

A Transdiagnostic Dimensional Approach to Behavioral Dysregulation: Examining Reward and Punishment Sensitivity Across Psychopathology

Short running title: Reward/punishment in Psychopathology

Taiki Oka^{1,2*} Ph.D., Akihiro Sasaki³, Ph.D., Nao Kobayashi³, Ph.D.

¹ The Department of Decoded Neurofeedback, Computational Neuroscience Laboratories, Advanced Telecommunications Research Institute International, Kyoto, Japan

² Clinical Psychology, Graduate School of Human Sciences, Osaka University, Suita, Japan

³ Health and Medical Research Group, Think Tank Division, KDDI Research Inc., Fujimino, Saitama, Japan.

*Send correspondence to Dr. Taiki Oka morio.sinri@gmail.com

The Department of Decoded Neurofeedback, Computational Neuroscience Laboratories,
Advanced Telecommunications Research Institute International, Kyoto, Japan

TEL: +81-774-95-1268

FAX: +81-774-95-1111

Email: morio.sinri@gmail.com

Akihiro Sasaki email: xakh-sasaki@kddi.com

Nao Kobayashi email: no-kobayashi@kddi.com

Abstract word count: 219/250, Main word count: 2925/5000, Figures: 2, Tables: 1

Abstract

Aim

Theoretically, deficits in reward/punishment sensitivity are considered an essential component associated with behavioral dysregulation, which is characteristic of compulsive-impulsive disorders. However, recent studies have indicated that several disorders are linked to problems with reward/punishment sensitivity, and their results have been inconsistent. This lack of clinical specificity and robustness might reflect more general problems with traditionally diagnostic categories of psychiatry. To address these concerns, we investigated whether a transdiagnostic dimensional approach could more effectively examine clinical associations related to reward/punishment sensitivity for behavioral dysregulation.

Methods

Using multiple psychiatric symptom scores and reward/punishment sensitivity in online general-population samples (N = 19505), we applied factor analyses to extract transdiagnostic symptom dimensions. Then, we conducted a mixed-effect generalized linear model to examine the relationships between psychopathology and reward/punishment sensitivity.

Results

We extracted three transdiagnostic dimensions, which were validated between two separate datasets: ‘Compulsive hypersensitivity (CH), ‘Social withdrawal (SW),’ and ‘Addictive behavior (AB).’ While SW was associated with reward sensitivity negatively and punishment sensitivity positively, AB showed opposite associations. On the other hand, CH was positively associated with both sensitivities.

Conclusion

Our results highlight the importance of reward/punishment sensitivity for our understanding of behavioral dysregulation, especially in the compulsive-impulsive dimension. Moreover, these findings underscore how transdiagnostic perspectives contribute to a more powerful examination of reward/punishment deficits than studies focusing on a categorical disorder.

Keywords: Clinical Psychopathology, Affective Disorders, Addiction Psychiatry, Classification, Diagnostic Assessment & Nomenclature

Introduction

A loss of control over repetitive self-destructive behaviors is problematic and found in a variety of disorders, particularly obsessive-compulsive and addictive disorders^{1,2}. Moreover, with the advent of digital technological devices, a new psychiatric problem has emerged, such as gaming disorder, which characterizes the maladaptive engagement in game playing³. Researchers have suggested that issues with processing rewards and/or punishments may be involved in the characteristic of such behavioral dysregulation⁴, e.g., insensitivity to punishment in compulsive tobacco abuse and high sensitivity to reward in obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD)^{5,6}. In addition, problems related to reward/punishment sensitivity have been shown to be associated with abnormalities in brain functions such as the amygdala⁷, suggesting that understanding the relationship may be a promising target for developing new drug and psychotherapeutic interventions for behavioral dysregulation.

Importantly, the specificity of the association between reward/punishment sensitivity and each diagnosis of psychopathology has not been established. Indeed, similar deficits in reward/punishment sensitivity have been reported in a number of other patient groups, including internalizing disorders (depression, anxiety, etc.)⁸. Given that such disorders are not characterized by repetitive, compulsive behavior and impulse control deficits, it is questionable to hypothesize that reward/punishment sensitivity is a neuropsychological mechanism involved only in behavioral dysregulation associated with specific obsessive/addictive diagnoses. Moreover, the results are not consistent across studies. For example, with regard to addiction, some papers reported that symptoms were positively associated with reward sensitivity^{9,10}, while others suggested more complex relationships with reward/punishment sensitivity¹¹⁻¹³. Unfortunately, this lack of specificity and consistency is ubiquitous in psychiatric research¹⁴. This problem may be the result of a broader problem in which conventional psychiatric diagnostic labeling does not reflect a neurobiologically or psychologically beneficial phenomenon. Of particular relevance to the present study is the suggestion that behavioral preoccupations such as obsessive-compulsive and gaming disorders need to be viewed broadly as disorders of behavioral control related to compulsive/impulsive spectrum⁴, and more broadly, that the majority of patients diagnosed with these disorders meet lifelong depression and anxiety or meet other criteria^{15,16}. Moreover, compulsive-impulsive spectrum has recently been suggested as a theoretical transdiagnostic aspect representing a loss of control over repetitive self-destructive behaviors across various disorders^{1,2}. Given these perspectives, current studies following categorical-based diagnoses may struggle to disentangle the specific neurocognitive and psychological mechanisms of behavioral dysregulation for each diagnostic category.

One such proposed approach beyond diagnosis is the Research Domain Criteria (RDoC), which helps identify transdiagnostic and translational features of affective disorders¹⁷. Mechanistic clarification using this framework has been accomplished to some extent by studies examining

separable patient clusters within groups diagnosed with the same disorder^{18,19}. However, identifying robust, generalizable, specific markers that contribute to psychiatric comorbidity is limited by the small sample sizes typical of patient studies²⁰. Previous studies have, therefore, used a transdiagnostic dimensional approach that leverages the efficiency of large-scale online data collection from healthy subjects rather than diagnosed patients to identify associations between transdiagnostic dimensions and various behavioral properties^{21,22}. The use of such data-driven approaches to uncover transdiagnostic psychological mechanisms has become a major trend in recent psychiatric research^{23,24}. However, few studies have focused on and conducted on the transdiagnostic levels of the obsessive-compulsive/impulsive spectrum and reward/punishment sensitivity.

The present study addressed this issue using an unsupervised approach based on a large online sample of approximately 20,000 individuals. Initially, we attempted to extract transdiagnostic factors based on data from eight questionnaires related to behavioral dysregulation and psychopathology. We then analyzed the data using generalized linear regression models to identify specific/heterogeneous associations between each disorder/dimension and reward/punishment sensitivity. As a result, three factors characterized by compulsive hypersensitivity, social withdrawal, and addictive disorder were extracted, and each was found to have a transdiagnostic association with reward/punishment sensitivity. The results of this study are a step forward toward establishing a transdiagnostic approach such as RDoC and suggest that dimensional markers of psychiatric disorders may correspond closely to neuropsychological characteristics.

Methods

Ethics

This study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the Advanced Telecommunications Research Institute International (Japan) (No.182H). All participants gave informed consent before responding to the surveys.

Participants and procedure

All procedures were approved by the Ethics Committee of the Advanced Telecommunications Research Institute International (Japan) (approval No.182H). In September 2023, we collected questionnaire data from 20,000 respondents monitored by Macromill Survey Services. Of these, 495 participants were excluded due to the identification of unreliable responses, e.g., they responded identically to all items using only the maximum or minimum values in the questionnaires, which included reversed questions. As a result, 19,505 participants were included in the analysis.

Measures

Reward/punishment sensitivity questionnaire

We assessed the reward/punishment sensitivity score using a behavioral inhibition/approach system questionnaire (BIS/BAS²⁵). The BIS/BAS has been defined as a subscale of the affective valence system characterized as reward (positive) punishment (negative) sensitivity in RDoC, which may better capture aspects of reward/punishment sensitivity across psychiatric disorders. Although the BAS is generally considered to be divided into three sub-factors (BAS-Drive, BAS Reward Responsiveness, and BAS FunSeeking), the previous article indicated that it has a one-factor structure, so for this analysis, the entire BAS was considered as a variable²⁶.

Self-report psychiatric questionnaires

Participants completed self-report questionnaires assessing attentional/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) based on ASRS²⁷; social anxious symptoms based on LSAS²⁸; impulsivity based on BIS²⁹; OCD obsessive-compulsive disorder based on OCI³⁰; psychological distress general mental health based on K6³¹; alcohol-related disorder and tobacco dependence based on CAGE³²/TDS³³; gaming disorder based on POGQ³⁴. These domains are considered to be closely interrelated given the comorbidity and the interrelationship^{35,36}. In the following regression analyses, they were analyzed based on each questionnaire unit.

Analysis

Factor analysis

To obtain a parsimonious latent structure for explaining shared variance at the item level across questionnaires, factor analysis with maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) was employed to follow previous research²⁰. This factor analysis was conducted using oblique rotation (OBLIMIN), with the 176 question items entered as measurement variables. This data analysis used unscaled data to compute and analyze the heterogeneous correlation matrix because the data set included scales evaluated on a binary basis. All these procedures follow the method of Gillan et al. (2016), in which the authors extracted transdiagnostic dimensions using factor analysis. We separated large online samples into two balanced samples (Ds1: N=9753, Ds2: N=9752) and applied exploratory factor analysis in one dataset. We then did the same process in another one to confirm the validity of the result. The Cattell-Nelson-Gorsuch (CNG) test was performed in each dataset, and the optimal number of factors was extracted. Importantly, we used each factor score derived from factor analysis based on all samples for the following analysis.

Generalized mixed-effect linear model

Generalized linear mixed models were used to examine the association between each symptom and each diagnostic transdiagnostic dimension and BIS/BAS. Each symptom and

transdiagnostic dimension was standardized and included as a dependent variable. Gender, age, occupation, and house income were controlled by being included in fixed effects, while each subject factor was included as a random effect. The equation is expressed as follows.

$$\text{Psychiatric Score (or Transdiagnostic Dimension)} \sim \text{Intercept} + \beta_1 \text{BIS} + \beta_2 \text{BAS} + \text{covariables} + (1|\text{Participant ID})$$

Factor analysis was conducted using R (4.2.3) and generalized linear regression using MatlabR2020b.

Results

Sample characteristics

The average age of the survey population was 41.5 years [standard deviation (SD) = 10.7], and 49.7% were male. Other details are described in Table 1.

Table 1. Characteristics of the survey population

All	19505 (100%)									
Sex	Male	Female								
	9687 (49.7%)	9818 (50.3%)								
Marital status	Not married	Married								
	9427 (48.3%)	10078 (51.7%)								
The existence of child	No	Yes								
	11015 (56.5%)	8490 (43.5%)								
Household income (yen)	Less than 2 million	2 to Less than 4 million	4 to Less than 6 million	6 to less than 8 million	8 to less than 10 million	10 to less than 12 million	12 to less than 15 million	15 to less than 20 million	More than 20 million	Missing
	1525 (7.8%)	3503 (18.0%)	3729 (19.1%)	2609 (13.4%)	1599 (8.2%)	777 (4.0%)	400 (2.1%)	217 (1.1%)	119 (0.6%)	5027 (25.8%)
Job	Employee or Executive	Self-employed	Homemaker	Other	No job					
	10296 (52.8%)	1224 (6.3%)	2249 (11.5%)	4529 (23.2%)	1207 (6.2%)					

Factor analysis to extract transdiagnostic dimensions

Our CNG test indicated three factors of latent structure (Figure 1a,b). The correlation between the two separated datasets was high in eigenvalues and each factor score ($r > 0.9$), indicating the structure's robustness. We labeled each factor as 'Compulsive hypersensitivity (CH),' 'Social withdrawal (SW),' and 'Addictive behavior (AB)' based on the strongest individual item loadings. For the CH factor, the highest average loadings came from OCD (Ds1: $M=0.71$, $SD=0.06$; Ds2: $M=0.71$, $SD=0.06$), followed by ADHD (Ds1: $M=0.39$, $SD=0.06$; Ds2: $M=0.40$, $SD=0.06$) and psychological distress (Ds1: $M=0.48$, $SD=0.04$; Ds2: $M=0.49$, $SD=0.03$). The highest average loadings of the second factor SW came from social anxiety (Ds1: $M=0.65$, $SD=0.12$; Ds2: $M=0.64$, $SD=0.12$), followed by psychological distress (Ds1: $M=0.22$, $SD=0.05$; Ds2: $M=0.23$, $SD=0.04$). For

the third factor AB, the highest average loadings came from the gaming disorder (Ds1: $M=0.73$, $SD=0.03$; Ds2: $M=0.72$, $SD=0.03$), followed by alcohol-related disorder (Ds1: $M=0.20$, $SD=0.08$; Ds2: $M=0.21$, $SD=0.09$) and tobacco dependence (Ds1: $M=0.19$, $SD=0.01$; Ds2: $M=0.20$, $SD=0.01$). Notably, each transdiagnostic dimension included loading values from various items across questionnaires.




Figure 1. Extracting transdiagnostic factors

(a,b) Scree plot, correlation matrix, and item loadings from factor analysis in the separated datasets (Ds 1, Ds 2). The result suggested that the three-factor solution best explained the data from our

*samples. Factors were named 'Compulsive hypersensitivity,' 'Social withdrawal,' and 'Addictive behavior.' Each label meaning indicates the names of questionnaires as follows: ASRS attentional/hyperactivity disorder; LSAS-F/A social anxious symptoms of fear/avoidance; BIS Impulsivity; OCI obsessive-compulsive disorder; K6 Psychological distress; CAGE/TDS alcohol-related disorder and tobacco dependence; POGQ Gaming disorder. The reason why we use different colors for two factors of social anxiety separately and the same color for alcohol and tobacco use disorder is because the direction of loadings looks different/same in each factor. (c) **Scatter plots to compare the results from two datasets.** All correlations were more than $r = 0.90$, which indicates that the factor structure is robust.*

Generalized mixed effect model revealed the relationship between psychopathological scores and reward/punishment sensitivity

Our regression analyses for each disorder indicated significant associations with reward/punishment sensitivity (Fig 2). With reward sensitivity, there were significant relationships in social anxiety ($\beta = -0.061$, Standard Error (SE) = 0.008, $p_{FDR} < 0.001$); gaming disorder ($\beta = 0.076$, SE = 0.008, $p_{FDR} < 0.001$); ADHD ($\beta = 0.120$, SE = 0.008, $p_{FDR} < 0.001$); OCD ($\beta = 0.052$, SE = 0.009, $p_{FDR} < 0.001$); PD ($\beta = -0.030$, SE = 0.008, $p_{FDR} < 0.001$); Tobacco dependence ($\beta = 0.038$, SE = 0.009, $p_{FDR} < 0.001$). With punishment sensitivity, there were significant relationships in social anxiety ($\beta = 0.313$, SE = 0.008, $p_{FDR} < 0.001$); gaming disorder ($\beta = -0.076$, SE = 0.009, $p_{FDR} < 0.001$); ADHD ($\beta = 0.196$, SE = 0.009, $p_{FDR} < 0.001$); OCD ($\beta = 0.095$, SE = 0.009, $p_{FDR} < 0.001$); PD ($\beta = 0.318$, SE = 0.008, $p_{FDR} < 0.001$); Alcohol-related disorder ($\beta = -0.053$, SE = 0.009, $p_{FDR} < 0.001$); Tobacco dependence ($\beta = -0.037$, SE = 0.009, $p_{FDR} < 0.001$). Impulsivity was not related to both sensitivities significantly.

Our regression analyses for transdiagnostic dimensions also revealed distinctive significant relationships between the factors. SW factor was associated with reward sensitivity negatively ($\beta = -0.069$, SE = 0.008, $p_{FDR} < 0.001$) and with punishment sensitivity positively ($\beta = 0.351$, SE = 0.008, $p_{FDR} < 0.001$). Contrarily, the AB factor was associated with reward sensitivity positively ($\beta = 0.080$, SE = 0.008, $p_{FDR} < 0.001$) and with punishment sensitivity negatively ($\beta = -0.156$, SE = 0.009, $p_{FDR} < 0.001$). Notably, CH was associated with both sensitivities positively, differently from the other two dimensions ($\beta = 0.064$, SE = 0.008, $p_{FDR} < 0.001$; $\beta = 0.122$, SE = 0.009, $p_{FDR} < 0.001$). See Table

S1&S2 for the details of each statistical value.




Figure 2. Associations between reward/punishment sensitivity and psychopathology.

(a) The regression results for the relationship between reward sensitivity and psychopathology.

(b) The regression results for the relationship between punishment sensitivity and psychopathology.

*ADHD attentional/hyperactivity disorder; OCD obsessive-compulsive disorder based; PD psychological distress. *** indicates $p_{FDR} < 0.001$.*

Discussion

Here, we used a dimensional approach to investigate the psychological mechanisms for transdiagnostic behavioral dysregulation and reward/punishment sensitivity in a large general population sample. Evidence from our analyses showed that the compulsive hypersensitivity factor is a symptom dimension associated with both reward and punishment, distinct from its relationships with the other two transdiagnostic dimensions. Interestingly, the compulsive hypersensitivity-related dimension includes a wide variety of items related to obsessiveness, impulsivity, inattention, and potential fear in social contexts.

With regard to our factor analysis, three robust transdiagnostic dimensions were extracted: ‘Compulsive hypersensitivity (CH),’ ‘Social withdrawal (SW),’ and ‘Addictive behavior (AB).’ Although there are differences from those obtained in past dimensional approaches^{20,37}, given that the present study sought to capture psychopathological aspects characteristic focusing on behavioral dysregulation, it is natural that differences would arise with data-driven studies that also include more items related to general symptoms, e.g., major depression disorder. On the other hand, there are several commonalities, and the results of the study on compulsive hypersensitivity and social withdrawal are partially consistent with those of previous studies (e.g., compulsive and intrusive thoughts, social withdrawal^{20,37}). These results suggest that transdiagnostic dimensions may be robust across regions, races, and cultures. Moreover, considering most existing research has not validated the factors in large hold-out samples, the fact that this study used approximately 10,000 samples as a hold-out group to confirm the robustness of the structure presents the validity of the transdiagnostic factors obtained here.

Our regression analyses found significant associations between categorical and transdiagnostic dimensions and reward/punishment sensitivity, respectively. Significant negative and positive associations existed between SW and reward/punishment sensitivity, respectively. Similarly, there were positive and negative associations between AB and these sensitivities. These findings align with previous studies^{38,39} exploring the relationships from a transdiagnostic perspective. However, even though the association of the scores of alcohol-related disorder and impulsivity with reward sensitivity was not significant when viewed by categorical disorder, the fact that the relationship with AB was significant suggests that the association could have been found more robustly based on an index based on transdiagnostic symptom dimensions. The specificity of CH, which is constructed

based on OCD and ADHD transdiagnostically, is associated with greater sensitivity to both reward and punishment in this dimension, unlike the other two dimensions. The results support a critique of the notion that compulsivity and impulsivity are at opposite ends of the approach/avoidance spectrum. They suggest that compulsive-impulsive dyscontrol may coexist at a higher level, as many clinicians and researchers have proposed regarding reward/punishment processing^{40,41}.

On the other hand, reward/punishment treatment was assessed based on subjective reports; therefore, its ecological validity is questionable compared to behavioral indexes and parameters derived from computational modeling. Indeed, such self-reported indexes may not be directly related to behaviorally or computationally defined reward/punishment sensitivity⁴². However, this does not simply mean that such a subjective index does not have validity. It also indicates that it is a psychological characteristic captured by the individual's subjective awareness and that the layer may differ from the behavioral and computational one. In fact, studies that have investigated the relationship between psychopathology, behavioral measures, and subjective self-esteem have also suggested that self-esteem as a higher-level concept that sits above behavioral measures best explains psychopathology³⁷. Considering the assumption of such complex relationships, future research should clarify the relationship between subjective sensitivity and psychopathology and reward/punishment sensitivity, which should be formulated through a combination of behavioral experiments and computational modeling⁴³.

Moreover, it should be noted that even though traits such as reward/punishment sensitivity examine psychopathology, the characteristics are not pathology per se. In addition, the association between psychopathology and reward/punishment sensitivity might be mediated by other neuropsychological factors such as meta-cognition⁴⁴. When considering more general applications, such as psychotherapy, a transdiagnostic dimensional model should be used to identify detailed mediating processes, leading to an approach that increases the precision of intervention targeting. Through such detailed future research, the transdiagnostic dimensional model allows us to take a more granular approach rather than merely focusing on categorical psychiatric disorders.

Given the complexity of the association between behavioral dysregulation and various psychological constructs, this study has several limitations. First, as this study is cross-sectional, it does not shed light on time-dependent and causal associations. Considering the recent suggestion that psychiatry needs time and context^{45,46}, future research should apply a longitudinal approach and take care of spatiotemporal aspects. Second, the psychiatric scores assessed here do not include essential dimensions for behavioral dysregulation, such as eating disorders. However, it has been reported that general factors of psychopathology are identifiable, even if the measures assessing symptoms do not cover all elements⁴⁷, which means this issue is negligible to some extent here. Third, our analysis focuses on the Japanese population. A deeper understanding of the transdiagnostic psychological mechanisms of behavioral dysregulation would benefit from international comparisons including various races, cultures, religions, and other statuses, which were not assessed in the present study.

Fourth, these surveys were conducted using online recruitment methods, which may introduce sampling bias. Generalized linear model analyses corrected for this possibility by adjusting for confounding factors such as age, gender, and other socio-demographic attributes, reducing the influence of bias.

In summary, the symptoms from eight psychiatric disorders related to compulsive-impulsive behavioral dysregulation were aggregated into three factors with different relationships with reward/punishment sensitivity. Our findings underline the association between compulsive hypersensitivity and reward and punishment sensitivities. This finding highlights the importance of a transdiagnostic multidimensional approach for examining these relationships with psychological aspects. Furthermore, our results contribute to a step forward toward establishing a transdiagnostic framework, such as the RDoC, and suggest that dimensional symptoms of psychiatric disorders may correspond more clearly to psychological constructs than to existing overlapping and heterogeneous definitions of psychiatric disorders.

Declaration of AI use

We have used AI-assisted technologies to improve the manuscript's readability and language.

Acknowledgment

This research was supported by the KDDI collaborative research contract and JSPS KAKENHI grant number 24K22822 (TO).

Conflict of interest disclosure

KDDI Corporation funded this study; however, KDDI had no role in the study design, conclusions drawn, or publication decision. There are no other disclosures to report.

Data availability

The manuscript contains all summary statistics supporting this study's findings. The factor loadings of each transdiagnostic dimension will be accessible in the Open Science Framework (OSF). Owing to company cohort data sharing restrictions, individual-level data cannot be publicly posted. However, data are available from the authors upon request and with the permission of KDDI Corporation.

Author contributions

TO designed the study and prepared the original draft; TO, AS, and NK acquired and analyzed the data; AS and NK reviewed and edited the manuscript. All authors gave final approval for

submission and agreed to take responsibility for the manuscript.

Reference

1. Dalley JW, Everitt BJ, Robbins TW. Impulsivity, compulsivity, and top-down cognitive control. *Neuron*. 2011; 69: 680–94.
2. Robbins TW, Gillan CM, Smith DG, de Wit S, Ersche KD. Neurocognitive endophenotypes of impulsivity and compulsivity: towards dimensional psychiatry. *Trends Cogn. Sci.* 2012; 16: 81–91.
3. Przybylski AK, Weinstein N, Murayama K. Internet Gaming Disorder: Investigating the Clinical Relevance of a New Phenomenon. *Am. J. Psychiatry*. 2017; 174: 230–6.
4. Figeo M, Luigjes J, Goudriaan A, Willuhn I, Denys D. Neurocognitive Basis of Compulsivity. In: Fontenelle LF (ed.). *A Transdiagnostic Approach to Obsessions, Compulsions and Related Phenomena*. Cambridge University Press; 2019. p. 61–73.
5. Potts GF, Bloom EL, Evans DE, Drobos DJ. Neural reward and punishment sensitivity in cigarette smokers. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2014; 144: 245–53.
6. Brauer L, Storch EA, Lewin AB, Grant JE. Behavioral activation and inhibition in compulsive buying and obsessive-compulsive disorder. *Ann. Clin. Psychiatry*. 2021; 33: e2–7.
7. Den Ouden L, Suo C, Albertella L, Greenwood L-M, Lee RSC, Fontenelle LF, et al. Transdiagnostic phenotypes of compulsive behavior and associations with psychological, cognitive, and neurobiological affective processing. *Transl. Psychiatry*. 2022; 12: 10.
8. Verdejo-Garcia A, Rossi G, Albein-Urios N, Lozano OM, Diaz-Batanero C. Identifying internalizing transdiagnostic profiles through motivational and cognitive control systems: Relations with symptoms, functionality, and quality of life. *Compr. Psychiatry*. 2024; 133: 152498.
9. Balconi M, Finocchiaro R, Campanella S. Reward sensitivity, decisional bias, and metacognitive deficits in cocaine drug addiction. *J. Addict. Med.* 2014; 8: 399–406.
10. He W, Qi A, Wang Q, Wu H, Zhang Z, Gu R, et al. Abnormal reward and punishment sensitivity associated with Internet addicts. *Comput. Human Behav.* 2017; 75: 678–83.
11. Rádosi A, Pászthy B, Welker T, Zubovics EA, Réthelyi JM, Ulbert I, et al. The association between reinforcement sensitivity and substance use is mediated by individual differences in dispositional affectivity in adolescents. *Addict. Behav.* 2021; 114: 106719.
12. Kidd C, Loxton NJ. A narrative review of reward sensitivity, rash impulsivity, and food addiction in adolescents. *Prog. Neuropsychopharmacol. Biol. Psychiatry*. 2021; 109: 110265.
13. Meerkerk G-J, van den Eijnden RJJM, Franken IHA, Garretsen HFL. Is compulsive internet use related to sensitivity to reward and punishment, and impulsivity? *Comput. Human Behav.* 2010; 26: 729–35.
14. Dalgleish T, Black M, Johnston D, Bevan A. Transdiagnostic approaches to mental health problems: Current status and future directions. *J. Consult. Clin. Psychol.* 2020; 88: 179–95.
15. Schou Andreassen C, Billieux J, Griffiths MD, Kuss DJ, Demetrovics Z, Mazzoni E, et al. The

- relationship between addictive use of social media and video games and symptoms of psychiatric disorders: A large-scale cross-sectional study. *Psychol. Addict. Behav.* 2016; 30: 252–62.
16. Rowe C, Deledalle A, Boudoukha AH. Psychiatric comorbidities of obsessive-compulsive disorder: A series of systematic reviews and meta-analyses. *J Clin Psychol.* 2022; 78: 469–84.
 17. Insel T, Cuthbert B, Garvey M, Heinssen R, Pine DS, Quinn K, et al. Research domain criteria (RDoC): toward a new classification framework for research on mental disorders. *Am. J. Psychiatry.* 2010; 167: 748–51.
 18. Ahmed AT, Frye MA, Rush AJ, Biernacka JM, Craighead WE, McDonald WM, et al. Mapping depression rating scale phenotypes onto research domain criteria (RDoC) to inform biological research in mood disorders. *J. Affect. Disord.* 2018; 238: 1–7.
 19. Zhang S, Yang T, Wu Z, Wang Y, Lui SSY, Yang B, et al. Identifying subgroups of attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder from the psychopathological and neuropsychological profiles. *Journal of Neuropsychology.* 2024; 18: 173–89.
 20. Gillan CM, Kosinski M, Whelan R, Phelps EA, Daw ND. Characterizing a psychiatric symptom dimension related to deficits in goal-directed control. *Elife.* 2016; 5. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/10.7554/eLife.11305>
 21. Wise T, Robinson OJ, Gillan CM. Identifying Transdiagnostic Mechanisms in Mental Health Using Computational Factor Modeling. *Biol. Psychiatry.* 2023; 93: 690–703.
 22. Seow TXF, Gillan CM. Transdiagnostic Phenotyping Reveals a Host of Metacognitive Deficits Implicated in Compulsivity. *Sci. Rep.* 2020; 10: 1–11.
 23. Eaton NR, Bringmann LF, Elmer T, Fried EI, Forbes MK, Greene AL, et al. A review of approaches and models in psychopathology conceptualization research. *Nature Reviews Psychology.* 2023; : 1–15.
 24. Yücel M, Oldenhof E, Ahmed SH, Belin D, Billieux J, Bowden-Jones H, et al. A transdiagnostic dimensional approach towards a neuropsychological assessment for addiction: an international Delphi consensus study. *Addiction.* 2019; 114: 1095–109.
 25. Carver C, White TL. Behavioral inhibition, behavioral activation, and affective responses to impending reward and punishment: The BIS/BAS Scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology.* 1994; 67: 319–33.
 26. Maack DJ, Ebesutani C. A re-examination of the BIS/BAS scales: Evidence for BIS and BAS as unidimensional scales. *Int J Methods Psych Res.* 2018; 27. Available from <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/mpr.1612>
 27. Kessler RC, Adler L, Ames M, Demler O, Faraone S, Hiripi E, et al. The World Health Organization Adult ADHD Self-Report Scale (ASRS): a short screening scale for use in the general population. *Psychol. Med.* 2005; 35: 245–56.
 28. Baker SL, Heinrichs N, Kim H-J, Hofmann SG. The liebowitz social anxiety scale as a self-report instrument: a preliminary psychometric analysis. *Behav. Res. Ther.* 2002; 40: 701–15.
 29. Patton JH, Stanford MS, Barratt ES. Factor structure of the Barratt impulsiveness scale. *J. Clin. Psychol.* 1995; 51: 768–74.
 30. Foa EB, Kozak MJ, Salkovskis PM, Coles ME, Amir N. The validation of a new obsessive-compulsive disorder scale: The Obsessive-Compulsive Inventory. *Psychological Assessment.* 1998; 10: 206–14. Available from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.10.3.206>

31. Kessler RC, Andrews G, Colpe LJ, Hiripi E, Mroczek DK, Normand SLT, et al. Short screening scales to monitor population prevalences and trends in non-specific psychological distress. *Psychol. Med.* 2002; 32: 959–76.
32. Ewing JA. Detecting alcoholism. The CAGE questionnaire. *JAMA.* 1984; 252: 1905–7.
33. Kawakami N, Takatsuka N, Inaba S, Shimizu H. Development of a screening questionnaire for tobacco/nicotine dependence according to ICD-10, DSM-III-R, and DSM-IV. *Addict. Behav.* 1999; 24: 155–66.
34. Demetrovics Z, Urbán R, Nagygyörgy K, Farkas J, Griffiths MD, Pápay O, et al. The development of the Problematic Online Gaming Questionnaire (POGQ). *PLoS One.* 2012; 7: e36417.
35. Miyauchi M, Matsuura N, Mukai K, Hashimoto T, Ogino S, Yamanishi K, et al. A prospective investigation of impacts of comorbid attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) on clinical features and long-term treatment response in adult patients with obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD). *Compr. Psychiatry.* 2023; 125: 152401.
36. Davis JP, Christie NC, Pakdaman S, Hummer JF, DeLeon J, Clapp JD, et al. Multifaceted impulsivity as a moderator of social anxiety and cannabis use during pregameing. *J. Anxiety Disord.* 2020; 76: 102320.
37. Hoven M, Luigjes J, Denys D, Rouault M, van Holst RJ. How do confidence and self-beliefs relate in psychopathology: a transdiagnostic approach. *Nature Mental Health.* 2023; 1: 337–45.
38. Katz BA, Matanky K, Aviram G, Yovel I. Reinforcement sensitivity, depression and anxiety: A meta-analysis and meta-analytic structural equation model. *Clin. Psychol. Rev.* 2020; 77: 101842.
39. Van Malderen E, Goossens L, Claes L, Wilderjans TF, Kemps E, Verbeken S. Self-regulation profiles in addictive behaviors among adolescents: A transdiagnostic approach. *Appetite.* 2024; 192: 107128.
40. Figeo M, Pattij T, Willuhn I, Luigjes J, van den Brink W, Goudriaan A, et al. Compulsivity in obsessive-compulsive disorder and addictions. *Eur. Neuropsychopharmacol.* 2016; 26: 856–68.
41. Mestre-Bach G, Granero R, Steward T, Fernández-Aranda F, Baño M, Aymamí N, et al. Reward and punishment sensitivity in women with gambling disorder or compulsive buying: Implications in treatment outcome. *J. Behav. Addict.* 2016; 5: 658–65.
42. Vrizzi S, Najar A, Lemogne C, Palminteri S, Lebreton M. Comparing the test-retest reliability of behavioral, computational and self-reported individual measures of reward and punishment sensitivity in relation to mental health symptoms.
43. Yamamori Y, Robinson OJ, Roiser JP. Approach-avoidance reinforcement learning as a translational and computational model of anxiety-related avoidance. *Elife.* 2023; 12: RP87720.
44. Dercon Q, Mehrhof SZ, Sandhu TR, Hitchcock C, Lawson RP, Pizzagalli DA, et al. A core component of psychological therapy causes adaptive changes in computational learning mechanisms. *Psychol. Med.* 2024; 54: 327–37.
45. Hitchcock PF, Fried EI, Frank MJ. Computational Psychiatry Needs Time and Context. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* 2022; 73: 243–70.
46. Northoff G, Daub J, Hirjak D. Overcoming the translational crisis of contemporary psychiatry – converging phenomenological and spatiotemporal psychopathology. *Mol. Psychiatry.* 2023; 28:

4492–9.

47. Caspi A, Moffitt TE. All for One and One for All: Mental Disorders in One Dimension. *Am. J. Psychiatry*. 2018; 175: 831–44.