



HAL
open science

Understanding the link between childhood trauma and schizophrenia: A systematic review of neuroimaging studies

Aïda Cancel, Samy Dallel, Aïcha Zine, Wissam El-Hage, Eric Fakra

► To cite this version:

Aïda Cancel, Samy Dallel, Aïcha Zine, Wissam El-Hage, Eric Fakra. Understanding the link between childhood trauma and schizophrenia: A systematic review of neuroimaging studies. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, 2019, 107, pp.492 - 504. 10.1016/j.neubiorev.2019.05.024 . hal-03488587

HAL Id: hal-03488587

<https://hal.science/hal-03488587>

Submitted on 20 Jul 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

Quality of life instruments used in problem gambling studies:
A systematic review and a meta-analysis

Nicolas A. Bonfils^{1,3,4,5,*}, Henri-Jean Aubin^{1,2}, Amine Benyamina^{1,2}, Frédéric Limosin^{3,4,5},

Amandine Luquiens^{1,2}

1. CESP, Univ. Paris-Sud, UVSQ, INSERM, Université Paris-Saclay, Villejuif, France

2. APHP, Hôpitaux Universitaires Paris-Sud, Villejuif, France
Faculté de Médecine Paris Sud, Université Paris XI, Paris, France

3. AP-HP, Hôpitaux Universitaires Paris Ouest, Department of Psychiatry and
Addictology, Paris, France

4. Université Paris Descartes, Sorbonne Paris Cité, Faculté de Médecine, Paris,
France

5. Inserm, U894, Centre Psychiatrie et Neurosciences, Paris, France

*** Correspondance to:**

Nicolas A. Bonfils

Inserm, U894, Centre Psychiatrie et Neurosciences, Paris, France

nicolas.bonfils@aphp.fr

Phone : +33 6 37 29 40 15

Fax : + 33 1 58 00 47 85

Funding source

Nothing declared.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this systematic review was to identify the instruments used in original articles to measure quality of life (QOL) or health-related QOL (HRQOL) in gambling-disorder patients and to assess their suitability.

The systematic literature search to identify QOL/HRQOL instruments used among gambling-disorder patients was performed in PubMed, Embase and PsycINFO databases up to November 2018. A meta-analysis was performed to study the effect size of the QOL/HRQOL instruments and gambling outcomes after an intervention.

Thirty-five studies were included. Seven types of instruments aiming at measuring QOL/HRQOL were identified. These instruments explored twenty-six domains. The instruments used were not properly validated in the studies. Most of the clinical trials reported a significant difference in QOL/HRQOL between pre- and post-intervention. These results were concordant with gambling outcomes but had a smaller effect size than gambling outcomes.

The currently used general instruments are efficient to measure a significant change after an intervention but might not evaluate specific areas of health related QOL impacted by gambling disorders

Keywords: review; meta-analysis; gambling; quality of life; harm.

1 **1. INTRODUCTION**

2

3 Problem gambling is characterized by a persistent and recurrent problematic gambling
4 behavior leading to clinically significant impairment or distress (Browne et al., 2016).
5 However treatment outcomes in this field remain poorly defined and are measured
6 inconsistently across studies (Pickering et al., 2017). This is probably due to no consensual
7 definition of recovery, as remission is only defined by no diagnostic operatory criterion
8 during twelve months (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). Moreover, the course of the
9 disease can vary deeply from one subject to another, as attests DSM-5 specification of the
10 diagnosis “episodic” or “persistent”. Gambling disorder does not follow a linear course over
11 time (Bruneau et al., 2016; LaPlante et al., 2008; Slutske et al., 2003). A wide range of
12 outcome measures is used in gambling disorder research (Walker et al., 2006). A recent
13 systematic review identified sixty-three different outcome measures in gambling disorder
14 studies (Pickering et al., 2017). Their authors recommend developing a multidimensional
15 scale that could assess the efficacy of an intervention in various domains of functioning
16 (Pickering et al., 2017). Earlier, the Banff Consensus provided a framework with the
17 minimum features of reporting efficacy of intervention and came to support the relevance of
18 quality of life assessment in gambling disorder, in complement with the reduction of
19 gambling behavior and the reduction of problems caused by gambling (Walker et al., 2006).
20 In 1993, the World Health Organization defined quality of life (QOL) “as an individual's
21 perception of their position in life in the context of the culture and value systems in which
22 they live and in relation to their goals, expectations, standards and concerns. It is a broad
23 ranging concept affected in a complex way by the person's physical health, psychological
24 state, level of independence, social relationships, and their relationship to salient features of

25 their environment” (Szabo and WHOQOL Group, 1996). Two types of QOL instruments are
26 usually used: (i) general QOL instruments exploring overall QOL regardless of any health
27 condition and (ii) health-related QOL (HRQOL) classically involving four areas: physical,
28 physical well-being, psychological state and social relations (Leplège, 1999). On one hand,
29 “quality of life” describes a subjective feeling of satisfaction with life in domains of
30 importance to the subjects. On the other hand, “health-related quality of life” reports a
31 subjective perception of the impact of the disease and its treatment(s) on daily life, physical,
32 psychological and social functioning and well-being (Leidy et al., 1999).

33 QOL has been discussed in the medical literature since the 1960s (Elkinton, 1966). It became
34 increasingly important in health care to measure outcomes beyond morbidity and biological
35 functioning (Karimi and Brazier, 2016). The practice of medicine is often based on the
36 identification and management of symptoms, while patients' expectations go beyond
37 management of symptoms: they are looking for optimal well-being (Luquiens and Aubin,
38 2014). In addition, QOL assessment matches with the treatment goal of enhanced client
39 functioning and predict treatment adherence (Laudet, 2011). Moreover, participants with
40 addiction at all stages of recovery expressed concerns about multiple areas of functioning
41 (Laudet et al., 2009). QOL is often included as a secondary endpoint in clinical trials,
42 reflecting patients' feelings and functioning and the impact of their health condition beyond
43 simple symptom assessment (Carr et al., 2001). In 2006, Walker et al. stressed that there
44 was a lack of evaluated or validated psychometric instruments assessing QOL in gambling
45 disorder (Walker et al., 2006) whereas evaluated or validated psychometric instruments
46 assessing QOL do exist in substance use disorders (Luquiens et al., 2016; Neale et al., 2016).

47 The purpose of this review was (i) to identify the instruments used in original articles to
48 measure QOL/HRQOL in subjects with a gambling disorder in all original articles and then (ii)

49 to assess the suitability of these instruments (reliability, content validity, effect size) in the
50 gambling disorder field.

51

52

53 **2. MATERIAL AND METHODS**

54

55 The systematic review was conducted independently using the Preferred Reporting Items for
56 Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) statement guidelines for systematic
57 reviews (Liberati et al., 2009) . Our review project was registered in PROSPERO database.
58 Our project began in 2016. Since then, we have updated our review and implemented it with
59 a meta-analysis. So we have updated our record in PROSPERO database
60 (<https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPERO/#recordDetails>).

61

62 **2.1. Selection criteria**

63 Articles were included if they were (i) original articles aiming at assessing QOL/HRQOL in
64 problem or pathological gambling/gambling disorder subjects and using an instrument
65 designated to measure QOL/HRQOL by the authors as an outcome and (ii) if subjects were
66 over 18 years old. We excluded (i) articles with subjects that did not fulfill problem or
67 pathological gambling/gambling disorder criteria and (ii) articles with Parkinson disease
68 subjects.

69

70 **2.2. Data sources**

71 The systematic literature searched to identify original studies using QOL instruments in
72 problem gambling was performed in the following electronic databases: PsycInfo (Ovid),
73 MEDLINE (using PubMed platform), and Embase (Ovid).

74

75 **2.3. Literature search strategy**

76 A systematic literature search was conducted among peer-reviewed journals from 1950 to
77 November 2018 in these three electronic databases. The search strategy included a
78 combination of the following relevant keywords: “quality of life”, “pathological gambling”,
79 “gambling disorder” and “problem gambling”. The search was conducted to identify original
80 studies that reported the use of QOL/HRQOL instruments in gambling in any country.
81 Electronic database searches were limited to English-language publications.

82

83 **2.4. Study selection**

84 The study selection process was comprised of the following two phases. First, titles and
85 abstracts of all potentially relevant publications were carefully screened and reviewed for
86 eligibility according to inclusion and exclusion criteria by two authors (AL and NB). Secondly,
87 the full texts of studies selected at the first step were obtained and reviewed for eligibility,
88 using the same inclusion and exclusion criteria as in Level 1, by the same researchers. When
89 necessary, we contacted authors of relevant studies to obtain additional information, article
90 texts, and resolve questions about eligibility. If there were disagreements between the two
91 authors in terms of selection of articles at the abstract level/ article level, discrepancies were
92 resolved by consensus. Finally, with the same method, we systematically conducted any
93 search of the reference list of the included studies

94

95 **2.5. Data extraction**

96 Data were extracted from the full text of articles by both the two investigators working
97 independently. Data extracted included the following items: aim, research question, design
98 and setting, sample characteristics, intervention, instrument used to assess QOL/HRQOL and
99 result(s) on QOL/HRQOL. For epidemiological studies, the main outcome measure nature
100 and results were extracted. For trials, we extracted whether QOL/HRQOL was a primary or
101 secondary endpoint and the other endpoint nature and results. The data were summarized
102 in **Tables 2** (see in results section).

103 Psychometric properties of the instrument (reliability, content validity, effect size) in
104 gambling population were also extracted. The QOL/HRQOL instruments are generally tested
105 for two types of reliability: (i) the internal consistency measured by Cronbach's alpha and (ii)
106 the test-retest reliability estimated by Pearson correlation coefficient. The content validity
107 refers to the degree to which an instrument measures the concept it has to measure. We
108 also studied the effect size of these instruments compared with the effect size of gambling
109 behavioral measures (See below: *Meta-analysis*).

110 Finally, we analyzed currently used QOL/HRQOL concepts in gambling-disorder subjects. For
111 this purpose, we identified the life domains of these instruments by extracting and
112 examining item concepts, after reviewing all relevant instruments. We have included as
113 many domains as possible but some may overlap.

114

115 **2.6. Meta-analysis**

116 To assess the ability to detect the change of QOL/HRQOL instruments, we also performed a
117 meta-analysis from selected trials. Three trials were excluded due to a lack of data with
118 which to perform the meta-analysis (no sample size or lack of documentation on outcome).

119 Each of the gambling and QOL/HRQOL pre/post intervention outcomes were analyzed by
120 calculating the Cohen's d effect-size for each trial with the uncertainty of each result being
121 expressed by their 95% confidence intervals (CI). An effect-size of 0.2 to 0.3 is considered to
122 be a "small" effect, around 0.5 a "medium" effect, and above 0.8, a "large" effect (Cohen,
123 1988). Consistent with convention, a conservative estimate of $r = 0.70$ was imputed as the
124 pre-post correlation in the calculation if it was not reported (Rosenthal, 1991; Wu et al.,
125 2015).

126 Then we calculated the summarized effect-size of gambling outcomes and QOL/HRQOL ones
127 using a random-effects model. Heterogeneity was assessed by calculating the I^2 value. The
128 random-effects model was chosen because of the between trial heterogeneity. The
129 underlying assumption of a random-effects model is that the true effect could vary between
130 studies based on characteristics of the study population or intervention. Indeed, a wide
131 range of gambling and QOL/HRQOL outcomes were used throughout the different included
132 studies. A random-effect model is more conservative because it produces wider confidence
133 intervals for the effect estimates than a fixed-effects model.

134 Publication bias was assessed using a funnel plot. In case of asymmetry, Duval and Tweedie's
135 Trim and Fill method was used to impute missing studies. A significance level of $p < .05$ (two-
136 tailed) was used for all analyses (Duval and Tweedie, 2000).

137 Finally, we performed a quality analysis of the included randomized controlled trials
138 following the "Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias" (Higgins et al., 2011),
139 which includes five risks of bias: 1- selection bias, assessing random sequence generation
140 and allocation concealment; 2- performance bias, assessing blinding of participants and
141 personnel; 3- detection bias, assessing blinding of outcome assessment; 4- attrition bias,

142 exploring for incomplete outcome data; and 5- reporting bias, searching for selective
143 reporting.

144 All analyses were conducted using the Comprehensive Meta-Analysis statistical program,
145 version 3.0 (Englewood, NJ). HJA and NB extracted the data and performed this meta-
146 analysis.

147

148

149 **3. RESULTS**

150

151 The search yielded 423 citations, published between 1997 and 2018. Of these, 221 were
152 ineligible after review of the title and abstract. Thirty-five studies were included in this
153 review. The PRISMA flow diagram of the study selection process (**Figure 1**) shows the
154 reasons for excluding articles. The thirty-five included articles were published between 2002
155 and 2017. We identified six types of instruments aiming at measure QOL or HRQOL - all
156 instruments self-administered:

- 157 • The Medical Outcomes Study Item Short-Form Health Survey (SF) with some different
158 length options for the SF: SF-36 (McHorney et al., 1993; Ware, 2000), SF-12 (Ware et
159 al., 1996), SF-8 (Ware and GlaxoSmithKline, 2001) and SF-6D (Brazier et al., 2002,
160 1998),
- 161 • The European Quality of Life Questionnaire (EQ-5D) and the EQ-Visual analogue scale
162 (EQ-VAS) (EuroQol Group, 1990; Scott and Huskisson, 1976),
- 163 • The World Health Organization Quality of Life Assessment Instrument (Szabo and
164 WHOQOL Group, 1996) with some length options for the WHO-QOL-BREF and the
165 EUROHIS-QOL 8 item index (Schmidt et al., 2006),

- 166 • The Quality of Life Enjoyment and Satisfaction Questionnaire (Q-LES-Q) (Endicott et
167 al., 1993),
- 168 • The Quality of Life Inventory (QOLI) (Frisch et al., 1992),
- 169 • The Personal Well Being Index – Adult (PWI-A) (Cummins et al., 2003).

170 The instruments used most frequently were the SF (n=11), followed by the QOLI (n=10) and
171 WHOQOL (n=6) (Table 1). In the last three years of the search (i.e. 2016, 2017, 2018), the
172 four following instruments were used: the QOLI (n=4), the SF (n=3), the WHOQOL-BREF (n=1)
173 and the Q-LES-Q (n=1) (Table 1). These instruments were initially designed for various
174 purposes and referred to different concepts. The SF instruments were constructed to
175 measure HRQOL. The EQ-5D is a standardized measure of health status, commonly used as a
176 HRQOL instrument. The other instruments were developed to measure QOL. None of these
177 instruments were specifically designed to gambling disorder.

178 The methods and the results of the thirty-five articles are presented in **Tables 2**.

179

180 **3.1. Description of the instruments and their psychometric properties**

181 The instruments differed widely in number of domains and items, scaling, scoring and
182 psychometric properties. The complete description of these instruments is provided in **Table**
183 **3**.

184 The psychometric properties of the included scales have been poorly studied in the gambling
185 population. We report those given in the included articles. The SF-12, SF-8 and SF-6D derive
186 from the SF-36. In a sample of 77 pathological gamblers, internal consistency (Cronbach's
187 alpha) of the SF-12 domains ranged from 0.76 to 0.77, indicating rather good reliability
188 (McIntosh et al., 2016). No more psychometric properties have been reported in the
189 gambling population for SF scales. In a sample of 139 individuals diagnosed with gambling

190 disordered, internal consistency of the WHOQOL-BREF domains measured ranged from 0.66
191 to 0.84, indicating rather good reliability (Oei and Raylu, 2015). In a sample of 260 alcohol-
192 dependent, 282 drug-dependent, and 132 pathological gambling outpatients, internal
193 consistency of the PWI was 0.87 (Manning et al., 2012). To the best of our knowledge,
194 psychometric properties of EQ-5D, QOLI and Q-LES-Q have not been reported in the
195 gambling-disordered population.

196

197 **3.2. Analysis of the current concept of quality of life in gambling-disordered subjects**

198 The twenty-six domains investigated by the QOL/HRQOL instruments of the included articles
199 are presented in **Table 4**. We categorized these domains into the following broader
200 categories: *relationships with others, activities, physical state, psychological state, financial*
201 *concerns, medical care and satisfaction with life*. Some disparities can be noticed between
202 the different instruments on the assessed areas. Most of the instruments assessed social
203 relationships (8/9) whereas EQ-5D did not. Moreover, only QOLI assessed “problems with
204 children” and only WHOQOL-BREF did not assess family relationships. Social activities form
205 the most explored domain across the instruments. Finally, only 3 instruments out of 6 assess
206 the financial concerns (QOLI, WHOQOL-BREF and Q-LES-Q).

207

208 **3.3. Meta-analysis: effect size of QOL instruments**

209 We studied the effect size of the QOL/HRQOL instruments and gambling outcomes after an
210 intervention. To this end, we only selected trials and performed a meta-analysis on gambling
211 outcomes and QOL outcomes. Three trials were excluded because of a lack of
212 documentation on QOL or outcome results. When combining the seven trials, our meta-
213 analysis showed these results: the global effect size for QOL/HRQOL was 0.54 (95%CI 0.34-

214 0.73); concerning gambling outcome, the global effect size was 1,550 (95%CI 1.20-1.90)
215 (Figure 2). Thus the measurement of QOL with non-gambling specific instruments showed a
216 significant medium-range effect size, significantly smaller than the large-range gambling
217 outcome effect size. The heterogeneity was quite high, rather similar for both outcomes: $I^2=$
218 87,82 for gambling outcome and $I^2= 83,20$ for QOL/HRQOL. A visual inspection of the funnel
219 plot for open-label studies revealed asymmetry, indicating possible publication bias (Figure
220 3). Using Trim and Fill the imputed point estimate is barely modified: 0.54 (95%CI 0.34-0.73)
221 for the QOL/HRQOL outcome and 1.53 (95%CI 1.17-1.89) for the gambling outcome.

222

223 **4. DISCUSSION**

224

225 To our knowledge, this is the first review that inventories and assesses the suitability of
226 QOL/HRQOL instruments in the gambling problem. We reviewed randomized controlled
227 trials, non-comparative trials and epidemiological studies in order to be as comprehensive as
228 possible. We explored the suitability of these instruments through their psychometric
229 properties and their content. In addition, we performed a meta-analysis to analyze their
230 global effect size compared to the effect size of gambling behavioral outcomes.

231

232 First, this review found that a high degree of heterogeneity in QOL/HRQOL used
233 instruments in the gambling studies: six different types of instruments were used in thirty-
234 five included articles. Among these thirty-five included articles, only three articles were
235 randomized clinical trials and seven were non-comparative trials. We found twenty-five
236 epidemiologic studies that completed the inventory. Among trials, QOL/HRQOL was a
237 secondary outcome for eight (Carlbring and Smit, 2008; Garcia-Caballero et al., 2018; Grant

238 and Potenza, 2006; Kim et al., 2016; Lahti et al., 2010; McIntosh et al., 2016; Oei et al., 2018;
239 Zimmerman et al., 2002) and among epidemiological articles, only eight assessed
240 QOL/HRQOL as a primary endpoint (Black et al., 2003; Ekholm et al., 2018; Grant and Kim,
241 2005; Kohler, 2014; Loo et al., 2016; Manning et al., 2012; Mythily et al., 2011; Scherrer JF et
242 al., 2005). This finding shows that the relevance of QOL/HRQOL is not fully recognized in
243 gambling studies. The addiction field has come late to the chronic disease perspective. These
244 models address the impact of disease and services on the patient's overall well-being. That is
245 why the concept of QOL/HRQOL in addiction is relatively undeveloped whereas it is highly
246 relevant (Laudet, 2011). If we consider observational studies, only one study was
247 longitudinal; the others were cross-sectional with no possibility of exploring a change over
248 time. Most often, QOL/HRQOL has been studied according to whether one is a pathological
249 gambler, a problem gambler or a non-gambler. Despite the use of heterogeneous and
250 generalist QOL/HRQOL measurement instruments, observational studies found that
251 pathological and problem gamblers were more impacted than controls in QOL (Black et al.,
252 2013; Chamberlain et al., 2016; Ekholm et al., 2018; Grant and Kim, 2005; Kohler, 2014;
253 Medeiros et al., 2016; Mythily et al., 2011; Scherrer JF et al., 2005). The duration of illness
254 was also correlated with QOL (Medeiros et al., 2017). Some sub-scores on the scales,
255 particularly SF scale, were not significant: physical subscale, bodily pain and even social
256 functioning for example (Mason and Arnold, 2007; Morasco and Petry, 2006; Najavits et al.,
257 2010; Scherrer JF et al., 2005). This could be explained by the fact that these sub-dimensions
258 seem to be poorly adapted to problem gambling. The instruments used were not completely
259 or not at all validated in this population regarding the psychometric properties. It is an
260 important limit regarding the use of these instruments. Moreover, we performed a meta-
261 analysis that revealed a smaller effect size of QOL/HRQOL instruments than gambling

262 outcomes. It was not surprising that QOL/HRQOL showed a smaller effect size than gambling
263 specific outcomes, as it was a more general construct, and could be affected by factors
264 unrelated to gambling. However, this difference seemed huge. We have two explanations
265 for this result. The first is that current therapeutic interventions would improve the
266 behavioral symptoms of addiction but would not consequently improve QOL/HRQOL. It
267 would then be important to consider interventions that improve QOL/HRQOL beyond
268 behavioral change, without excluding each other. The other explanation would be that
269 change in QOL/HRQOL is not fully captured by the QOL/HRQOL instruments used. This could
270 be explained by the fact that these instruments are not gambling specific and are less able to
271 measure a change than the other specific gambling behavioral measures. It would be
272 interesting to develop an instrument to measure QOL specific to gambling.

273

274 Secondly, a content analysis of the QOL/HRQOL instruments revealed that they explored
275 twenty-six domains that we have categorized in seven broader categories: relationships with
276 others, activities, physical state, psychological state, financial concerns, medical care and
277 satisfaction with life. Nevertheless, these instruments are general (i.e. unspecific)
278 QOL/HRQOL instruments, and might not evaluate the whole range of impacted QOL/HRQOL
279 caused by gambling disorders. Only a few studies revealed the results of the scale sub-
280 scores, while others gave an overall result. When we looked at the studies giving the results
281 of the sub scores, only one study found a significant result on all the sub-scores including
282 mental health, physical functioning, bodily pain, and general health (Black et al., 2003). The
283 other studies found mental sub-score significantly associated with gambling but no
284 significant results regarding physical, bodily pain, vitality or general health sub-scores (Black
285 et al., 2013; Mason and Arnold, 2007; McIntosh et al., 2016; Morasco and Petry, 2006;

286 Najavits et al., 2010; Scherrer JF et al., 2005). Previous studies focused on harms caused by
287 gambling (Commission, 2010; Langham et al., 2015) or on HRQOL areas impacted by
288 gambling (Bonfils et al., 2019). Bonfils et al. (2019) aimed to describe HRQOL impacted by
289 problem gambling from a patients' perspective, through a qualitative study. Financial
290 pressure, relationships deterioration, negative emotions, loneliness, feeling of
291 incomprehension, preoccupation with gambling and avoidance of helping relationship were
292 found to be HRQOL domains impacted by gambling (Bonfils et al., 2019). Loneliness, feeling
293 of incomprehension, preoccupation with gambling and avoidance of helping relationship
294 were not mentioned in HRQOL instruments previously used in problem gambling (Bonfils et
295 al., 2019). Moreover, Luquiens et al. (Luquiens et al., 2015) studied the impact of alcohol use
296 disorder on HRQOL through a qualitative analysis. To this end, they conducted focus groups
297 with 38 alcohol use disorder subjects and found seven areas of impact: relationships,
298 emotional impact, living conditions, control, activities, looking after self and sleep. Only the
299 first three areas were common for both addictive disorders. Although substance use
300 disorder and gambling disorder share common characteristics, people with gambling
301 disorders also have specific characteristics (Grant and Chamberlain, 2015). It seems that
302 general QOL/HRQOL instruments do not capture gambling specificities. It was for this reason
303 that recent Burden of Disease assessments of gambling in New Zealand and Australia utilized
304 time trade off and visual analogic scale elicitation methods to direct assess community and
305 expert opinions, rather inferring QOL from generic instruments (Browne et al., 2017). The six
306 different instruments listed in the included articles are very heterogeneous regarding the
307 QOL/HRQOL domains they assess (**Table 3**). It would be interesting to standardize
308 QOL/HRQOL instruments in this population in order to allow comparisons across different
309 studies. However, there is currently no specific instrument to assess a change in QOL/HRQOL

310 in subjects with a gambling disorder while there are instruments for specific diseases in
311 many specialties (such as oncology (Macquart-Moulin et al., 2000) or neurology (Fujishima-
312 Hachiya and Inoue, 2012; Tan et al., 2005) or gastroenterology (Zingone et al., 2013)), and in
313 the addiction field in particular (as alcoholism (Luquiens et al., 2016, 2015; Neale et al.,
314 2016)).

315

316 However, it seems interesting to look at which general instruments of QOL/HRQOL seem
317 most appropriate to use in this field of research, taking into account psychometric properties
318 and content. SF, WHOQOL, PWI are the only instruments that are partially psychometrically
319 validated with a correct internal consistency in gambling population. Only SF scales are
320 HRQOL instruments; WHOQOL and PWI are QOL instruments. Nevertheless, SF scales fail to
321 capture functioning in domains—especially financial concerns or self-esteem—that are
322 important to gambling disorder-affected populations. The same is true for PWI, which also
323 does not explore these domains or psychological well-being. The scale with both
324 psychometric qualities and the most appropriate content for gambling is probably WHOQOL
325 which offers a very promising alternative, yielding scores in psychological and social
326 functioning; living environment; and an overall satisfaction score (Laudet, 2011).

327

328 Finally, QOL instruments should be designed to reflect the impact of diseases and
329 interventions in daily life from the subject's perspective (Leplège, 1999). However, most
330 items of these instruments have been defined by experts to answer their own questions.
331 Therefore a tension may appear between the objective of the experts and the impact of the
332 or treatment as perceived by subjects. Despite being self-administered and requesting
333 subjects' subjective answers, the instruments are not necessarily a good reflection of

334 subjects concerns. Moreover, if these general instruments can partially explore the
335 occurrence of adverse consequences related to gambling disorder, it is important to
336 evaluate the subjective value of these consequences for each subject. It is clear that two
337 subjects can assign different weights to a single negative consequence related to his
338 gambling addiction. While many studied areas are common across the six instruments, the
339 wording of the question and thus the answers can differ widely. For instance, the wording of
340 the question on the financial aspect varies between two questionnaires. The Q-LES-Q is
341 interested in the satisfaction with the economic status during the past week. The WHOQOL-
342 BREF asks if the subject had enough money to meet his (her) needs in the last two weeks.
343 The different wordings and the different periods explored could induce dissimilar answers.

344

345 The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) encourages specific Patients Reported Outcomes
346 (PROs) instrument to support labeling claims of medical products (FDA, 2009). PRO
347 instruments insure the subjectivity of the outcome, but not its clinical pertinence. A
348 pertinent PRO instrument should be patient-focused. One way to reach this goal would be to
349 develop the instrument from the subjects themselves, via qualitative analysis of interviews
350 with gambling-disorder subjects. This methodology would allow identification of the most
351 impacted domains of life in this particular population and those aspects that are most
352 sensitive to change, thereby promising real usefulness in assessing the efficacy of
353 interventions among gambling disorder subjects. The development of a patient-focused
354 rigorous PRO QOL instrument specific to subjects with gambling disorders would allow
355 clinicians to have a relevant instrument to administer to their patients (Arpinelli and Bamfi,
356 2006).

357

358 There are several limitations to our literature review. First of all, we did not conduct an in-
359 depth search of the grey literature. However, we looked at the grey literature with the same
360 keywords on the database OpenSIGLE, recommended by Cochrane, and did not find any
361 results. Secondly, our review was limited to English-language articles. Some studies may not
362 have been included due to this. With regard to meta-analysis, we can also highlight some
363 limitations. First of all, the included articles had a great heterogeneity of judgment criteria.
364 Finally, we did not take into account the biases of the trials for inclusion in the meta-
365 analysis.

366

367 **5. Conclusion**

368 A successful intervention can be indirectly measured by consequent increases in the QOL.
369 The currently used general instruments are efficient to measure a significant change after an
370 intervention but might not evaluate specific areas of health related QOL impacted by
371 gambling disorders. Moreover, they are not totally validated in the problem gambling
372 population and are probably less sensitive than gambling behavioral criteria. Despite being
373 self-administered and requesting subjective answers, these instruments do not necessarily
374 explore the entire spectrum of patients' concerns on the impact on QOL of gambling
375 disorder and do not take into account the patient's subjectivity. Patients should contribute
376 to define the content of impact on QoL of gambling disorder. Such an approach could serve
377 as the basis for the future development of a tool specifically designed for gambling disorders
378 in order to assess health-related QoL.

379

380

381 **References**

382

383 American Psychiatric Association (2013)., 2013. Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental
384 disorders (5th ed.). American Psychiatric Association, Washington, DC.

385 Arpinelli, F., Bamfi, F., 2006. The FDA guidance for industry on PROs: the point of view of
386 a pharmaceutical company. *Health Qual. Life Outcomes* 4, 85. [https://doi.org/10.1186/1477-](https://doi.org/10.1186/1477-7525-4-85)
387 [7525-4-85](https://doi.org/10.1186/1477-7525-4-85)

388 Black, D.W., Coryell, W., McCormick, B., Shaw, M., Allen, J., 2017. A prospective follow-
389 up study of younger and older subjects with pathological gambling. *Psychiatry Res.* 256, 162–
390 168. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2017.06.043>

391 Black, D.W., Moyer, T., Schlosser, S., 2003. Quality of life and family history in pathological
392 gambling. *J. Nerv. Ment. Dis.* 191, 124–126.
393 <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.NMD.0000050942.86352.47>

394 Black, D.W., Shaw, M., McCormick, B., Allen, J., 2013. Pathological gambling: relationship
395 to obesity, self-reported chronic medical conditions, poor lifestyle choices, and impaired
396 quality of life. *Compr. Psychiatry* 54, 97–104.
397 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comppsy.2012.07.001>

398 Blum, A.W., Leppink, E.W., Grant, J.E., 2017. Neurocognitive dysfunction in problem
399 gamblers with co-occurring antisocial personality disorder. *Compr. Psychiatry* 76, 153–159.
400 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comppsy.2017.05.004>

401 Bonfils, N.A., Grall-Bronnec, M., Caillon, J., Limosin, F., Benyamina, A., Aubin, H.-J.,
402 Luquiens, A., 2019. Giving room to subjectivity in understanding and assessing problem
403 gambling: A patient-centered approach focused on quality of life. *J. Behav. Addict.* 8, 103–
404 113. <https://doi.org/10.1556/2006.7.2018.137>

405 Brazier, J., Roberts, J., Deverill, M., 2002. The estimation of a preference-based measure of
406 health from the SF-36. *J. Health Econ.* 21, 271–292.

407 Brazier, J., Usherwood, T., Harper, R., Thomas, K., 1998. Deriving a preference-based single
408 index from the UK SF-36 Health Survey. *J. Clin. Epidemiol.* 51, 1115–1128.

409 Browne, M., Bellringer, M., Greer, N., Kolandai-Matchett, K., Rawat, V., Langham, E.,
410 Rockloff, M., Preez, K.P.D., Abbott, M., 2017. Measuring the Burden of Gambling Harm in
411 New Zealand.

412 Browne, M., Langham, E., Rawat, V., Greer, N., Li, E., Rose, J., Rockloff, M., Donaldson, P.,
413 Thorne, H., Goodwin, B., Bryden, B., Best, T., 2016. Assessing gambling-related harm in
414 Victoria: a public health perspective [WWW Document]. URL
415 [https://www.responsiblegambling.vic.gov.au/information-and-resources/research/recent-](https://www.responsiblegambling.vic.gov.au/information-and-resources/research/recent-research/assessing-gambling-related-harm-in-victoria-a-public-health-perspective)
416 [research/assessing-gambling-related-harm-in-victoria-a-public-health-perspective](https://www.responsiblegambling.vic.gov.au/information-and-resources/research/recent-research/assessing-gambling-related-harm-in-victoria-a-public-health-perspective) (accessed
417 5.25.17).

418 Bruneau, M., Grall-Bronnec, M., Vénisse, J.-L., Romo, L., Valleur, M., Magalon, D., Fatséas,
419 M., Chéreau-Boudet, I., Luquiens, A., JEU-Group, Challet-Bouju, G., Hardouin, J.-B., 2016.
420 Gambling transitions among adult gamblers: A multi-state model using a Markovian approach
421 applied to the JEU cohort. *Addict. Behav.* 57, 13–20.
422 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2016.01.010>

423 Carlbring, P., Degerman, N., Jonsson, J., Andersson, G., 2012. Internet-based treatment of
424 pathological gambling with a three-year follow-up. *Cogn. Behav. Ther.* 41, 321–334.
425 <https://doi.org/10.1080/16506073.2012.689323>

426 Carlbring, P., Smit, F., 2008. Randomized trial of internet-delivered self-help with telephone
427 support for pathological gamblers. *J. Consult. Clin. Psychol.* 76, 1090–1094.
428 <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013603>

429 Carr, A.J., Gibson, B., Robinson, P.G., 2001. Measuring quality of life: Is quality of life
430 determined by expectations or experience? *BMJ* 322, 1240–1243.

431 Chamberlain, S.R., Derbyshire, K., Daws, R.E., Odlaug, B.L., Leppink, E.W., Grant, J.E.,
432 2016. White matter tract integrity in treatment-resistant gambling disorder. *Br. J. Psychiatry* J.

433 Ment. Sci. 208, 579–584. <https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.bp.115.165506>

434 Chamberlain, S.R., Stochl, J., Redden, S.A., Odlaug, B.L., Grant, J.E., 2017. Latent class
435 analysis of gambling subtypes and impulsive/compulsive associations: Time to rethink
436 diagnostic boundaries for gambling disorder? *Addict. Behav.* 72, 79–85.
437 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2017.03.020>

438 Chou, K.-L., Afifi, T.O., 2011. Disordered (pathologic or problem) gambling and axis I
439 psychiatric disorders: results from the National Epidemiologic Survey on Alcohol and Related
440 Conditions. *Am. J. Epidemiol.* 173, 1289–1297. <https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwr017>

441 Cohen, J., 1988. *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*, 2nd ed. ed. L. Erlbaum
442 Associates, Hillsdale, N.J.

443 Commission, corporateName:Productivity, 2010. *Gambling - Productivity Commission*
444 *Inquiry Report [WWW Document]*. URL
445 <http://www.pc.gov.au/inquiries/completed/gambling-2009/report> (accessed 5.25.17).

446 Cummins, R., Eckersley, R., Pallant, R., Vugt, J., Misajon, R., 2003. Developing a National
447 Index of Subjective Wellbeing: The Australian Unity Wellbeing Index 159–190.

448 Dowling, N.A., Suomi, A., Jackson, A.C., Lavis, T., 2015. Problem Gambling Family
449 Impacts: Development of the Problem Gambling Family Impact Scale. *J. Gambl. Stud.*
450 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10899-015-9582-6>

451 Duval, S., Tweedie, R., 2000. Trim and fill: A simple funnel-plot-based method of testing and
452 adjusting for publication bias in meta-analysis. *Biometrics* 56, 455–463.

453 Ekholm, O., Davidsen, M., Larsen, C.V.L., Juel, K., 2018. A nationwide study of health-
454 related quality of life, stress, pain or discomfort and the use of medicine among problem
455 gamblers. *Scand. J. Public Health* 46, 514–521. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1403494817739501>

456 Elkinton, J.R., 1966. Medicine and the quality of life. *Ann. Intern. Med.* 64, 711–714.

457 Endicott, J., Nee, J., Harrison, W., Blumenthal, R., 1993. Quality of Life Enjoyment and
458 Satisfaction Questionnaire: a new measure. *Psychopharmacol. Bull.* 29, 321–326.

459 EuroQol Group, 1990. EuroQol--a new facility for the measurement of health-related quality
460 of life. *Health Policy Amst. Neth.* 16, 199–208.

461 FDA, 2009. *Guidance for Industry Patient-Reported Outcome Measures: Use in Medical*
462 *Product Development to Support Labeling Claims*.

463 Frisch, M.B., Cornell, J., Villanueva, M., Retzlaff, P.J., 1992. Clinical validation of the
464 Quality of Life Inventory. A measure of life satisfaction for use in treatment planning and
465 outcome assessment. *Psychol. Assess.* 4, 92–101. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.4.1.92>

466 Fujishima-Hachiya, A., Inoue, T., 2012. Development and validation of a disease-specific
467 scale to assess psychosocial well-being of patients living with unruptured intracranial
468 aneurysm. *J. Neurosci. Nurs. J. Am. Assoc. Neurosci. Nurses* 44, 317–328.
469 <https://doi.org/10.1097/JNN.0b013e3182683075>

470 Garcia-Caballero, A., Torrens-Lluch, M., Ramírez-Gendrau, I., Garrido, G., Vallès, V.,
471 Aragay, N., 2018. The efficacy of Motivational Intervention and Cognitive-Behavioral
472 Therapy for Pathological Gambling. *Adicciones* 30, 219–224.
473 <https://doi.org/10.20882/adicciones.965>

474 Grant, J.E., Chamberlain, S.R., 2015. Gambling disorder and its relationship with substance
475 use disorders: implications for nosological revisions and treatment. *Am. J. Addict.* 24, 126–
476 131. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajad.12112>

477 Grant, J.E., Kim, S.W., 2005. Quality of life in kleptomania and pathological gambling.
478 *Compr. Psychiatry* 46, 34–37. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comppsy.2004.07.022>

479 Grant, J.E., Potenza, M.N., 2006. Escitalopram treatment of pathological gambling with co-
480 occurring anxiety: an open-label pilot study with double-blind discontinuation. *Int. Clin.*
481 *Psychopharmacol.* 21, 203–209.

482 Harries, M.D., Redden, S.A., Grant, J.E., 2018. *An Analysis of Treatment-Seeking Behavior*

483 in Individuals with Gambling Disorder. *J. Gambl. Stud.* 34, 999–1012.
484 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10899-017-9730-2>

485 Higgins, J.P.T., Altman, D.G., Gøtzsche, P.C., Jüni, P., Moher, D., Oxman, A.D., Savovic, J.,
486 Schulz, K.F., Weeks, L., Sterne, J.A.C., Cochrane Bias Methods Group, Cochrane Statistical
487 Methods Group, 2011. The Cochrane Collaboration’s tool for assessing risk of bias in
488 randomised trials. *BMJ* 343, d5928.

489 Karimi, M., Brazier, J., 2016. Health, Health-Related Quality of Life, and Quality of Life:
490 What is the Difference? *PharmacoEconomics* 34, 645–649. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s40273-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40273-016-0389-9)
491 [016-0389-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40273-016-0389-9)

492 Kennedy, S.H., Welsh, B.R., Fulton, K., Soczynska, J.K., McIntyre, R.S., O’Donovan, C.,
493 Milev, R., le Melleo, J.-M., Bisserbe, J.-C., Zimmerman, M., Martin, N., 2010. Frequency
494 and correlates of gambling problems in outpatients with major depressive disorder and bipolar
495 disorder. *Can. J. Psychiatry Rev. Can. Psychiatr.* 55, 568–576.

496 Kim, H.S., Hodgins, D.C., Bellringer, M., Abbott, M., 2016. Gender Differences Among
497 Helpline Callers: Prospective Study of Gambling and Psychosocial Outcomes. *J. Gambl.*
498 *Stud.* 32, 605–623. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10899-015-9572-8>

499 Kohler, D., 2014. A monetary valuation of the quality of life loss associated with pathological
500 gambling: An application using a health utility index. *J. Gambl. Issues* 29, 1–23.
501 <https://doi.org/10.1037/t03938-000>

502 Lahti, T., Halme, J.T., Pankakoski, M., Sinclair, D., Alho, H., 2010. Treatment of
503 pathological gambling with naltrexone pharmacotherapy and brief intervention: a pilot study.
504 *Psychopharmacol. Bull.* 43, 35–44.

505 Langham, E., Thorne, H., Browne, M., Donaldson, P., Rose, J., Rockloff, M., 2015.
506 Understanding gambling related harm: a proposed definition, conceptual framework, and
507 taxonomy of harms. *BMC Public Health* 16. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-016-2747-0>

508 LaPlante, D.A., Nelson, S.E., LaBrie, R.A., Shaffer, H.J., 2008. Stability and progression of
509 disordered gambling: lessons from longitudinal studies. *Can. J. Psychiatry Rev. Can.*
510 *Psychiatr.* 53, 52–60.

511 Laudet, A.B., 2011. The case for considering quality of life in addiction research and clinical
512 practice. *Addict. Sci. Clin. Pract.* 6, 44–55.

513 Laudet, A.B., Becker, J.B., White, W.L., 2009. Don’t wanna go through that madness no
514 more: quality of life satisfaction as predictor of sustained remission from illicit drug misuse.
515 *Subst. Use Misuse* 44, 227–252. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10826080802714462>

516 Leidy, N.K., Revicki, D.A., Genesté, B., 1999. Recommendations for evaluating the validity
517 of quality of life claims for labeling and promotion. *Value Health J. Int. Soc.*
518 *Pharmacoeconomics Outcomes Res.* 2, 113–127. [https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1524-](https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1524-4733.1999.02210.x)
519 [4733.1999.02210.x](https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1524-4733.1999.02210.x)

520 Leplège, A., 1999. *Les Mesures de la Qualité de Vie.*

521 Liberati, A., Altman, D.G., Tetzlaff, J., Mulrow, C., Gøtzsche, P.C., Ioannidis, J.P.A., Clarke,
522 M., Devereaux, P.J., Kleijnen, J., Moher, D., 2009. The PRISMA statement for reporting
523 systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate health care interventions:
524 explanation and elaboration. *J. Clin. Epidemiol.* 62, e1-34.
525 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2009.06.006>

526 Loo, J.M.Y., Shi, Y., Pu, X., 2016. Gambling, Drinking and Quality of Life: Evidence from
527 Macao and Australia. *J. Gambl. Stud. Co-Spons. Natl. Counc. Probl. Gambl. Inst. Study*
528 *Gambl. Commer. Gaming* 32, 391–407. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10899-015-9569-3>

529 Luquiens, A., Aubin, H.-J., 2014. Patient preferences and perspectives regarding reducing
530 alcohol consumption: role of nalmefene. *Patient Prefer. Adherence* 8, 1347–1352.
531 <https://doi.org/10.2147/PPA.S57358>

532 Luquiens, A., Whalley, D., Crawford, S.R., Laramée, P., Doward, L., Price, M., Hawken, N.,

533 Dorey, J., Owens, L., Llorca, P.M., Falissard, B., Aubin, H.J., 2015. Development of the
534 Alcohol Quality of Life Scale (AQoLS): a new patient-reported outcome measure to assess
535 health-related quality of life in alcohol use disorder. *Qual. Life Res.* 24, 1471–1481.
536 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-014-0865-7>

537 Luquiens, A., Whalley, D., Laramée, P., Falissard, B., Kostogianni, N., Rehm, J., Manthey, J.,
538 Paille, F., Aubin, H.J., 2016. Validation of a new patient-reported outcome instrument of
539 health-related quality of life specific to patients with alcohol use disorder: the Alcohol Quality
540 of Life Scale (AQoLS). *Qual. Life Res. Int. J. Qual. Life Asp. Treat. Care Rehabil.* 25, 1549–
541 1560. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-015-1190-5>

542 Macquart-Moulin, G., Viens, P., Palangié, T., Bouscary, M.L., Delozier, T., Roché, H.,
543 Janvier, M., Fabbro, M., Moatti, J.P., 2000. High-dose sequential chemotherapy with
544 recombinant granulocyte colony-stimulating factor and repeated stem-cell support for
545 inflammatory breast cancer patients: does impact on quality of life jeopardize feasibility and
546 acceptability of treatment? *J. Clin. Oncol. Off. J. Am. Soc. Clin. Oncol.* 18, 754–764.
547 <https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2000.18.4.754>

548 Manning, V., Gomez, B., Guo, S., Low, Y.D., Koh, P.K., Wong, K.E., 2012. An exploration
549 of quality of life and its predictors in patients with addictive disorders: Gambling, alcohol and
550 drugs. *Int. J. Ment. Health Addict.* 10, 551–562. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-011-9349-y>

551 Manning, V., Koh, P.K., Yang, Y., Ng, A., Guo, S., Kandasami, G., Wong, K.E., 2015.
552 Suicidal ideation and lifetime attempts in substance and gambling disorders. *Psychiatry Res.*
553 225, 706–709. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2014.11.011>

554 Manning, V., Ng, A., Koh, P.K., Guo, S., Gomathinayagam, K., Wong, K.E., 2014.
555 Pathological gamblers in Singapore: Treatment response at 3 months. *J. Addict. Med.* 8, 462–
556 469. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ADM.0000000000000082>

557 Mason, K., Arnold, R., 2007. Problem gambling risk factors and associated behaviours and
558 health status: results from the 2002/03 New Zealand Health Survey. *N. Z. Med. J.* 120, 9–20.

559 McHorney, C.A., Ware, J.E., Raczek, A.E., 1993. The MOS 36-Item Short-Form Health
560 Survey (SF-36): II. Psychometric and clinical tests of validity in measuring physical and
561 mental health constructs. *Med. Care* 31, 247–263.

562 McIntosh, C.C., Crino, R.D., O’Neill, K., 2016. Treating Problem Gambling Samples with
563 Cognitive Behavioural Therapy and Mindfulness-Based Interventions: A Clinical Trial. *J.*
564 *Gambl. Stud. Co-Spons. Natl. Council. Probl. Gambl. Inst. Study Gambl. Commer. Gaming.*
565 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10899-016-9602-1>

566 Medeiros, G.C., Redden, S.A., Chamberlain, S.R., Grant, J.E., 2017. Gambling disorder:
567 Association between duration of illness, clinical, and neurocognitive variables. *J. Behav.*
568 *Addict.* 6, 194–202. <https://doi.org/10.1556/2006.6.2017.029>

569 Medeiros, G.C., Sampaio, D.G., Leppink, E.W., Chamberlain, S.R., Grant, J.E., 2016.
570 Anxiety, Gambling Activity, and Neurocognition: A Dimensional Approach to a Non-
571 Treatment-Seeking Sample. *J. Behav. Addict.* 5, 261–270.
572 <https://doi.org/10.1556/2006.5.2016.044>

573 Morasco, B.J., Petry, N.M., 2006. Gambling problems and health functioning in individuals
574 receiving disability. *Disabil. Rehabil.* 28, 619–623.
575 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09638280500242507>

576 Mythily, S., Edimansyah, A., Qiu, S., Munidasa, W., 2011. Quality of life in pathological
577 gamblers in a multiethnic Asian setting. *Ann. Acad. Med. Singapore* 40, 264–268.

578 Najavits, L.M., Meyer, T., Johnson, K.M., Korn, D., 2010. Pathological Gambling and
579 Posttraumatic Stress Disorder: A Study of the Co-Morbidity versus Each Alone. *J. Gambl.*
580 *Stud.* 27, 663–683. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10899-010-9230-0>

581 Neale, J., Vitoratou, S., Finch, E., Lennon, P., Mitcheson, L., Panebianco, D., Rose, D.,
582 Strang, J., Wykes, T., Marsden, J., 2016. DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF

583 “SURE”: A PATIENT REPORTED OUTCOME MEASURE (PROM) FOR RECOVERY
584 FROM DRUG AND ALCOHOL DEPENDENCE. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 165, 159–167.
585 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2016.06.006>
586 Oei, T.P.S., Raylu, N., 2015. Cognitive and Psychosocial Variables Predicting Gambling
587 Behavior in a Clinical Sample. *Int. J. Ment. Health Addict.* 13, 520–535.
588 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-015-9555-0>
589 Oei, T.P.S., Raylu, N., Lai, W.W., 2018. Effectiveness of a Self Help Cognitive Behavioural
590 Treatment Program for Problem Gamblers: A Randomised Controlled Trial. *J. Gambl. Stud.*
591 34, 581–595. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10899-017-9723-1>
592 Pickering, D., Keen, B., Entwistle, G., Blaszczynski, A., 2017. Measuring treatment outcomes
593 in gambling disorders: a systematic review. *Addict.* Abingdon Engl.
594 <https://doi.org/10.1111/add.13968>
595 Rosenthal, R., 1991. *Meta-Analytic Procedures for Social Research*, Rosenthal, ed.
596 Scherrer JF, Xian H, Shah KR, Volberg R, Slutske W, Eisen SA, 2005. Effect of genes,
597 environment, and lifetime co-occurring disorders on health-related quality of life in problem
598 and pathological gamblers. *Arch. Gen. Psychiatry* 62, 677–683.
599 <https://doi.org/10.1001/archpsyc.62.6.677>
600 Schmidt, S., Mühlhan, H., Power, M., 2006. The EUROHIS-QOL 8-item index: psychometric
601 results of a cross-cultural field study. *Eur. J. Public Health* 16, 420–428.
602 <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/cki155>
603 Scott, J., Huskisson, E.C., 1976. Graphic representation of pain. *Pain* 2, 175–184.
604 Slutske, W.S., Jackson, K.M., Sher, K.J., 2003. The natural history of problem gambling from
605 age 18 to 29. *J. Abnorm. Psychol.* 112, 263–274.
606 Subramaniam, M., Abdin, E., Vaingankar, J.A., Wong, K.E., Chong, S.A., 2015. Comorbid
607 physical and mental illnesses among pathological gamblers: Results from a population based
608 study in Singapore. *Psychiatry Res.* 227, 198–205.
609 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2015.03.033>
610 Suomi, A., Dowling, N.A., Jackson, A.C., 2014. Problem gambling subtypes based on
611 psychological distress, alcohol abuse and impulsivity. *Addict. Behav.* 39, 1741–1745.
612 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2014.07.023>
613 Szabo, S., WHOQOL Group, 1996. The World Health Organization Quality of Life
614 (WHOQOL) assessment instrument.
615 Tan, E.K., Fook-Chong, S., Lum, S.-Y., Thumboo, J., 2005. Validation of a short disease
616 specific quality of life scale for hemifacial spasm: correlation with SF-36. *J. Neurol.*
617 *Neurosurg. Psychiatry* 76, 1707–1710. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jnnp.2005.065656>
618 Walker, M., Toneatto, T., Potenza, M.N., Petry, N., Ladouceur, R., Hodgins, D.C., el-
619 Guebaly, N., Echeburua, E., Blaszczynski, A., 2006. A framework for reporting outcomes in
620 problem gambling treatment research: the Banff, Alberta Consensus. *Addiction* 101, 504–
621 511. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1360-0443.2005.01341.x>
622 Ware, J., Kosinski, M., Keller, S.D., 1996. A 12-Item Short-Form Health Survey:
623 construction of scales and preliminary tests of reliability and validity. *Med. Care* 34, 220–233.
624 Ware, J.E., 2000. SF-36 health survey update. *Spine* 25, 3130–3139.
625 Ware, J.E., GlaxoSmithKline, 2001. How to score and interpret single-item health status
626 measures: a manual for users of the of the SF-8 health survey : (with a supplement on the SF-
627 6 health survey). QualityMetric, Inc. ; Health Assessment Lab, Lincoln, RI; Boston, MA.
628 Wu, J.Q., Appleman, E.R., Salazar, R.D., Ong, J.C., 2015. Cognitive Behavioral Therapy for
629 Insomnia Comorbid With Psychiatric and Medical Conditions: A Meta-analysis. *JAMA*
630 *Intern. Med.* 175, 1461–1472. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2015.3006>
631 Zimmerman, M., Breen, R.B., Posternak, M.A., 2002. An open-label study of citalopram in
632 the treatment of pathological gambling. *J. Clin. Psychiatry* 63, 44–48.

633 Zingone, F., Iavarone, A., Tortora, R., Imperatore, N., Pellegrini, L., Russo, T., Dorn, S.D.,
634 Ciacci, C., 2013. The Italian translation of the celiac disease-specific quality of life scale in
635 celiac patients on gluten free diet. *Dig. Liver Dis. Off. J. Ital. Soc. Gastroenterol. Ital. Assoc.*
636 *Study Liver* 45, 115–118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dld.2012.10.018>
637
638

639 **Figure and Tables**

640

641

642


Figure 1. PRISMA flow diagram of the study selection process

643

Legend: 'Wrong populations' designed subject without gambling disorder or, in other term, without gambling problem/pathological gambling


644

645



655
656
657


Figure 2. Forest plot




658
659
660
661
662
663

Figure 3. Tunnel plot

a. Funnel plot for gambling outcome



b. Funnel plot for QoL outcome



664
665

666

667
668
669
670

Table 1. Instruments designated as measuring quality of life in included studies among gambling-disorder patients.

	SF-36/SF-12 SF6 –D/SF-8	QOLI	WHO-QOL-BREF, EUROHIS-QOL 8- item index	Q-LES-Q	EQ-5D EQ-VAS	PWI
Ekholm et al. (2018) (Ekholm et al., 2018)	x					
Harries et al. (2018) (Harries et al., 2018)		x				
Oei et al. (2018) (Oei et al., 2018)			x			
Garcia-Caballero et al. (2018) (Garcia-Caballero et al., 2018)				x		
Black et al. (2017) (Black et al., 2017)	x					
Blum et al. (2017) (Blum et al., 2017)		x				
Chamberlain et al. (2017) (Chamberlain et al., 2017)		x				
Medeiros et al. (2017) (Medeiros et al., 2017)		x				
Chamberlain et al. (2016) (Chamberlain et al., 2016)		x				
Kim et al (2016) (Kim et al., 2016)			x			
Loo et al. (2016) (Loo et al., 2016)			x			
Madeiros et al. (2016) (Medeiros et al., 2016)		x				
McIntosh et al. (2016) (McIntosh et al., 2016)	x					
Manning et al. (2015) (Manning et al., 2015)						x
Oei et al. (2015) (Oei and Raylu, 2015)			x			
Subramanian et al (2015) (Subramaniam et al., 2015)					x	
Kohler (2014) (Kohler, 2014)	x				x	
Manning et al. (2014) (Manning et al., 2014)						x
Suomi et al (2014) (Suomi et al., 2014)			x			
Black et al. (2013) (Black et al., 2013)	x					
Carlbring et al. (2012) (Carlbring et al., 2012)		x				
Manning et al. (2012) (Manning et al., 2012)						x
Chou et al. (2011) (Chou and Afifi, 2011)	x					
Mythily et al. (2011) (Mythily et			x			

al., 2011)						
Kennedy et al. (2010) (Kennedy et al., 2010)				x		
Lahti et al. (2010) (Lahti et al., 2010)					x	
Najavits et al. (2010) (Najavits et al., 2010)	x			x		
Carlbring et al. (2008) (Carlbring and Smit, 2008)		x				
Mason et al. (2007) (Mason and Arnold, 2007)	x					
Grant et al. (2006) (Grant and Potenza, 2006)		x				
Morasco et al. (2006) (Morasco and Petry, 2006)	x					
Grant et al. (2005) (Grant and Kim, 2005)		x				
Scherrer et al. (2005) (Scherrer JF et al., 2005)	x					
Black et al. (2003) (Black et al., 2003)	x					
Zimmerman et al. (2002) (Zimmerman et al., 2002)				x		