## Introduction

> Previous studies have suggested two crucial psychological factors underlying delay discounting, that is, time and risk perceptions. For instance,

- Patak and Reynolds (2007) argued that people incorporated uncertainty into their valuations for delayed rewards.
- Zauberman et al. (2009) demonstrated a critical role of time perception in delay discounting.
- Date/delay effect (e.g., Read, Frederick, Orsel \& Rahman, 2005) suggested that time perception was longer when a delay was described in its length (e.g., in 7 days) than when it was described in terms of the due calendar date (e.g., on Aug. $23^{\text {th }}$ ).
- The relevant research, however, provided only correlational evidence for a causal chain from objective delay to delay discounting.
> Manipulated experiments were conducted in the current research to establish the causal links among the relevant variables as a support of the implicit-risk hypothesis of delay discounting.


## Experiment 1

> Delay lengths were manipulated and corresponding level of risk perception and delay discounting were measured. > Forty-one participants took the risk perception task first, whereas other 44 participants took the delay discounting task first.
> Objective delay causally affected risk perception and delay discounting.
> Measuring delay discounting first did not change the subsequent measurement of risk perception.


## Experiment 2

> Risk perception was manipulated by asking participants to remind the experimenter of the payment on its due date (i.e. high-risk group, 38 participants) or not (i.e., low-risk group, 36 participants).
> Risk perception and delay discounting were measured by area under the curve (i.e., AUC) and thus lower values indicated higher levels of corresponding measurements.
> The low-risk group showed lower levels of both risk perception and delay discounting than the high-risk group.

|  | Mean of low-risk <br> group | Mean of high-risk <br> group | BF10 | $95 \%$ credible intervals <br> of effect size |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Risk perception | 0.563 | 0.339 | 21.198 | $[0.254,1.338]$ |
| Delay discounting | 0.658 | 0.370 | 180.889 | $[0.437,1.576]$ |

## Experiment 3

> Time perception was manipulated using the date/delay effect.
$>$ Specifically, 64 participants encountered delays in terms of the due calendar dates (i.e., the shortperception group), and other 68 participants encountered delays in terms of their lengths (i.e., the longperception group).
> The short-perception group showed a lower level of time perception as well as lower levels of both risk perception and delay discounting than the long-perception group.

|  | Mean of short- <br> perception group | Mean of long- <br> perception group | BF10 | $95 \%$ credible intervals <br> of effect size |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time perception | 0.579 | 0.733 | 2394.027 | $[-1.414,-0.612]$ |
| Risk perception | 0.573 | 0.469 | 3.293 | $[0.071,0.838]$ |
| Delay discounting | 0.565 | 0.452 | 3.111 | $[0.069,0.813]$ |

> Bayesian path analyses revealed evidence for both the direct effect from objective delay to risk perception and the indirect effect via time perception.

## Conclusion

$>$ There is a causal chain from objective delay to delay discounting through risk perception in favor of the implicit-risk hypothesis.
> Time perception causally mediated the influence of objective delay on risk perception.
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