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Reviewer’s report:

In the introduction section you haven't mentioned the DSM-V criteria for internet addiction.

Between the lines 73 and 76 in the introduction, you have given two contradictory information about the relationship between serum cortisol level and addiction. However you haven't given an adequate explanation for these contradictory data.

Methods were extensively explained and that section is well written.

In line 132; you have stated "Students with a diagnosed medical condition were also excluded". Can you give a broader description for the exclusion criteria. If they were diagnosed and treated with any medical condition (psychiatric or not) were they included in the study. What were the medical condition that was adequate for the exclusion?

In the line 135; you have stated "Study data were collected in a public sports center." Were the subjects part of that sports center or were they selected according to their high school? Was the sports center a hub for the interviews and taking blood samples or were the subjects selected according to their sport center membership? Please clarify the confusion mentioned above.

In the line, 217 you have stated that "Details of the participants' demographic and Internet gambling-related characteristics are described elsewhere." You should specify "elsewhere".

As you have explained between the lines 247 and 250; and throughout your manuscript, racial variations for genetic polymorphisms is one of the main limitations of your study. However you haven't given broad enough explanation and literature information on the subject.

In the line 273, you have stated "difference was not significant". This statement is a misuse, which should be corrected with "There was not a significant difference". However if you apply this change all the meaning in that paragraph will change. Do you want to argue that there is actually difference but your statistical analysis couldn't find a significance, in such case 230 subjects should have been plenty to find a statistical significance if there were any. Do you want to argue that if you had more subjects there would have been statistical significance; which would be highly debatable? If you change your statement to "There was not a significant difference" and make changes accordingly, you should argue why there was not a significant difference, instead of a difference that was not significant.
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.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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I am able to assess the statistics

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

Acceptable

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?
If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal