

ESM 2. Tables 1 to 3

Table 1

*Mean values (SD) for age, the scaled scores of the two Beta-III (Kellogg & Morton, 1999) subscales coding and picture absurdities, detention time in months, and age of the youngest victim across participant groups and the complete sample.*

Participant group	<i>N</i>	Age	Coding	Picture absurdities	Detention time	Age youngest victim
CSO (a)	77	46.0(11.5) <sup>b,c,d</sup>	7.1(2.7) <sup>d</sup>	6.6(2.2) <sup>c,d</sup>	96.7(81.2)	7.8(2.6)
OSO (b)	47	40.8(13.1) <sup>a</sup>	7.0(2.7) <sup>d</sup>	6.9(2.7) <sup>c,d</sup>	87.2(88.4)	24.4(12.9)
NSO (c)	14	34.7(12.2) <sup>a</sup>	8.1(2.4) <sup>d</sup>	9.1(3.1) <sup>a,b</sup>	22.0(34.1)	-- (--)
CC (d)	95	35.4(15.1) <sup>a</sup>	9.5(2.5) <sup>a,b,c</sup>	9.4(2.7) <sup>a,b</sup>	-- (--)	-- (--)
TOTAL	233	40.0(14.2)	8.1(2.8)	8.0(2.9)	85.7(83.0)	13.4(11.0)

*Note.* For the dependent variables age, coding, picture absurdities, and detention time, an independent ANOVA with participant group as a fixed factor and for the dependent variable age of the youngest victim a *t*-test was calculated. All tests yielded significant effects (all *ps* < .001).

<sup>a,b,c,d</sup> indicates significant differences based on post-hoc (Duncan) tests for the respective dependent variable between the present group and the other groups: a = child sex offenders (CSO), b = other sex offenders (OSO), c = non-sex offenders (NSO), and d = community controls (CC).

Table 2

*Distribution of percentages with respect to index offense, sex of the victim(s), sex-offense characteristics, and diagnosed sexual deviance across offender groups.*

Participant group	Index offense			Sex of the victim(s)			Sex offense characteristics		Diagnosed sexual deviance	
	CSA/CP <sup>1</sup>	other sex offense <sup>2</sup>	other crime <sup>3</sup>	female	male	both	hands-on	penetration	pedophilia	other <sup>4</sup>
CSO	86%/1%	7%	6%	52%	23%	25%	91%	49%	55%	12%
OSO	4%/0% <sup>a</sup>	85%	11%	96%	2%	2%	98%	77%	0%	15%
NSO	0%	0%	100%	--	--	--	--	--	0%	0%

*Note.* CSO: child sex offenders, OSO: other sex offenders, NSO: non-sex offenders.

<sup>1</sup> Includes child sexual abuse (CSA) and possession of child pornography (CP). <sup>2</sup> Includes rape, exhibitionistic acts, and sexual assault. <sup>3</sup> Includes manslaughter, kidnapping, assault, theft, robbery, drugs, arson, and threatening. <sup>4</sup> Includes exhibitionism, sadomasochism, multiple disorders of sexual preference, other disorders of sexual preference, fetishism and voyeurism.

<sup>a</sup> Two Italian participants were officially convicted for child sexual abuse, although their victims were above 14 years of age (both 15), due to their relationship to the victim (teacher and coach). However, in the present study these participants were treated as other sex-offenders.

Table 3

*Area under the Curve (AUC) values (with 95% confidence intervals) across the different group comparisons for the indices of the single paradigms and the combined index, and test statistics indicating the difference between the AUCs of the two paradigms.*

Participant groups	Single paradigms			Combined CRT-NRP/CRT-VPS
	CRT-NRP	CRT-VPS	$X^2$ ( $df = 1$ ) <sup>a</sup>	
CSO vs. OSO	.63* (.54-.73)	.67** (.57-.76)	0.22	.64** (.54-.74)
CSO vs. NSO	.62 (.48-.76)	.69* (.55-.82)	0.45	.63 (.50-.75)
CSO vs. CC	.68*** (.60-.77)	.59* (.50-.68)	2.64	.68*** (.59-.76)
CSO vs. others	.66*** (.58-.74)	.62** (.54-.70)	0.54	.66*** (.58-.74)
CSO <sub>p</sub> vs. CSO <sub>np</sub>	.53 (.40-.67)	.67** (.55-.79)	2.86 <sup>†</sup>	.54 (.41-.68)
CSO <sub>p</sub> vs. OSO	.64** (.53-.75)	.72*** (.62-.82)	1.40	.65** (.55-.76)
CSO <sub>p</sub> vs. NSO	.62 (.47-.78)	.77** (.66-.88)	2.58	.64 (.50-.79)
CSO <sub>p</sub> vs. CC	.69*** (.59-.79)	.67*** (.56-.77)	0.14	.68*** (.58-.78)
CSO <sub>p</sub> vs. others	.65*** (.55-.74)	.69*** (.59-.78)	0.48	.65*** (.56-.74)

*Note.* CSO: child sex offenders, OSO: other sex offenders, NSO: non-sex offenders, CC: community controls, CSO<sub>p</sub>: pedophilic child sex offenders (SSPI  $\geq 3$ ;  $n = 51$ ), CSO<sub>np</sub>: non-pedophilic child sex offenders (SSPI  $< 3$ ;  $n = 26$ ).

*df*: degrees of freedom, <sup>†</sup> :  $p < .10$ , \* :  $p < .05$ , \*\* :  $p < .01$ , \*\*\* :  $p \leq .001$  (all  $p$  values two-sided).

<sup>a</sup> Nonparametric approach to test significant differences between two AUC values (DeLong, DeLong, & Clarke-Pearson, 1988).

## References

- DeLong, E. R., DeLong, D. M., & Clarke-Pearson, D. L. (1988). Comparing the areas under two or more correlated receiver operating characteristic curves: A nonparametric approach. *Biometrics*, *44*(3), 837–845. doi:10.2307/2531595
- Kellogg, C. E., & Morton, N. W. (1999). *Beta III - Manual*. San Antonio, TX: The Psychological Corporation.