CORRECTION

Correction: Marital status and gambling disorder: a longitudinal study based on national registry data

André Syvertsen[1,2*], Tony Leino[3], Ståle Pallesen[1,2], Otto R. F. Smith[1,3,4], Børge Sivertsen[3,5], Mark D. Grifths[6] and Rune Aune Mentzoni[1,2]

Correction: BMC Psychiatry 23: 199 (2023)
https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-023-04697-w

Following the publication of the original article [1], multiple errors were identified in the sections and Tables 1 and 2. The correct tables are given below and the changes in the abstract, results and discussion sections have been highlighted in **bold typeface**.

The original article can be found online at https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-023-04697-w.

*Correspondence:
André Syvertsen
andre.syvertsen@uib.no
[1] Department of Psychosocial Science, University of Bergen, P.O. Box 7807, 5020 Bergen, Norway
[2] Norwegian Competence Center for Gambling and Gaming Research, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway
[3] Department of Health Promotion, Norwegian Institute of Public Health, Bergen, Norway
[4] Department of Teacher Education, NLA University College, Bergen, Norway
[5] Department of Research & Innovation, Helse Fonna HF, Haugesund, Norway
[6] International Gaming Research Unit, Psychology Department, Nottingham Trent University, Nottingham, UK

Syvertsen *et al. BMC Psychiatry*   (2024) 24:140

Page 2 of 4

The incorrect Table 1 is:

Sample	GD (n = 5,121)	Illness control (n = 27,826)	General control (n = 26,695)	p-value[1]
Women	935 (18.3%)	5,038 (18.1%)	5,193 (19.5%)	<0.001
Age in 2008				<0.001
Median (IQR)	29 (22, 39)	29 (22, 39)	30 (22, 39)	
Mean (SD)	30.9 (12)	30.8 (12)	31.3 (12)	
Marital status in 2008				<0.001
Unmarried	3,674 (71.7%)	17,828 (64.1%)	16,819 (63.0%)	
Married	914 (18.9%)	8,404 (30.2%)	8,345 (31.3%)	
Separated/divorced	510 (10.0%)	1,510 (5.4%)	1,444 (5.4%)	
Widowed	23 (0.4%)	84 (0.3%)	87 (0.3%)	
Marital status changes[a]				<0.001
0	4,024 (78.6%)	22,324 (80.2%)	21,123 (79.1%)	
1	812 (15.9%)	4,730 (17.0%)	4,757 (17.8%)	
2	224 (4.4%)	633 (2.3%)	685 (2.6%)	
3+	61 (1.2%)	139 (0.5%)	130 (0.5%)	

The correct Table 1 is:

Table 1 Participant characteristics at baseline

Sample	GD (n = 5,121)	Illness control (n = 27,826)	General control (n = 26,695)	p-value[1]
Women	935 (18.3%)	5,038 (18.1%)	5,193 (19.5%)	<0.001
Age in 2008				<0.001
Median (IQR)	29 (22, 39)	29 (22, 39)	30 (22, 39)	
Mean (SD)	30.9 (12)	30.8 (12)	31.3 (12)	
Marital status at baseline				<0.001
Unmarried	3,674 (71.7%)	17,828 (64.1%)	16,819 (63.0%)	
Married	914 (18.9%)	8,404 (30.2%)	8,345 (31.3%)	
Separated/divorced	510 (10.0%)	1,510 (5.4%)	1,444 (5.4%)	
Widowed	23 (0.4%)	84 (0.3%)	87 (0.3%)	
Marital status changes[2]				<0.001
0	4,024 (78.6%)	22,324 (80.2%)	21,123 (79.1%)	
1	812 (15.9%)	4,730 (17.0%)	4,757 (17.8%)	
2	224 (4.4%)	633 (2.3%)	685 (2.6%)	
3+	61 (1.2%)	139 (0.5%)	130 (0.5%)	

Note. [1]Pearson's Chi-squared test for categorical; One-way ANOVA for continuous. [2]During study period January 2008 to December 2018. Total percentage slightly exceeds 100 in some cases due to rounding

Syvertsen *et al. BMC Psychiatry*   (2024) 24:140

Page 3 of 4

The incorrect Table 2 is:

Predictor	Against NPR illness control ($n = 8,114$)			Against FD-Trygd general control ($n = 8,116$)		
	OR[1]	95% CI[a]	*p*-value	OR[a]	95% CI[a]	*p*-value
Unadjusted analysis						
Age in 2008	1.00	[1.00, 1.01]	0.519	0.99	[0.99, 1.00]	0.144
Gender						
Men (reference)	1.00	—		1.00	—	
Women	0.78	[0.67, 0.91]	0.001	0.75	[0.64, 0.87]	<0.001
Exposure						
Married (reference)	1.00	—		1.00	—	
Divorce	2.42	[2.03, 2.88]	<0.001	2.42	[2.03, 2.88]	<0.001
Adjusted analysis						
Age in 2008	1.01	[1.00, 1.01]	0.134	1.00	[0.99, 1.00]	0.573
Gender						
Men (reference)	1.00	—		1.00	—	
Women	0.77	[0.66, 0.90]	0.001	0.75	[0.64, 0.87]	<0.001
Exposure						
Married (reference)	1.00	—		1.00	—	
Divorce	2.45	[2.06, 2.92]	<0.001	2.41	[2.02, 2.87]	<0.001

The correct Table 2 is:

Table 2 Logistic regressions for divorce on odds for first gambling disorder diagnosis

Predictor	Against NPR illness control ($n = 7,441$)			Against FD-Trygd general control ($n = 7,443$)		
	OR[1]	95% CI[1]	*p*-value	OR[1]	95% CI[1]	*p*-value
Unadjusted analysis						
Age in 2008	1.00	[1.00, 1.01]	0.261	1.00	[0.99, 1.00]	0.403
Gender						
Men (reference)	—	—		—	—	
Women	0.77	[0.65, 0.90]	0.002	0.73	[0.62, 0.86]	<0.001
Exposure						
Married (reference)	—	—		—	—	
Divorce	2.82	[2.36, 3.37]	<0.001	2.82	[2.36, 3.37]	<0.001
Adjusted analysis						
Age in 2008	1.01	[1.00, 1.02]	0.025	1.00	[0.99, 1.01]	0.720
Gender						
Men (reference)	1.00	—		1.00	—	
Women	0.75	[0.64, 0.89]	<0.001	0.73	[0.61, 0.86]	<0.001
Exposure						
Married (reference)	1.00	—		1.00	—	
Divorce	2.89	[2.41, 3.45]	<0.001	2.83	[2.36, 3.38]	<0.001

Note. [1]*OR* odds ratio, *CI* confidence interval. GD cases = 885

Syvertsen *et al. BMC Psychiatry*   (2024) 24:140

Page 4 of 4

Abstract-Results

The sentence currently reads: Logistic regressions showed that transition through divorce was associated with higher odds of future GD compared to illness controls (odds ratio [OR]=2.45, 95% CI [2.06, 2.92]) and the general population (OR=2.41 [2.02, 2.87]).

The sentence should read: Logistic regressions showed that transition through divorce was associated with higher odds of future GD compared to illness controls (odds ratio [OR]=**2.89**, *95% CI* [**2.41, 3.45**]) and the general population (OR=**2.83** [**2.36, 3.38**]).

Results

The incorrect paragraph is: Logistic regression results on analysis of exposure to divorce on GD are provided in Table 2 and informed RQ2. The interaction terms between gender and exposure were not statistically significant (NPR control: OR=1.11, 95% CI [0.74, 1.66]; FD-Trygd control: OR=1.15, 95% CI [0.76, 1.72]), so only main effect analyses are reported in the table. ORs were similar between the adjusted and unadjusted analysis. The analytic samples were comparable in terms of age distributions: M=50 (9) among GD cases, M=50 (10) among NPR controls, and M=51 (10) among FD-Trygd controls. Distribution gender differed somewhat, with the proportion of women being lower among cases with GD (23%) compared to NPR controls (26%) and FD-Trygd controls (28%). The results showed that getting divorced was associated with a higher odds ratio of receiving a GD diagnosis. The strength of association was comparable using both types of control groups. Using individuals with other illnesses as controls, those getting divorced had 2.45 (95% CI [2.06, 2.92]) times the odds of getting a GD diagnosis compared to individuals who remained married during the exposure period, based on the adjusted analysis. Using individuals from the general population as controls, those getting divorced had 2.41 (95% CI [2.02, 2.87]) times the odds of getting a GD diagnosis compared to individuals who remained married during the exposure period, based on the adjusted analysis.

The correct paragraph is: Logistic regression results on analysis of exposure to divorce on GD are provided in Table 2 and informed RQ2. The interaction terms between gender and exposure were not statistically significant (NPR control: OR=**1.16, 95% CI [0.76, 1.75**]; FD-Trygd control: OR=**1.21**, 95% CI [**0.79, 1.82**]), so only main effect analyses are reported in the table. ORs were similar for the adjusted and unadjusted analysis. The analytic samples were comparable in terms of age distributions: M=50 (**10**) among GD cases, M=50 (10) among NPR controls, and M=51 (10) among FD-Trygd controls. Distribution of gender differed somewhat, with the proportion of women being lower among cases

with GD (**22%**) compared to NPR controls (**27%**) and FD-Trygd controls (28%). The results showed that getting divorced was associated with a higher odds ratio of receiving a GD diagnosis. The strength of association was comparable using both types of control groups. Using individuals with other illnesses as controls, those getting divorced had **2.89** (95% CI [**2.41, 3.45**]) times the odds of getting a GD diagnosis compared to individuals who remained married during the exposure period, based on the adjusted analysis. Using individuals from the general population as controls, those getting divorced had 2.83 (95% CI [**2.36, 3.38**]) times the odds of getting a GD diagnosis compared to individuals who remained married during the exposure period, based on the adjusted analysis.

Discussion

The incorrect sentence is: The results showed that going through a divorce was associated with 2.45 and 2.41 higher odds of receiving a subsequent GD diagnosis in the case group compared to the NPR illness group and FD-Trygd general population group, respectively.

The correct sentence is: The results showed that going through a divorce was associated with **2.89** and **2.83** higher odds of receiving a subsequent GD diagnosis in the case group compared to the NPR illness group and FD-Trygd general population group, respectively.

The original article [1] has been corrected.

Reference
1. Syvertsen A, et al. Marital status and gambling disorder: a longitudinal study based on national registry data. BMC Psychiatry. 2023;23:199. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-023-04697-w.