

Research

Open Access

Executive function abnormalities in pathological gamblers

Donatella Marazziti*, Mario Catena Dell'Osso, Ciro Conversano, Giorgio Consoli, Laura Vivarelli, Francesco Mungai, Elena Di Nasso and Francesca Golia

Address: Dipartimento di Psichiatria, Neurobiologia, Farmacologia e Biotecnologie, University of Pisa, Italy

Email: Donatella Marazziti* - dmarazzi@psico.med.unipi.it; Mario Catena Dell'Osso - catena.mario@virgilio.it;

Ciro Conversano - psicologiaapplicata@gmail.com; Giorgio Consoli - consoli_giorgio@libero.it; Laura Vivarelli - laura_vivarelli@yahoo.it;

Francesco Mungai - francesco_mungai@yahoo.it; Elena Di Nasso - elenadinasso@virgilio.it; Francesca Golia - francescagolia@hotmail.com

* Corresponding author

Published: 27 March 2008

Received: 7 July 2007

Accepted: 27 March 2008

Clinical Practice and Epidemiology in Mental Health 2008, 4:7 doi:10.1186/1745-0179-4-7

This article is available from: <http://www.cpementalhealth.com/content/4/1/7>

© 2008 Marazziti et al; licensee BioMed Central Ltd.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Abstract

Background: Pathological gambling (PG) is an impulse control disorder characterized by persistent and maladaptive gambling behaviors with disruptive consequences for familial, occupational and social functions. The pathophysiology of PG is still unclear, but it is hypothesized that it might include environmental factors coupled with a genetic vulnerability and dysfunctions of different neurotransmitters and selected brain areas. Our study aimed to evaluate a group of patients suffering from PG by means of some neuropsychological tests in order to explore the brain areas related to the disorder.

Methods: Twenty outpatients (15 men, 5 women), with a diagnosis of PG according to DSM-IV criteria, were included in the study and evaluated with a battery of neuropsychological tests: the Wisconsin Card Sorting Test (WCST), the Wechsler Memory Scale revised (WMS-R) and the Verbal Associative Fluency Test (FAS). The results obtained in the patients were compared with normative values of matched healthy control subjects.

Results: The PG patients showed alterations at the WCST only, in particular they had a great difficulty in finding alternative methods of problem-solving and showed a decrease, rather than an increase, in efficiency, as they progressed through the consecutive phases of the test. The mean scores of the other tests were within the normal range.

Conclusion: Our findings showed that patients affected by PG, in spite of normal intellectual, linguistic and visual-spatial abilities, had abnormalities emerging from the WCST, in particular they could not learn from their mistakes and look for alternative solutions. Our results would seem to confirm an altered functioning of the prefrontal areas which might provoke a sort of cognitive "rigidity" that might predispose to the development of impulsive and/or compulsive behaviors, such as those typical of PG.

Background

In 1980, with the publication of the third edition of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-III) [1], the problem of excessive gambling was officially recognized as a psychiatric diagnosis. In DSM-IV-R [2] pathological gambling (PG) is defined as an impulse control disorder, characterized by persistent and maladaptive gambling behaviours, with disruptive consequences for familial, occupational and social functions. Epidemiological studies suggest that men, adolescents, ethnic minorities and patients with other psychiatric disorders are at a higher risk of suffering from PG [3], although more recent epidemiological data indicate that the disorder is progressing rapidly also amongst women and teen-agers [4,5]. Other risk factors include early exposure to gambling opportunities, such as those offered by the internet, cognitive deficits and relatives with PG or alcohol dependence [6-9].

Several studies have documented that PG patients are often affected by other psychiatric disorders, in particular depression, alcoholism or drug abuse (DA) [10-13]; the comorbid disorders are explained either as secondary to PG or primarily responsible for PG onset. Furthermore, PG is interpreted as belonging to the group of impulsive, compulsive, addictive behaviours which may share common genetic and/or etiological mechanisms [14].

Although the pathophysiology of PG is unclear, probably it represents the result of the interplay between individual and environmental factors. Different hypotheses have been put forward: a genetic vulnerability mainly involving dopamine receptors, biochemical dysfunctions at the level of the serotonin and dopamine systems and/or alterations of different brain areas.

Patients with ventromedial prefrontal cortex abnormalities show a peculiar impairment in decision making, as assessed by the gambling task, a specific test that explores the ability to balance immediate rewards against long-term consequences [15-17]. PG patients, as well as patients suffering from obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD) or cocaine, opiate or alcohol abuse, present similar alterations when presented with the gambling task: these subjects continue to make choices according to an immediate reward, despite being fully aware of the long-term negative consequences [18,19]: taken together, these findings would suggest that all these heterogeneous patients may share a common dysfunction at the level of the ventromedial prefrontal cortex. In line with this hypothesis, a recent study using a comprehensive neuropsychological battery measuring executive functions, demonstrated that PG and alcohol-dependent patients showed a reduction of executive functioning performance on inhibition, time estimation, cognitive flexibility and

planning tasks [20]. Moreover, neurocognitive indicators of decision-making and disinhibition, such as the Card Playing Task and Stop Signal Reaction Time respectively, seem to be powerful predictors of relapse in PG [21]. The impairment of decision-making observed in PG might be explained by the inability to inhibit irrelevant information: in a recent study, the performances on the reverse Stroop task, which highly discriminates the ability to inhibit interferences, were significantly impaired in PG patients than in healthy subjects [22].

PG has been associated to impulsivity and attention deficit: PG patients were found to perform significantly worse than control subjects on attention measures and showed more childhood behaviors related to attention deficits [23]. More recently, neuropsychological measures of impulsivity, such as the reaction time and number of errors at Go/No-go tasks, as well as the scores at the Barratt Impulsiveness Scale, were higher in PG patients than healthy control subjects [24], while highlighting the importance of this dimension in the clinical picture of PG.

Given the paucity of information in this field, our study aimed to evaluate the possible involvement of some brain areas in PG by means of a battery of neuropsychological tests, in particular the Wisconsin Card Sorting Test (WCST) [25], the Wechsler Memory Scale revised (WMS-R) [26] and the Verbal Associative Fluency Test (FAS) [27,28].

Methods

Twenty outpatients (15 men, 5 women, mean age: 26 ± 4 years) with a diagnosis of PG according to the DSM-IV-R criteria [2] were recruited at the Dipartimento di Psichiatria, Neurobiologia, Farmacologia e Biotecnologia at Pisa University, in the Psychiatry Section. None suffered from any severe physical illness nor had ever taken psychotropic drugs, except for two patients who had occasionally taken benzodiazepine for difficulty with sleeping. The mean score of PG at the Yale Brown for Obsessive Compulsive Disorder modified for PG (Y-BOCS-PG) [29] was 30 ± 2 . The age of onset of the disorder (mean \pm SD) was 17 ± 2 years.

Seven patients were suffering also from bipolar disorder (BD) of type II, 5 from OCD, 5 from DA (cocaine and cannabis) and 3 from alcohol abuse. Five patients had two comorbid disorders: 4 BD patients were suffering also from DA and 1 OCD patients from alcohol dependence.

The patients were compared with 20 matched healthy subjects (15 men, 5 women, mean age: 25 ± 5), who were selected from amongst a pool of 500 control individuals undergoing the same battery of neuropsychological tests. Both patients and control subjects were all right-handed.

Neuropsychological Tests

Neuropsychological tests were administered by a psychologist (CC) in a relaxed setting, all together and following the same sequence: WCST, WMS-R and finally FAS. No subject reported any difficulty in completing the tests in about 30–40 minutes.

The WCST assesses abstract ability, namely the ability to shift cognitive strategies in response to changing environmental conditions, thereby assessing the kind of executive functioning which involves strategic planning, organized searching and the ability to use environmental feedback to modify cognitive sets. In this test, the subjects are required to take one card at a time from a pack and then place it below one of 4 different top cards, previously laid out on the table by the interviewer. They must pair off the cards according to categories of colour, shape or the number of stimuli reproduced on the card. The subjects have to discover the right strategy to follow in pairing off the stimulus cards with the top cards, making use of the feedback received from the interviewer. After each card has been put on the table, feedback is given. After 10 cards have been selected correctly in one category, the interviewer changes the category without informing the subject and from that moment on, answers which would have been correct for the previous category are considered wrong. The subjects have to change the principles according to which they pair off the cards in order to discover the new category chosen by the interviewer. The test lasts until 6 categories have been correctly identified, with no time limit.

The WMS-R includes verbal and visual learning tests by means of association and matching, memory of excerpts, drawings and the identification of visual spatial information previously presented. Memory is assessed in terms of both immediate and delayed recall. The WMS-R provides global values for general, verbal and visual short- and long-term memory, as well as for attention and concentration. Specific functionality is evaluated in the verbal areas of logical memory and associative learning with verbal pairing (immediate and delayed) along with the visual areas of memory of image, learning associated with visual stimuli (immediate and delayed) and visual reproduction of pictures (immediate and delayed), as well as the areas of mental concentration, numeric span and visual memory. Comparison of the index of attention/concentration with the general index of memory on the WMS-R provides a means of distinguishing between disorders of concentration and those of memory.

FAS is a test which evaluates the verbal fluency for phonological stimuli that is the ability to produce fluent and spontaneous language without unnecessary pauses or being unable to find more appropriate words. Verbal flu-

ency is assessed typically by noting the number of words which an individual manages to pronounce with reference to a specific category (e.g., types of animals or words which begin with a specific letter). The patient is asked to think of the greatest number of words (excluding personal names and geographical places) beginning with a specific letter of the alphabet, until the interviewer interrupts the test. In the space of a minute for each of the three letters F, A, and S, subjects with a high-school certificate typically produce a total of 30–50 words, maintaining a steady flow for a whole minute. An inability to list 12 or more words for each letter indicates reduced verbal fluency.

Statistical analysis

Parametric and non-parametric data of the two groups were compared by means of the Student t-test or chi-square analysis, respectively, all with personal computer programs, using the SSPS, version 12.01 [30].

Results

The sociodemographic characteristics of the patients and healthy control subjects are shown in table 1. The PG patients showed different alterations at the WCST, as compared with healthy control subjects, in particular, perseverant errors, failure to maintain the series and difficulty in learning to learn. As far as the perseverant errors were concerned, the mean score was obtained by eliminating two extreme positive and negative performances, with $x = 48 \pm 3.2$ which corresponds to the mean score of the ratings $T = 25+4$, while the mean score of the healthy control subjects was significantly lower ($x = 18 \pm 2.1$ and $T = 45+9$, $p < 0.001$); according to this score, the patients fell into the moderate performance group. With regard to the failure to maintain a series, the healthy control subjects showed a score (mean \pm SD) of 0.87 ± 0.9 , while the patients of 1.00 ± 0.55 ($p < 0.005$), suggestive of a great difficulty in finding alternative methods of problem-solving. The "learning to learn" scores obtained by the patients (-8.66 ± 4) were significantly higher ($p < 0.001$) than those of the healthy control group (-2.41 ± 5.26), which meant that the patients' efficiency decreased instead of increasing during the consecutive phases of the test, so that they seemed unable to learn from their mistakes. However, the number of categories completed, that is the number of 10 consecutive correct matchings according to the criterion of each category, was not different in the 2 groups (3.7 ± 1.1 and 4.4 ± 2.2 , respectively).

On the other hand, the score (mean \pm SD) of the WMR-S was 97 ± 11 in the patients, not different from that of the healthy subjects (95 ± 10); the same was true for the FAS score (mean \pm SD) which was 27 ± 3 in the patients and 28 ± 6 in the control subjects (table 2).

Table 1: Socio-demographic characteristics of the subjects.

	PG patients Mean (± SD) N (%)	HS Mean (± SD) N (%)	P value
Age (years)	26.2 (± 4.4)	25.3 (± 5.6)	ns
<u>Gender</u>			
Men	15 (75)	15 (75)	
Women	5 (25)	5 (25)	ns
<u>Marital Status</u>			
Unmarried (single, separated or divorced)	13 (65)	14 (70)	
Married	7 (35)	6 (30)	ns
<u>Work Status</u>			
Unemployed	11 (55)	8 (40)	
Employed	9 (45)	12 (60)	ns
<u>Education</u>			
Low	9 (45)	12 (60)	ns
High (high school and graduate)			

PG, Pathological Gambler; HS, Healthy control subjects

Discussion

The main bias of our study is that it was carried out in a small sample of PG patients: this was a consequence of the setting in which the patients were selected, namely a public psychiatric department, to which patients with such a disorder are generally sent on account of severe legal problems and/or as a result of strong prompting by their relatives. This might also provide an explanation for the high level of comorbid disorders observed; also, because of the small sample size, we were unable to determine the possible effect of different diagnostic patterns on neuropsychological tests. Nevertheless, our findings may be considered intriguing: in fact, our group of patients affected by PG undergoing a battery of neurological tests, namely the WCST, the WMS-R and the FAS, showed that they had sufficient or normal intellectual, linguistic and visual-spatial abilities. As far as the WCST is concerned, PG patients showed qualitative but not quantitative deficits: in fact, although no differences were found between PG patients and healthy control subjects in the total number of categories completed, different abnormalities

were detected at some subscales. As compared with healthy subjects, the thinking of PG patients appeared perseverant, because when they tried to resolve a problem while using an incorrect method, they tended to continue beyond that point at which other subjects would have looked for alternative solutions. A similar behavior has been observed in PG patients at both the card-choosing tests [21] and the GO/NO-GO task [24]. The difficulty that PG patients showed in learning from their mistakes and in re-directing themselves in the appropriate direction represents one of the most characteristic features of patients with alterations of the prefrontal lobe. This aspect has been observed in a significant number of experimental paradigms, in particular, patients with lesions of the prefrontal lobe are sometimes able to identify correct answers, while nevertheless still continuing to produce wrong answers [31-36]. Given the possibility of disproportionate aging of the ventromedial prefrontal areas, which would implicate the decline of decision making with age [37], the sample we selected was homogeneous with regard to that variable.

Table 2: Scores (mean±SD) of the neuropsychological tests of PG patients (PG) and healthy control subjects (HS).

		PG	HS
<u>WCST</u>	perseverant errors	x = 48 ± 3.2 T = 25 ± 4	x = 18 ± 2.1 T = 45 ± 9*
	failure to maintain	1.00 ± 0.55	0.87 ± 0.9**
	learning to learn	-8.66 ± 4	-2.41 ± 5.26*
	number of categories	3.7 ± 1.1	4.4 ± 2.2
<u>WMR-S</u>		97 ± 11	95 ± 10
<u>FAS</u>		27 ± 3	28 ± 6

* significant: p < 0.001.

** significant: p < 0.005.

WCST = Wisconsin Card Sorting test.

WMR-S = the Wechsler Memory Scale revised.

FAS test = Verbal Associative Fluency Test.

Our findings are also compatible with other studies reporting worse performances in cognitive "risk-taking" tasks in patients with prefrontal lesions, as compared with healthy control subjects or patients with temporal lobe excision [38]. A link has also been underlined between attention problems or impulsivity in executive functions and minimal brain damage including impairment of the prefrontal lobe [39]; in some cases, the difficulties in controlling behaviour leads such patients to neglect or break the rules of the game [40,41]. Previous studies, although reporting no alterations at the WMS-R and FAS similar to what described by us, could not detect dysfunctions at the WCST, but only at the gambling task in disagreement with our findings [42]. Since the WCST is sensitive to damage to the dorsolateral portion of the prefrontal cortex, as well

as to damage to non-prefrontal cortical regions connected to the prefrontal cortex (e.g., parietal cortex) [43,44], despite the preliminary hypothesis of a selective ventromedial prefrontal cortex dysfunction in PG patients [42], our data would suggest a more generalized frontal lobe impairment. This is also supported by a recent study showing alteration of both dorsolateral prefrontal and orbitofrontal cortex in PG [45]. However, it is still unclear whether the observed frontal lobe abnormalities should be considered a primary phenomenon linked to the aetiology of PG, or secondary to some symptomatological features, or to the comorbid psychopathological conditions.

Conclusion

Taken together, our results would seem to confirm an altered functioning of the prefrontal areas which would determine a cognitive rigidity that might be expressed through altered executive functions and the decision making process; this could represent a factor of vulnerability to the development of impulsive and/or compulsive behaviours, such as those typical of PG. It would be interesting to replicate these findings in patients suffering from PG alone, or with distinct comorbidity patterns.

Abbreviations

Pathological gambling (PG); Wisconsin Card Sorting Test (WCST); Wechsler Memory Scale revised (WMS-R); Verbal Associative Fluency Test (FAS); Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM); obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD); Yale Brown for Obsessive Compulsive Disorder modified for PG (Y-BOCS-PG).

Competing interests

The author(s) declare that they have no competing interests.

Authors' contributions

DM conceived of the study and participated in its design and coordination. MCDO and GC participated in the design and organization of the study and gave the informations about the new reported case. LV, FM, FG and EDN participated in the review of the literature and drafted the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgements

none.

References

- American Psychiatric Association: *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* 3rd edition. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press; 1980.
- American Psychiatric Association: *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* 4th edition. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press; 1994.
- Volberg RA: **The prevalence and demographics of pathological gamblers: implications for public health.** *Am J Public Health* 1994, **84**:237-241.
- Pietrzak RH, Ladd GT, Petry NM: **Disordered gambling in adolescents: epidemiology, diagnosis, and treatment.** *Paediatr Drugs* 2003, **5**:583-595.
- Lynch WJ, Maciejewski PK, Potenza MN: **Psychiatric correlates of gambling in adolescents and young adults grouped by age at gambling onset.** *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 2004, **61**:1116-1122.
- Lesieur H, Blume SB, Zoppa RM: **Alcoholism, drug abuse and gambling.** *Alcohol Clin Exp Res* 1986, **10**:33-38.
- Browne BA, Brown DJ: **Predictors of lottery gambling among American college students.** *J Soc Psychol* 1994, **134**:339-347.
- Zeitlin H: **Children with alcohol misusing parents.** *Br Med Bull* 1994, **50**:139-151.
- Dannon P, Sason M, Shalgi B, Tusan L, Sapir Y, Kotler M: **Comorbid psychiatric symptoms in pathological gamblers: anxiety, depression and substance abuse.** *Harefuah* 2004, **143**:643-695.
- Volberg RA: *Gambling and problem gambling among adolescents in New York* Report to the New York Council on problem gambling, Inc; 1998.
- Skokauskas N, Satkeviciute R, Burba B: **Psychiatric comorbidity in pathological gambling.** *Medicina* 2003, **39**:838-844.
- Carvalho SV, Collakis ST, Oliveira MP, Silveira DX: **Frequency of pathological gambling among substance abusers under treatment.** *Rev Saude Publica* 2005, **39**:217-222.
- Petry NM, Stinson FS, Grant BF: **Comorbidity of DSM-IV pathological gambling and other psychiatric disorders: results from the national epidemiologic survey on alcohol and related conditions.** *J Clin Psychiatry* 2005, **66**:564-574.
- Comings DE: **The molecular genetics of pathological gambling.** *CNS Spectr* 1998, **3**:20-37.
- Bechara A, Damasio AR, Damasio H, Anderson SW: **Insensitivity to future consequences following damage to human prefrontal cortex.** *Cognition* 1994, **50**:7-15.
- Fellows LK, Farah MJ: **Different underlying impairments in decision-making following ventromedial and dorsolateral frontal lobe damage in humans.** *Cereb Cortex* 2005, **15**:58-63.
- Wiederkehr S, Barat M, Dehail P, de Seze M, Lozes-Boudillon S, Giroire JM: **Decision making and executive function in severe traumatic brain injured patients: validation of a decision-making task and correlated features.** *Rev Neurol* 2005, **161**:201-210.
- Bechara A, Damasio H: **Decision-making and addiction (part I): impaired activation of somatic states in substance dependent individuals when pondering decisions with negative future consequences.** *Neuropsychologia* 2002, **40**:1675-1689.
- Goudriaan AE, Oosterlaan J, De Beurs E, Van den Brink W: **Decision making in pathological gambling: a comparison between pathological gamblers, alcohol dependents, persons with Tourette syndrome, and normal controls.** *Brain Res Cogn Brain Res* 2005, **23**:137-151.
- Goudriaan AE, Oosterlaan J, De Beurs E, Van den Brink W: **Neurocognitive functions in pathological gambling: a comparison with alcohol dependence, Tourette syndrome and normal controls.** *Addiction* 2006, **101**:534-47.
- Goudriaan AE, Oosterlaan J, De Beurs E, Van den Brink W: **The role of self-reported impulsivity and reward sensitivity versus neurocognitive measures of disinhibition and decision-making in the prediction of relapse in pathological gamblers.** *Psychol Med* 2007, **14**:1-11.
- Kertzman S, Lowengrub K, Aizer A, Nahum ZB, Kotler M, Dannon PN: **Stroop performance in pathological gamblers.** *Psychiatry Res* 2006, **142**:1-10.
- Rugle L, Melamed L: **Neuropsychological assessment of attention problems in pathological gamblers.** *J Nerv Ment Dis* 1993, **181**:107-12.
- Fuentes D, Tavares H, Artes R, Gorenstein C: **Self-reported and neuropsychological measures of impulsivity in pathological gambling.** *J Int Neuropsychol Soc* 2006, **12**:907-12.
- Bergh EA: **A simple objective technique for measuring flexibility in thinking.** *J Gen Psychol* 1948, **39**:15-22.
- Wechsler D: *Wechsler Memory Scale-Revised manual* San Antonio TX: Psychological Corporation; 1987.
- Lezak MD: *Neuropsychological assessment* New York: Oxford University Press; 1983.

28. Benton AL, Hamsher K: *Multilingual Aphasia Examination* Iowa City, IA: AJA Associates; 1989.
29. Pallanti S, Decaria CM, Grant JE, Urpe M, Hollander E: **Reliability and Validity of the Pathological Gambling Adaptation of the Yale-Brown Obsessive-Compulsive Scale (PG-YBOCS).** *J Gambl Stud* 2005, **21**:431-443.
30. Nie NH, Hull CH, Steinbrenner K, Bent DH: *Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS)* 4th edition. Mc Graw-Hill, New York; 1998.
31. Lurija AR, Homskaya ED: **Disturbance in the regulative role of speech with frontal lobe lesions.** In *The Frontal Granular Cortex and Behaviour* Edited by: Warren J, Albert K. New York: McGraw-Hill; 1964:353-371.
32. Konow A, Pribram KH: **Error recognition and utilization produced by injury to the frontal cortex in man.** *Neuropsychologia* 1970, **8**:489-491.
33. Crone EA, Van der Molen MW: **Developmental changes in real life decision making: performance on a gambling task previously shown to depend on the ventromedial prefrontal cortex.** *Dev Neuropsychol* 2004, **25**:251-279.
34. Milner B: **Some effects of frontal lobectomy in man.** In *The Frontal Granular Cortex and Behaviour* Edited by: Warren JM, Aker K. New York: McGraw-Hill; 1964:313-314.
35. Toczek S: **Disturbances of inhibitory processes due to lesions in the frontal area of the brain in man.** *Acta Biol Exp* 1960, **20**:103-119.
36. Drewe EA: **Go-no go learning after frontal lobe lesions in humans.** *Cortex* 1975, **11**:816.
37. Denburg NL, Tranel D, Bechara A: **The ability to decide advantageously declines prematurely in some normal older persons.** *Neuropsychologia* 2005, **43**:1099-106.
38. Miller LA: **Impulsivity, risk-taking and ability to synthesize fragmented information after frontal lobectomy.** *Neuropsychologia* 1992, **30**:69-79.
39. Specker SM, Carlson GA, Christenson GA, Marcotte M: **Impulse-control disorders and attention deficit disorder in pathological gamblers.** *Ann Clin Psychiatry* 1995, **7**:175-179.
40. Milner B: **Visually-guided maze learning in man: effects of bilateral hippocampal, bilateral frontal, and unilateral cerebral lesions.** *Neuropsychologia* 1965, **3**:317-338.
41. Canavan AGM: **Stylus-maze performance in patients with frontal-lobe lesions: effects of signal valency and relationship to verbal and spatial abilities.** *Neuropsychologia* 1983, **21**:375-382.
42. Cavedini P, Riboldi G, Keller R, D'Annunzi A, Bellodi L: **Frontal lobe dysfunction in pathological gambling patients.** *Biol Psychiatry* 2002, **51**:334-341.
43. Anderson SW, Damasio H, Jones RD, Tranel D: **Wisconsin Card Sorting Test performance as a measure of frontal lobe damage.** *J Clin Exp Neuropsychol* 1991, **13**:909-922.
44. Berman KF, Ostrem JL, Randolph C, Gold J, Goldberg TE, Coppola R, Carson RE, Herscovitch P, Weinberger DR: **Psychological activation of a cortical network during performance of the Wisconsin Card Sorting Test: a positron emission tomography study.** *Neuropsychologia* 1995, **33**:1027-1046.
45. Brand M, Kalbe E, Labudde K, Fujiwara E, Kessler J, Markowitsch HJ: **Decision-making impairments in patients with pathological gambling.** *Psychiatry Res* 2005, **133**:91-99.

Publish with **BioMed Central** and every scientist can read your work free of charge

"BioMed Central will be the most significant development for disseminating the results of biomedical research in our lifetime."

Sir Paul Nurse, Cancer Research UK

Your research papers will be:

- available free of charge to the entire biomedical community
- peer reviewed and published immediately upon acceptance
- cited in PubMed and archived on PubMed Central
- yours — you keep the copyright

Submit your manuscript here:
http://www.biomedcentral.com/info/publishing_adv.asp

