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Summary

This study analyzed the outcome predictors of an Internet-delivered cognitive behavior therapy (ICBT) for problem gambling, examining users’ socio-economic profile and gambling behavior. Being males and employed, the fact of playing and to have gambling problems for less than a year, preference for non strategy-based games, and high frequency of playing were found to be predictors of therapy dropout. The findings from this study, though preliminary, suggest that certain patients’ socio-economic characteristics and gambling behavior may have a bearing on the success or failure of an ICBT and that there is a need to adapt the therapy for those individuals at risk. In fact, detect at an early stage of the therapeutic relationship those patients with a greater propensity to dropout may allow the implementation of appropriate and customized approaches to reduce the difficulties to follow and complete a therapy.
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Introduction

In a comprehensive review of problem gambling, Neal, Delfabbro and O’Neill (2005) define it as “characterised by difficulties in limiting money and/or time spent on gambling which leads to adverse consequences for the gambler, others, or for the community”. Problem gamblers do not always recognize the critical situation they face. It is often relatives, colleagues/employers and friends who induce them to seek help in order to solve gambling-related psychological, economic and legal problems (Pulford et al., 2009; Gainsbury et al., 2014). In many cases, shame and fear of stigma represent insurmountable barriers (Suurvali et al., 2009; 2012; Hodgins et al., 2012; Bellringer et al., 2008) which prevent many problem gamblers from seeking help. In an attempt to lower these barriers, new types of professional help have emerged (Carlbring et al., 2008), based on use of telephone and information technology (eg. professional helplines, online counseling, websites). Indeed, several lines of evidence (Cunningham et al., 2008) show that many problem gamblers prefer this type of approach when asking for help or beginning treatment (Wood & Griffiths, 2007) due to the degree of perceived privacy and anonymity offered. Furthermore, such interventions – compared to traditional face-to-face methods – permit greater flexibility in time management as well as overcoming geographical isolation (Griffiths & Cooper, 2003; Monaghan & Blaszczynski, 2009; Gainsbury & Blaszczynski, 2011; Rodda et al., 2013; Hodgins et al., 2013; Titov et al., 2015).

In Italy epidemiological studies suggest that 4.3% of the general population is at moderate risk of problem gambling and 1.3% are actually problem gamblers (Colasante et al., 2013). Thus, phone and online counselling and assistance services for gamblers have been introduced. Started in October 2009, Giocaresponsabile (GR Responsible Gambling) is the first Italian national helpline dedicated to problem gambling. The service provides free and anonymous professional counselling and assistance via web (e-mail and chat) not only to gamblers, but also to those indirectly affected, such as relatives and friends. In its first six years of activity, the GR helpline provided roughly 45,000 con-
Users are required to register on the website giocaresponsabile.it, and anonymity and confidentiality are guaranteed throughout the entire treatment. Access to therapy is subject to clinical assessment of both the severity of the gambling disorder and the motivation for treatment.

Assessment of gambling disorder is based on the Problem Gambling Severity Index (PGSI) (Ferris & Wynne, 2001), a nine-item screening tool used to measure the severity of gambling problems in the general population. The PGSI has a range of 0 to 27, describing different levels of problem gambling. A score of 0 means the person does not have a problem (social gambling); a score of 1 and 2 highlights a low risk (low risk gambling); a score of 3 to 7 represents a risk, though limited, of developing an addiction (moderate risk gambling); a score between 8 and 27 indicates a problematic condition. Users with a score between 8 and 27 are automatically admitted to the therapy.

For the motivational assessment, a short test based on clinical experience (Miller & Rollnick, 2014) identify four different profiles: A. low motivation and low perceived self-efficacy (no user matched this profile); B. low motivation but high perceived self-efficacy (1% of the users); C. high motivation but low perceived self-efficacy (48% of the users); D. high motivation and high perceived self-efficacy (51% of the users). Users matching profile A are automatically excluded from the therapy.

Program modules are visible in a private session accessed by the patient using a personal user ID and password, and are managed by therapists in agreement with the patient. Furthermore, patients must attend a weekly 30-minute telephone conversation with the assigned therapist. Patients completing the therapy continued to receive treatment for nine months, with two follow-ups (in the third and sixth months after completion). The others dropped out after an average of four months.

The GR ICBT is structured in five phases associated with nine related goals:
1. assessment;
2. functional analysis (1st goal – identify risky situations; 2nd goal – keep a weekly gambling diary; 3rd goal – identify gambling-related factors);
3. craving management (4th goal – manage craving intensity; 5th goal – reformulate craving-related dysfunctional thoughts; 6th goal – evaluate craving-related rational thoughts);
4. resource management (7th goal – get out of debt and/or manage personal resources independently);
5. relapse prevention (8th goal – react to slips in problem gambling; 9th goal – recognize high-risk situations).

Finally, patients were asked to fill out a customer satisfaction survey composed of 14 items (minimum score = 1; maximum score = 5) related to the structure (timing, working mode, contact with the therapist) and effectiveness of the treatment received and to the therapist-patient relationship (Fig. 1).

During the therapy, information on the following variables was collected:
(a) socio-economic status: gender, age, marital status, educational level, employment status, housing situation;
(b) gambling behaviour:
(i) history of gambling (duration of gambling activity): less than 1 year, less than 10 years, 10 years or more;
(ii) awareness of problem gambling (duration of self-perception of problems related to gambling activity): less than 1 year, less than 10 years, 10 years or more;
Statistical analysis

All analyses were performed using STATA 13.0 (STATA Corp., TX, USA) and SPSS v.21.0 (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY, USA). Categorical variables were expressed as percentages, and continuous variables were expressed as mean, standard deviation, median and interquartile ranges (IQR). An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare the mean of different variables between two groups (treatment completed vs dropouts). The Chi-square test (or Fisher’s exact test) was used to compare categorical variables between two groups. Cox proportional hazard models were tested for the unadjusted hazard ratios of treatment completed/dropout among each covariate (i.e., gender, marital status, educational level, employment status, housing situation, history of gambling, awareness of problem gambling, types of games, gambling setting, frequency of gambling, monthly expenditure on gambling, gambling debts). The multivariate Cox model with the backward stepwise procedure was performed to evaluate the relationship between treatment completed/dropouts (dependent variable) and the covariates assessed in this study (independent variables).

Results

Table 1 shows differences in terms of socio-economic status and gambling behavior between patients who completed the GR Internet-based therapy (completed) and those who did not (dropouts). Significant differences were observed with respect to some variables. Among socio-economic characteristics, a significant difference was observed with respect to gender, with 74% of dropouts and 92.5% of completed being males. A significant difference was also observed in employment status: 13% of dropout subjects have no regular job, while none of those who completed the therapy is unemployed. With reference to gambling behavior, dissimilarities emerge between completed and dropouts in the number of years spent on gambling (history of gambling), in the awareness of problem gambling, but also in the frequency of gambling. The majority of both dropouts and completed has been gambling for more than one year but less than ten. Among the dropouts, 40.3% have been playing for less than one year and 16.9% acknowledged that they are problem gamblers within the past year; among the completed, 20% have been gambling for ten years or more and 53.1% have known they are problem gamblers for ten years or more. This highlights a greater proportion of subjects in the group of dropouts who have been playing for less than a year being aware of their gambling problem. Lastly, it has been observed that dropouts have a greater propensity for non-strategy-based games than the completed group.

Furthermore, the results of the univariate Cox model analysis (Fig. 2) revealed that males had a significantly higher risk of giving up treatment than females (Hazard Ratio [HR], 1.73; confidence interval [CI], 1.04-2.88), as did employed subjects compared to unemployed ones (HR, 2.66; CI, 1.35-5.24). Many patients attending the GR ICBT reported difficulty maintaining the weekly telephone appointment with the therapist, which is always scheduled at the same time on the same day of the week. This rigidity in the organization may explain why – in contrast with the findings from other studies (Melville et al., 2007) – employed patients, especially those working shifts, have a higher risk of dropping out of treatment than unemployed ones.

No statistically significant association was observed with respect to housing situation, educational level or marital status. Also, the fact of having gambling debts, of spending a little or a lot, and the setting of gambling do not seem to be associated with dropout. The characteristics associated with dropout from therapy, on the other hand, are the frequency of gambling and the

### Table 1: Differences in terms of socio-economic status and gambling behavior between patients who completed the GR Internet-based therapy (completed) and those who did not (dropouts).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Completed GR ICBT</th>
<th>Dropouts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>49.5% males</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td>13% employed</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of gambling</td>
<td>&gt; 1 year</td>
<td>1-2 times per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure on gambling monthly</td>
<td>&lt; 1,000 euros; from 1,000 to 10,000 euros; &gt; 10,000 euros</td>
<td>&lt; 1,000 euros; from 1,000 to 10,000 euros; &gt; 10,000 euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of games</td>
<td>Strategy-based</td>
<td>Non-strategy-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing situation</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of gambling</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of gambling problem</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game settings</td>
<td>On-site, on-line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting of gambling</td>
<td>On-site, on-line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
types of game played. A higher rate of dropouts is found among regular players (up to 6 times a week) and among those who prefer non-strategy-based games, with an HR equal to 1.67 (95% CI, 1.02-2.78) and 1.83 (95% CI, 1.04-3.22) respectively. Having started playing less than 12 months ago (HR, 2.85; 95% CI, 1.40-5.80) and perceiving one’s gambling behavior as problematic for less than a year (HR, 2.84; 95% CI, 1.10-8.03) were also associated with dropping out of treatment.

The Multivariate Cox model analysis (Fig. 3) showed that subjects preferring non-strategy-based games (HR, 1.26; 95% CI, 1.14-1.65), playing frequently (HR, 2.26; 95% CI, 1.30-3.93) and having started to play less than one year ago (HR, 2.33; 95% CI, 1.03-5.85) had a higher risk of abandoning treatment.

Discussion
This study aimed to analyze the outcome predictors of an Internet-delivered cognitive behavior therapy for problem gambling. Univariate analysis shows that males have a higher risk of leaving the GR ICBT, though the small number of females present in the sample limits the validity of gendered analysis. Employed subjects and those who have been perceiving their problematic behavior for less than a year have a higher risk of leaving the GR ICBT. Considering the multivariate Cox analysis, subjects preferring non-strategy-based games, playing frequently (up to 6 times a week), and having started playing less than one year ago have a higher risk of leaving the GR ICBT.
Fig. 2 - Univariate Cox model analysis
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Fig. 3 - Multivariate Cox model analysis
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These results are consistent with research associating both non-strategic gambling and high gambling frequency with severe gambling problems, which are more difficult to interrupt. In fact, non-strategic games are indeed more addictive than those involving competence and skill: the structural characteristics of non-strategy-based games, and slot machines in particular, seem to stimulate cognitive biases such as illusion of control, flexible attributions, representativeness, availability bias, illusory correlations and fixation on absolute frequency (Griffiths, 1994; Meyer et al., 2011; Scalese et al., 2015). Also, problem gamblers, treatment services, and gambling researchers consistently link high frequency of gambling activity with dysfunctional behaviors (Meyer et al., 2009; Williams et al., 2012) – for instance, scratch cards are categorized as a form of continuous gambling strongly predictive of behavioral disorders (Williams et al., 2015).

As noted above, a systematic review (Merkouris et al., 2016) revealed that likely predictors of successful treatment outcome include male gender, older age, being employed, lower severity of gambling symptoms and lower levels of gambling behavior, while preferred gambling activity and problem gambling duration do not appear to be significantly associated with the outcome of treatment. The results of this review are not fully in line with the findings of the present study. These inconsistencies could be partially explained by several methodological issues that limit the relevance of behavioral therapy trials in problem gamblers (Hodgins et al., 2009): it may be difficult, for instance, to generalize the findings obtained from patients recruited via advertisements to patients seeking treatment in real-life settings (Fink et al., 2012), as in the case of the GR ICBT.

Moreover, individuals with a recent onset of gambling and an equally recent development of problem gambling (less than one year) may have not yet consolidated enough motivation for change. Motivation, in fact, is often triggered by gambling-related financial difficulties worsened over time (Ledgerwood et al., 2013). Some patients may therefore not be sufficiently motivated when approaching a treatment that – while freely available online – requires an on-going commitment. All this suggests that there is a particular need for research exploring the several variables associated with dropping out of treatment, such as: stressful life events and the presence or absence of supportive social relationships; psychological variables, such as impulsivity, sensation-seeking and self-control; differences in these variables between genders (González-Ortega et al., 2014); availability of reliable internet access and of a quiet environment to for computer use; treatment-related variables such as patients’ expectations and motivation, therapeutic alliance, treatment duration. In particular, treatment credibility and a good working alliance (Postel et al., 2011) are important factors in Internet-based psychotherapy (Alfonsson et al., 2016). In GR ICBT case, 40 subjects completed a customer satisfaction survey (minimum score = 1; maximum score = 5), which yielded 4 as the average response score.

We should also consider the reasons why many individuals registered for the GR ICBT and then did not ask for an initial appointment with a therapist – the first concrete step in treatment – or dropped out in the early stages. One possible explanation for this might be the easy access to GR service: registration is often driven by impulsivity and curiosity rather than by real motivation for change. Considering a general high risk of dropout in internet-based treatment for psychological disorders – an average rate of thirty-five percent (Melville et al., 2010) – additional research is needed in order to understand and prevent it (Casey et al., 2017).

Limitations

One of the limitations of this study is certainly the nature of the sample, which is not representative of the general population of problem gamblers in Italy. There are, for example, considerable socio-economic differences even between GR helpline users and GR ICBT users. Compared to the helpline users, online therapy patients are younger (39 years vs 42), with a higher level of education (high school diploma or degree in 63% of cases), and have stable employment (60% are employees while 20% are self-employed). Comparison with the population samples of outpatients (Bellio & Fiorin, 2009; Lovaste et al., 2015) assisted by local Italian addiction/problem gambling services facilities (SERD) outlines a similar inclination for non-strategic gambling but significant differences in average age (higher), educational and employment level (lower).

Other limitations on the data should be taken into consideration when interpreting the findings of the study. Firstly, the relatively small size of the sample, which is almost exclusively restricted to men and composed of treatment seekers. Secondly, the lack of control and comparison groups preclude a definitive conclusion (Chebbi et al., 2016). In general, as there are only a small number of research examining the association between socio-economic status/gambling behavior and outcome of the treatment of disordered gambling (Melville, 2007; Merkouris, 2016), caution is required in the interpretation of the evidence of the present study.

Conclusion and future research

The findings of this study, the first in Italy to follow patients engaged in online therapy over time, provide useful, though preliminary, information on the socio-economic and gambling behavior characteristic of patients at risk of dropout. Being male and employed, the fact of playing and to have gambling problems for less than a year, a preference for non-strategic gambling, and high frequency of playing were found to be predictors of therapy dropout. This suggests that certain patients’ socio-economic characteristics and gambling behavior may play a role in the success or failure of an ICBT. Thus, there is a need to adapt the therapy for patients at risk, placing greater emphasis on motivating them (Jiménez-Murcia et al., 2015). In fact, detecting patients with a greater propensity to dropout at an early stage in the therapeutic relationship might enable the implementation of appropriate and effective customized approaches.

In summary, considering that the goal of this study is to identify factors associated with dropping out of an ICBT, it is important to further investigate the impact of these factors in order to tailor treatment to specific patients’ needs (Echeburúa et al., 2017). This would help clinicians to identify participants who are likely to dropout and select who are most likely to benefit in situations where resources are limited. In the months to come, these and other findings will be considered in the evaluation of patients in order to maximize their retention in care. In particular, to enhance treatment retention, an effective ICBT should include intrinsic motivational components aimed at increasing patient engagement. Approaches focusing on motivational factors may result in better treatment engagement for some problem gamblers (Ledgerwood et al., 2013). Thus, GR professionals have recently included a motivational module in the therapy to support patients in the early stages of treatment and to reduce their...
risk of dropout. Another aspect is related to the development – in progress – of tools for evaluating the effectiveness of therapy. Assessment of the effectiveness of the GR ICBT based on objective parameters would help enhance strategies aimed at reducing the treatment dropout rate. It would also corroborate the results of the present study, which will be expanded with further data collection and analysis.
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