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**Introduction / Issues OR Introduction and Aims:** Problem gambling behaviour has historically been viewed through a clinical lens, however is also considered from a broader public health perspective. Similarly, the measurement of problem gambling has taken its cues from clinically-significant markers of behavioural addiction and their consequences, which may preclude sub-clinical but concerning manifestations of gambling behaviour and related consequences.

**Method / Approach OR Design and Methods:** The current study reviews the problem gambling severity index (PGSI) and subjects the measure to confirmatory factor analysis, comparing a one- and two-factor solution in terms of model fit. Data from the 2015 Northern Territory Gambling Prevalence and Wellbeing Survey was used in the analysis.

**Key Findings OR Results:** Findings from confirmatory factor analyses confirmed both a one- and two-factor solution, however a two-factor solution offered significant improvement in model fit.

**Discussions and Conclusions:** Though the two factors were highly correlated, it may be beneficial to consider problematic gambling as comprising behavioural and consequential elements that have application in different populations or contexts.

**Implications for Practice or Policy:** Isolating behavioural and consequential elements of problem gambling may have utility in public health interventions where behaviour is concerning, yet falls below the threshold for a clinically-significant disorder. Similarly, the predictive validity of the PGSI may not capture more subclinical elements of problem gambling behaviour.