body of	described,	relevant and	methods clearly	described and	[illegible]	clearly described	and systematic	verification	procedure(s) to	establish	[illegible]	supported by the	results	Reflexivity of the	account	Total Sum	Total Possible Sum	Summary Score
Anderson, Rempusheski and Leedy (2017)	3	3		3		3		3		3		3		3		3		2							19	28	0.68
Bergh and Kuhlhorn (1994)	3	3		3		3		1		2		1		1		3		1							11	28	0.39
Binde (2016)	3	3		3		3		1		2		2		1		3		1							12	28	0.43
Breen (2011)	3	3		3		3		3		3		3		3		3		1							18	28	0.64
Breen, Hing and Gordon (2010)	3	3		3		3		3		3		3		3		3		1							18	28	0.64
Delfabbro and	2	2		3		3		1		1		2		1		2		1							8	28	0.29

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

King (2017)													
Delfabbro and King (2019)	2	2	3	3	1	1	2	1	3	2	10	28	0.36
Ferrara, Franceschini and Corsello (2018)	1	2	3	3	1	1	2	1	3	1	8	28	0.29
Fulton (2019)	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	18	28	0.64
Goh, Ng and Yeoh (2016)	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	20	28	0.71
Kolandai-Matchett, Langham, Bellringer and Siitia (2017)	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	1	17	28	0.61
Langham, Thorne, Browne, Donaldson, Rose and Rockloff (2016)	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	19	28	0.68

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

McCarthy, Thomas, Bellringer and Cassidy (2019)	3	2	3	3	2	2	2	1	3	2	13	28	0.46
Pitt, Thomas, Bestman, Daube and Derevensky (2017)	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	19	28	0.68
Rintoul, Deblaquiere and Thomas (2017)	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	18	28	0.64
Samuelsson, Sundqvist and Binde (2018)	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	19	28	0.68
Wardle, Bramley, Norrie and Manthorpe (2019)	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	19	28	0.68

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Study	Criteria																
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14			
	[illegible]	group selection or and appropriate	source of information/input	[illegible] applicable)	characteristics random allocation was possible, was it	[illegible] investigators was	possible, was it blinding of subjects was possible, was it	[illegible] defined and robust to measurement /	misclassification bias?	[illegible] appropriate	described/justified and appropriate	variance is reported	[illegible] confounding	Results reported in sufficient detail	Conclusions supported by the results	Total Sum	Total Possible Sum	Summary Score
Schellinck, Schrans, Schellinck and Bliemel (2015)	3	3	2	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	17	22	0.77
Tu, Gray and Walton (2014)	3	3	3	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	3	3	3	1	3	3	19	22	0.86

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure 3. Langham et al (2016) Taxonomy of Harms

Table 1 A taxonomy of harms experienced by people who gamble

	General	Crisis	Legacy
Financial Harm	• Reduction or loss of capacity to purchase luxury items such as holidays, electronics • Reduction or loss of discretionary spending such as non-gambling related entertainment or other family members' activities (ie. children's sports) • Erosion of savings • Activities to manage short term cash-flow issues: o Additional employment or other forms of income generation o Accessing more credit o Use of credit cards (kite flying) o Selling or pawning items o Pay day loans o Non-payment or juggling of large bills such as utilities or rates • Cost of replacing items sold or pawned as part of short term cash strategies • Reduction or loss of non-immediate consequence expenditure o Insurance (health, home, car, income protection, business) o Repairs or maintenance costs (home, car, business) o Health promotion activities (check-ups, long term medications, allied health support) o Household items • Reduction or loss of expenditure on items of immediate consequence: o Children's expenses (education) o Medication or health care o Clothing o Food (including use of food parcel) o Housing or accommodation o Needing assistance with bill payments from welfare organisations or inability to pay bills (eg utilities) o Transport costs (petrol, fares)	• Loss of sources of additional funds (ie no further credit available) • Loss of capacity to meet requirements of essential needs (food) • Loss of normal accommodation requiring temporary accommodation or resulting in homelessness • Loss of major assets (car, home, business) • Bankruptcy	• Reliant on welfare • Restrictions due to bankruptcy or credit rating • Ongoing financial hardship • "Forced" cohabitation or involvement in unhealthy relationship due to financial constraint • Further financial harm from attempts to manage debt (ie. Non-reputable finance providers for debt consolidation) • Ongoing issues relating to financial security, poverty, or financial disadvantage. • Higher costs associated with poor credit rating including premium cost of pay as you go services or increased security bonds.
Relationship Disruption, Conflict or Breakdown	• Dishonest communication within relationships with spouse, partner, children, family, friends or community • Unreliable or unavailable to spouse, partner, children,	• Threat of separation or rejection from relationship with spouse, partner, children, family, friends or community • Actual separation or rejection from relationship with spouse,	• Social isolation due to ongoing estrangement from relationships with spouse, partner, children, family, friends or community

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 1 A taxonomy of harms experienced by people who gamble *(Continued)*

	family, friends or community • Reduced amount of time spent with spouse, partner, children, family, friends or community • Reduced quality of time spent with spouse, partner, children, family, friends or community • Disengagement or withdrawal from relationship responsibilities. • Increased levels of neglect of relationships • Pervasive neglect or disengagement from relationships • Reduced engagement in family or social events, • Tension with spouse, partner, children, family, friends or community • Minor or occasional conflict due to increased involvement in gambling or suspicion of increased involvement with gambling • Serious or regular conflict due to increased involvement in gambling or suspicion of increased involvement with gambling • Major or constant conflict due to increased involvement in gambling or suspicion of increased involvement with gambling • Loss of trust from relationship with spouse, partner, children, family, friends or community • "Punishment" by spouse, partner, children, family, friends or community • Episodic distortion of relationship roles (infantilising the person gambling, others including children having to take parental type role) • Incidence or escalation of family violence or intimate partner violence	partner, children, family, friends or community • Social isolation • Loss of relationship (temporary or permanent) with spouse, partner, children, family, friends or community • Distortion of relationship roles (infantilising the person gambling, others including children having to take parental type role) • Incidence or escalation of family violence or intimate partner violence	• Vulnerability to problematic gambling relapse due to isolation or relationship breakdown • Inability or reluctance to participate in social functions at gambling venues • Ongoing "punishment" or resentment from spouse, partner, children, family, friends or community • Relationship rebuilding or reconciliation • Ongoing involvement of family court in parenting or co-parenting • Long term damage or estrangement from relationship/s with spouse, partner, children, family, friends or community • Ongoing distortion of relationship roles (infantilising the person gambling, others including children having to take parental type role) • Loss of psychological development through lack of appropriate social interaction • Incidence or escalation of family violence or intimate partner violence
Emotional or Psychological Distress	• Emotional and psychological distress caused by living outside of your value system • Experience of distorted cognitions or erroneous beliefs • Emotional or psychological distress of hiding gambling from others (including lying and creating alibis for lost time and money) • Reduced feelings of self-worth and pride • Increased feelings of shame • Increased feelings of inadequacy or personal failing because of inability to control gambling to recreational levels • Perceptions of being stigmatised • Emotional or psychological distress of inability to control gambling • Increased feelings of insecurity and vulnerability • Emotional or psychological distress caused by other harms • Emotional or psychological distress due to harm caused to others (guilt) • Loss of "face" or reputation due to impact of other harms	• Extreme emotional or psychological distress in relation to other harms • Extreme emotional or psychological distress due to harm caused to others • Extreme emotional or psychological distress caused by living outside of your value system • Complete loss of feelings of self-worth and pride • Extreme shame • Extreme sense of hopelessness and powerlessness • Suicidal ideation • Loss of "face" or reputation (stigma) if problem with gambling becomes publicly known • Shame from utilising responsible gambling measures such as exclusion or seeking treatment. • Extreme fear and distress from follow up and harassment by creditors (legal and illegal)	• Experienced, perceived and internal stigma • Ongoing guilt and shame • Emotional and psychological impacts of managing recovery or harm minimisation strategies including constant vigilance and behavioural adaptation • Ongoing feelings of insecurity and vulnerability • Ongoing emotional and psychological distress in relation to other harms • Ongoing emotional or psychological distress due to harm caused to others • Ongoing emotional or psychological distress caused by having lived outside of your value system • Ongoing vulnerability to suicidal behaviours

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 1 A taxonomy of harms experienced by people who gamble *(Continued)*

	• Desperation from not being able to recoup losses. • Emotional or psychological distress of not wanting to accept problems with gambling • Loss of sense of future or ability to get ahead • Increasing feelings of powerlessness • Fear and distress from follow up and harassment by creditors (legal and illegal)		
Decrements to Health	• Increased sedentary behaviour during time spent gambling • Biological manifestation of emotional and psychological distress eg. increased blood pressure, loss of sleep • Reduced levels of self-care: o nutrition o hygiene o sufficient sleep o compliance with medical care o physical activity o reduced quality of living circumstances (ie. cannot afford heating) • Incidence of disease or injury due to reduced levels of self care • Increased risk due to gateway effect, interaction with, or exacerbation of other health risk factors (drinking, smoking, illegal substances) • Increased risk due to gateway to, interaction with, or exacerbation of comorbidities (depression, anxiety, biophysical chronic disease) • Increased experience of family violence due to involvement in gambling • Incidence of self-harm • Minor health ailments (headache migraine) relating to focussing on a screen for long periods of time with particular gambling products	• Physical impacts of living rough due to homelessness, including increased risk of disease, violence and impact of poor living conditions • Experience of violence due to involvement in gambling • Medical emergency (including mortality) due to onset, exacerbation, or failure to diagnose condition due to gambling • Serious self-harm • Attempted (or completed) suicide	• Ongoing disability or decrement to health through attempted suicide or other forms of self-harm • Ongoing increased risk of disease or decrement to health due to legacy effects of risk factors or poor self-care • Ongoing disability or decrement to health due to other medical conditions exacerbated or advanced due to involvement with gambling.
Cultural Harm	• Reduced engagement in cultural rituals • Culturally based shame in relation to cultural roles and expectations • Reduction of contribution to community and cultural practices of the community • Reduction of cultural practices • Reduced connection to cultural community • Harm to individual through reduced connection to community and culture in terms of increased social exclusion or isolation	• Extreme cultural shame in relation to culturally based roles and expectations • Loss of ability to contribute to community • Impact (loss) on cultural practices • Damaged or lost connection to community and culture • Harm to individual through reduced or lost connection to community	• Ongoing cultural shame in relation to roles and expectations • Ongoing reduction or loss of contribution to community • Ongoing reduction or loss of cultural practices • Ongoing loss of connection to community • Ongoing harm to individual through reduced connection to community
Reduced Performance at Work or Study	• Reduced performance due to tiredness or distraction • Increased absenteeism due to time spent actually gambling, tiredness, ill health or lack of transport due to gambling • Workplace or educational institution consequences of use of work or educational institution resources	• Loss of job due to theft or fraud involving employment or educational institution • Loss of job, suspension or exclusion from educational institution due to poor performance	• Reduced opportunity for employment or enrolment due to past poor performance or criminal activity • Ongoing impact in participation in volunteer work (linked to reputation and restriction of activities)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012104; this version posted November 12, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 1 A taxonomy of harms experienced by people who gamble *(Continued)*

	for gambling activity • Reduced availability to contribute to the community through volunteer work	• Exacerbation or contribution to other harms due to job loss (including loss of wage) • Rejection from volunteer work	
Criminal Activity	• Vulnerability to illegal activities that can provide fast access to funds • Engagement in crimes of negligence - acts such as child neglect (leaving children unsupervised) • Engagement in crimes of opportunity - petty theft including from family members • Engagement in crimes of opportunity - property crimes for funds, illicit lending, fraudulent efforts to attain funds • Engagement in crimes of duress - relating to repaying debt such as drug trafficking and prostitution	• Arrest and/or conviction of criminal activity of opportunity • Arrest and/or conviction of criminal activity of duress • Arrest and / or conviction of criminal activity of negligence	• Impact of criminal record on future employment opportunities, voluntary and community opportunities, travel restrictions • Disruption to relationships of custodial sentence • Ongoing impact on spouse, partner, child, family and friends due to impact of criminal record or custodial sentence through other mechanisms • Trans-generational impact of criminal record or custodial sentence • Shame and stigma of criminal conviction or involvement in criminal activity
Lifecourse and Intergenerational Harms • Generational loss relating to financial security or stages of financial achievement (ongoing impact caused by inability to secure or loss of major asset, superannuation) • Loss of lifecourse events such as engagement/marriage/having children (generational loss) • Loss of primary relationships and social connection (including parents/children/community) • Having to move towns/states due to impact of gambling or other harms • Homelessness • Change to career due to impact of gambling or other harms • Incarceration due to gambling			