Supplementary Material A: Sample Descriptions based on Viewing Time

Study 1

With 83% reporting to have achieved the Abitur, VT-inferred teleiophilic men were more likely to be highly educated than VT-inferred pedohebephilic men, who had Abitur in 61% of cases ($\chi^2 = 9.76$, $df = 1$, $p = .002$, $\varphi = .25$). In the pedohebephilic group, 11.9%, 0.0%, and 23.9% reported prior convictions for child sexual abuse, rape, and child pornography offenses, respectively. In the teleiophilic group, 4.4% reported prior convictions for child pornography offenses, but none reported convictions for child sexual abuse or rape. Pedo-SO/+SO were older than Tel-SO, and Pedo-SO were younger than Pedo+SO (see Table S1 and S2 in Supplement B). There were no differences in educational level between Pedo-SO and Pedo+SO ($\chi^2 = 2.37$, $df = 1$, $\varphi = -.19$, $p = .123$), but between Pedo-SO/+SO and Tel-SO ($\chi^2 = 9.90$, $df = 1$, $\varphi = .25$, $p = .002$)

Study 2

We found high education levels in the three VT-based groups (42%, 60%, and 59% with an associate degree, BA. degree, or higher in VT-based pedophilic, hebephilic, and teleiophilic group, respectively). Among the three groups, 18%, 14%, and 4% reported convictions for sexual offenses (for pedophilic, hebephilic, and teleiophilic men, respectively). Differences between Pedo-SO, Pedo+SO, and Tel-SO were not significant regarding educational level ($\chi^2 = 4.26$, $df = 2$, $\varphi = .01$, $p = .118$) or age (see Table S3).

Supplementary Material B: Results for classification based on viewing time.

Table S1. Planned comparisons (Helmert contrasts): VT-based pedohebephilic men vs. teleiophilic men (Study 1)

Variable	Pedohebephilia (P –SO, P+SO)		Teleiophilia, no sexual offending (T-SO)		(P-SO, P+SO) vs. T-SO		
	M (*SD*)	*N*	*M* (*SD*)	*n*	*t (df)*	*p*	*d* [a]
VT T1	2543 (857)	67	1550 (538)	86	-8.29*** (66.93)[b]	<.001	-1.44
VT T5	1660 (560)	67	2382 (767)	86	6.11*** (150)	<.001	1.06
Age	38.81 (14.58)	67	32.02 (11.61)	86	-3.79*** (64.26) [b]	<.001	-0.53
Height	179.33 (7.26)	67	180.59 (6.58)	86	1.01 (150)	.315	0.18
EHI Laterality Index	0.88 (0.36)	67	0.84 (0.49)	86	-0.67 (150)	.505	-0.09
Head Injuries before age 13	0.16 (0.48)	67	0.36 (0.82)	86	1.49 (150)	.135 [c]	0.28
Head Injuries after age 13	0.26 (0.77)	67	0.32 (0.85)	85	0.08 (149)	.936 [c]	0.07
Social Desirability	1.99 (0.59)	66	1.90 (0.52)	86	-1.20 (149)	.230	-0.17

*** $p < .001$ (two-sided)

[a] $d = M_1 - M_2 / SD_{pooled}$, calculated using the *cohen.d* function of the R package *psych*

[b] we used Welch's correction due to unequal variances (as indicated by Levene test for equality, center = median)

[c] *p*-value based on 1,000 bootstrapped samples due to severe deviations from the assumption that residuals are normally distributed

Table S2. Planned comparisons (Helmert contrasts): VT-based pedohebephilic men with vs. without convictions for sexual offending (Study 1)

Variable	Pedohebephilia, no sexual offending (P –SO)		Pedohebephilia, sexual offending (p+SO)		P-SO vs. P+SO		
	M (*SD*)	*N*	*M* (*SD*)	*n*	*t (df)*	*p*	*d* [a]
VT T1	2488 (883)	46	2665 (805)	21	0.81 (42.33) [b]	.423	0.21
VT T5	1647 (565)	46	1687 (562)	21	0.22 (150)	.827	0.07
Age	35.57 (13.18)	46	45.90 (15.3)	21	2.68* (34.10) [b]	.011	0.76
Height	179.20 (7.47)	46	179.62 (6.94)	21	0.23 (150)	.816	0.06
EHI Laterality Index	0.87 (0.38)	46	0.92 (0.33)	21	0.41 (150)	.685	0.13
Head Injuries before age 13	0.13 (0.45)	46	0.24 (0.54)	21	0.59 (150)	.435 [c]	0.23
Head Injuries after age 13	0.18 (0.57)	46	0.43 (1.08)	21	1.14 (149)	.323 [c]	0.32
Social Desirability	1.96 (0.56)	46	2.06 (0.67)	20	0.68 (149)	.496	0.17

* $p < .05$ (two-sided)

[a] $d = M_1 - M_2 / SD_{pooled}$, calculated using the *cohen.d* function of the R package *psych*

[b] we used Welch's correction due to unequal variances (as indicated by Levene test for equality of variances, center = median)

[c] *p*-value based on 1,000 bootstrapped samples due to severe deviations from the assumption that residuals are normally distributed

Table S3. Planned comparisons (Helmert contrasts): VT-based pedohebephilic men vs. teleiophilic men (Study 2)

Variable	Pedohebephilia (P –SO, P+SO)		Teleiophilia, no sexual offending (T-SO)		(P-SO, P+SO) vs. T-SO		
	M (*SD*)	*N*	*M* (*SD*)	*n*	*t (df)*	*p*	*d* [a]
VT T1	2160 (865)	179	1419 (640)	326	-9.70*** (69.81) [b]	<.001	-1.07
VT T2, 3	2544 (794)	179	1658 (670)	326	-8.86*** (43.55) [b]	<.001	0.75
VT T4, 5	2096 (695)	179	2705 (999)	326	6.91*** (85.69) [b]	<.001	0.26
Age	34.38 (12.39)	179	35.15 (11.89)	326	-1.90 (502)	.058	-0.07
Height	178.04 (7.47)	171	178.27 (7.32)	317	0.69 (485)	.491	-0.06
EHI Laterality Index	0.75 (0.54)	179	0.67 (0.59)	326	-1.83 (502)	.068	0.02
ICAR	8.79 (4.04)	179	7.52 (3.69)	326	-1.75 (46.36) [b]	.086	0.16
Head Injuries before age 13	0.30 (0.63)	179	0.26 (0.70)	326	-0.98 (501)	.387 [c]	0.27
Head Injuries after age 13	0.20 (0.61)	178	0.30 (0.80)	326	0.12 (501)	.929 [c]	0.47

*** $p < .001$ (two-sided)

[a] $d = M_1 - M_2 / SD_{pooled}$, calculated using the *cohen.d* function of the R package *psych*

[b] we used Welch's correction due to unequal variances (as indicated by Levene test for equality of variances, center = median

[c] *p*-value based on 1,000 bootstrapped samples due to severe deviations from the assumption that residuals are normally distributed

Table S4. Planned comparisons (Helmert contrasts): VT-based pedohebephilic men with vs. without convictions for sexual offending (Study 2)

Variable	Pedohebephilia, no sexual offending (P –SO)		Pedohebephilia, sexual offending (P +SO)		P-SO vs. P+SO		
	M (*SD*)	*N*	*M* (*SD*)	*n*	*t (df)*	*p*	*d* [a]
VT T1	2153 (903)	154	2199 (593)	25	0.33 (44.43) [b]	.744	0.05
VT T2, 3	2557 (791)	154	2459 (825)	25	-0.56 (31.58) [b]	.582	-0.12
VT T4, 5	2100 (705)	154	2074 (644)	25	-0.19 (34.05) [b]	.854	-0.04
Age	33.02 (12.07)	154	42.76 (11.15)	25	3.79*** (502)	<.001	0.82
Height	178.18 (7.49)	149	177.06 (7.42)	22	-0.67 (485)	.506	-0.15
EHI Laterality Index	0.73 (0.56)	154	0.86 (0.41)	25	1.12 (502)	.263	0.26
ICAR	8.95 (4.02)	154	7.80 (4.14)	25	-1.29 (31.78) [b]	.206	-0.29
Head Injuries before age 13	0.27 (0.55)	154	0.44 (1.00)	25	-0.97 (501)	.415 [c]	0.27
Head Injuries after age 13	0.17 (0.52)	154	0.42 (1.02)	24	1.53 (501)	.226 [c]	0.41

*** $p < .001$ (two-sided)

[a] $d = M_1 - M_2 / SD_{pooled}$, calculated using the *cohen.d* function of the R package *psych*

[b] we used Welch's correction due to unequal variances (as indicated by Levene test for equality of variances, center = median)

[c] *p*-value based on 1,000 bootstrapped samples due to severe deviations from the assumption that residuals are normally distributed

Supplementary Material C: Control analyses based on viewing time.

Study 1. We found no links between age and height for VT-based Pedo+SO (r = -.40, p = .076, 95%*CI* = [-.71, .04]) and Tel-SO (r = -.07, p = .549, 95% *CI* = [-.27, .15]), but height was significantly negatively associated with age for Pedo-SO (r = -.36, p = .014, 95% *CI* = [-.59, -.08]). For head injuries before age 13, we did not find significant links to age for any of the three VT-based groups (Pedo-SO: r = .17, 95%*CI* = [-.01, .41], Pedo+SO: r = .31, 95%*CI* = [-.21, .65], Tel-SO: r = .44, 95%*CI* = [-.11, .24]). We also could not detect links between head injuries after age 13 and age (Pedo-SO: r = -.001, 95%*CI* = [-.25, .32], Pedo+SO: r = .26, 95%*CI* = [-.11, .56], Tel-SO: r = -.06, 95%*CI* = [-.23, .17]). The associated confidence intervals for the head injury measures are based on 1,000 bootstrap samples. Hence, only 1/9 correlations reached significance.

Study 2. We detected no links between height (all p < .150), IQ (all p < .475) or head injuries before age 13 (no 95%*CI* based on 1,000 bootstrap samples containing 0) and age for any of the three VT-based groups. For Pedo+SO, we detected a link between age and head injuries after age 13 (r = -.25, 95%*CI* based on 1,000 bootstrap samples = [-.46, -.01], note that the associated confidence intervals are). Hence, only 1/12 correlations reached significance.