

Supplement Table 1: Summary of hierarchical regression analyses for the active consensual somnophilia subscale

Variable	Male participants					Female participants				
	β	t	p	R^2	ΔR^2	β	t	p	R^2	ΔR^2
<i>Step 1</i>				.03	.03				.01	.01
Necrophilic Fantasies	.17	2.42	.016			.11	1.60	.11		
<i>Step 2</i>				.13	.10				.31	.29
Necrophilic Fantasies	.02	.31	.76			.06	.98	.33		
Biastopphilic Fantasies	.28	3.14	.002			.55	9.34	<.001		
Rape Proclivity	.11	1.26	.21			-	-	-		
<i>Step 3</i>				.16	.03				.38	.07
Necrophilic Fantasies	.05	.69	.49			-.02	-.28	.78		
Biastopphilic Fantasies	.22	2.02	.04			.31	4.24	<.001		
Rape Proclivity	.05	.59	.56			-	-	-		
Sadistic Fantasies	.02	.15	.88			.22	2.60	.01		
Need for Dominance	.17	1.98	.049			.19	2.60	.01		
<i>Step 4</i>				.63	.48				.61	.23
Necrophilic Fantasies	.03	.67	.51			-.03	-.58	.56		
Biastopphilic Fantasies	.04	.59	.56			.09	1.40	.16		
Rape Proclivity	.03	.58	.56			-	-	-		
Sadistic Fantasies	.05	.68	.50			.09	1.33	.19		
Need for Dominance	.04	.77	.45			.05	.80	.42		
Active Somnophilic fantasy	.73	15.59	<.001			.64	10.82	<.001		

For the active consensual subscale in males, necrophilic fantasies contributed significantly to the model, $F(1, 193) = 5.86, p = .02$, and accounted for 2.9% of the variance. Introducing biastophilic fantasies and rape proclivity explained an additional 10.2% of the variance, and this change in R^2 was significant; $F(2, 191) = 11.17, p < .001$. Adding sadistic fantasies and the need for dominance explained a further 2.5%, but the change in R^2 was not significant, $F(2, 189) = 2.80, p = .06$. Finally, introducing active somnophilic fantasies explained an additional 47.6% of the variance, and this change in R^2 was significant; $F(1, 188) = 242.97, p < .001$. Together, the six variables explained 63.2% of the variance. However, at the final stage, none of the variables were significant except for the somnophilic fantasy item. For females, necrophilic fantasies did not significantly contribute to the model, $F(1, 207) = 2.55, p = .11$, explaining only 1.2% of the variance. Adding biastophilic fantasies contributed to a significant R^2 change, $F(1, 206) = 87.20, p < .001$, explaining an additional 29.4% of the variance. Adding sadistic fantasies and the need for dominance explained a further 7.2%, showing a significant change in R^2 , $F(2, 204) = 11.88, p < .001$. Finally, adding active somnophilic fantasies explained an additional 22.7% of the variance, and resulted in a significant R^2 change; $F(1, 203) = 117.01, p < .001$. Together, the five variables explained 60.5% of the variance. Again, however, only the active somnophilic fantasy item remained significant at the final stage.

Supplement Table 2: Summary of hierarchical regression analyses for the passive consensual somnophilia subscale

Variable	Male participants					Female participants				
	β	t	p	R^2	ΔR^2	β	t	p	R^2	ΔR^2
<i>Step 1</i>				.001	.001				.03	.03
Necrophilic Fantasies	.04	.51	.61			.16	2.32	.02		
<i>Step 2</i>				.17	.16				.42	.40
Necrophilic Fantasies	-.04	-.64	.52			.04	.72	.48		
‘Being Raped’ fantasy	.41	6.13	<.001			.64	11.89	<.001		
<i>Step 3</i>				.25	.09				.52	.10
Necrophilic Fantasies	-.02	-.26	.79			.001	.02	.99		
‘Being Raped’ fantasy	.17	1.92	.06			.36	5.45	<.001		
Masochistic fantasies	.16	1.76	.08			.28	3.29	.001		
Need for Submission	.26	3.34	.001			.19	2.71	.007		
<i>Step 4</i>				.51	.26				.76	.23
Necrophilic Fantasies	.005	.11	.92			-.04	-.99	.33		
‘Being Raped’ fantasy	.08	1.90	.28			.06	1.21	.23		
Masochistic fantasies	.04	.51	.61			.18	2.98	.003		
Need for Submission	.12	1.85	.07			.05	1.05	.29		
Passive Somnophilic fantasies	.59	9.98	<.001			.68	13.98	<.001		

For the passive subscale in males, necrophilic fantasies did not contribute significantly to the model, $F(1, 193) = 0.26, p = .61$, accounting for only 0.01% of the variance. Adding fantasies of 'Being raped' explained an additional 16.3% of the variance, and this change in R^2 was significant; $F(1, 192) = 37.53, p < .001$. Adding masochistic fantasies and the need for submission explained a further 8.8%, but with the change in R^2 being significant, $F(2, 190) = 11.17, p < .001$. Finally, introducing passive somnophilic fantasies explained an additional 2.6% of the variance, and this change in R^2 was significant; $F(1, 189) = 99.52, p < .001$. Together, the six variables explained 27.71% of the variance. However, at the final stage, none of the variables were significant except for the passive somnophilic fantasy item. For females, necrophilic fantasies significantly contributed to the model, $F(1, 208) = 5.37, p = .02$, explaining 2.5% of the variance. Adding fantasies of 'Being raped' contributed to a significant R^2 change, $F(1, 207) = 141.41, p < .001$, explaining an additional 39.6% of the variance. Adding masochistic fantasies and the need for submission resulted in a significant R^2 change, $F(2, 205) = 21.55, p < .001$, which explained 10.1% of the variance. Finally, adding passive somnophilic fantasies explained an additional 23.4% of the variance, and this change in R^2 was also significant; $F(1, 204) = 195.40, p < .001$. Together, the five variables explained 75.6% of the variance. While passive somnophilic fantasies remained significant at the final stage, masochistic fantasies also remained significant independent variable (see Supplement Table 2).

Supplement Table 3: Summary of hierarchical regression analyses for the active non-consensual somnophilia subscale

Variable	Male participants					Female participants				
	β	t	p	R^2	ΔR^2	β	t	p	R^2	ΔR^2
<i>Step 1</i>				.05	.05				.001	.001
Necrophilic Fantasies	.22	3.16	.002			-.02	-.33	.75		
<i>Step 2</i>				.32	.27				.24	.24
Necrophilic Fantasies	.03	.41	.68			-.07	-1.16	.25		
Biaophilic Fantasies	.07	.91	.36			.49	8.81	<.001		
Rape Proclivity	.51	6.80	<.001			-	-	-		
<i>Step 3</i>				.34	.02				.26	.02
Necrophilic Fantasies	.02	.36	.72			-.04	-.67	.50		
Biaophilic Fantasies	.20	2.05	.04			.52	6.40	<.001		
Rape Proclivity	.51	6.58	<.001			-	-	-		
Sadistic Fantasies	-.30	-2.36	.02			-.16	-1.73	.09		
Need for Dominance	.10	1.32	.19			.14	1.79	.08		
<i>Step 4</i>				.50	.16				.43	.18
Necrophilic Fantasies	.01	.23	.82			-.05	-.94	.35		
Biaophilic Fantasies	.10	1.12	.26			.32	4.25	<.001		
Rape Proclivity	.50	7.35	<.001			-	-	-		
Sadistic Fantasies	-.21	-2.47	.01			-.27	-3.32	.001		
Need for Dominance	.03	.41	.69			.02	.25	.80		
Active Somnophilic fantasy	.42	7.54	<.001			.56	7.96	<.001		

For the active non-consensual subscale in males, necrophilic fantasies contributed significantly to model, $F(1, 193) = 9.98, p = .002$, and accounted for 4.9% of the variance. Introducing biastophilic fantasies and rape proclivity explained an additional 27.1% of the variance, and showed a significant R^2 change; $F(2, 191) = 38.16, p < .001$. Adding sadistic fantasies and the need for dominance explained a further 2.0%, but the change in R^2 did not reach significance, $F(2, 189) = 2.80, p = .06$. Finally, introducing active somnophilic fantasies explained an additional 15.6% of the variance, and this change in R^2 was significant; $F(1, 188) = 58.36, p < .001$. Together, the six variables explained 49.6% of the variance. At the final stage, rape proclivity, sadistic fantasies (negative association), and the active somnophilic fantasy item remained significant independent variables. For females, necrophilic fantasies did not significantly contribute to the model, $F(1, 207) = 0.11, p = .75$, explaining only 0.01% of the variance. Adding biastophilic fantasies contributed to a significant R^2 change, $F(1, 206) = 65.38, p < .001$, explaining an additional 24.1% of the variance. Adding sadistic fantasies and the need for dominance resulted in no significant R^2 change, $F(2, 204) = 2.16, p < .12$, which explained only 1.6% of the variance. Finally, adding active somnophilic fantasies explained an additional 17.7% of the variance, and this change in R^2 was significant; $F(1, 203) = 63.41, p < .001$. Together, the five variables explained 43.41% of the variance. At the final stage, biastophilic fantasies, sadistic fantasies (negative association), and active somnophilic fantasies remained significant independent variables (see Supplement Table 3).