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Reviewer's report:

I thank the authors for taking the time to incorporate my comments. I have just a few outstanding comments. As a side note, if the authors could provide revisions in the future using tracked changes, or highlighting the text changes, this would help reviewers re-review manuscripts. Also the content of my minor points was removed, so I had to go back to the original review document to understand these changes.

Main point 3: Thank you for the addition of this information, it is very helpful. However the means and min-max machines are just presented for one time point (presumably the latter year?) - could the authors add these statistics for the first year data?

Main point 5 - this table is still difficult to understand. It is not clear that the first two (Non-EGM and EGM annual) include everyone, and that EGM 1-3 and EGM weekly are a subset of the EGM annual category. Providing an indent to the latter two categories, indicating they are a subset, may help. Renaming EGM annual participant to EGM gambler would also help indicate this includes all EGM gamblers, and the footnote can describe this includes all people who play EGMs at least once a year. These two changes would make the table a lot clearer.

Minor comment:

Original p10, line 13 comments: this is the sentence that I was referring to:

(all regular gamblers and one in four non-regular gamblers, and one in two non-regular gamblers).

Is it one in four non-regular gamblers or one in two?

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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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?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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