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Reviewer's report:

Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format.

Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.

This is a good, relevant and honest paper on a original topic

However some aspects have to be described in a more detailed manner

1) The answer rate: the authors seem to be satisfied with a 21% participation rate which in fact is a very low rate. It may not change so much their results since it a follow up but this has to be discussed as a serious limit and they should at least compare their rates with other surveys among them Canadian survey to check bias

Plus we do not now how did they mix the general sample with the at risk sample

2) In addition we do not have a clear vision of the participation rate at each year nor any comparisons on the gaming and religiosity of those who abandon

3) Since this is a Canadian survey it may be relevant to have a brief description of languages spoken which may be linked to religion as the immigration statute and country of origin

I am not competent enough to assess the statistics which appear to me adequate

Beside these remarks which should be addressed I found the paper publishable

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes
**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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