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Reviewer's report:

The modified version of the manuscript entitled "Assisting an Australian Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander person with gambling problems: A Delphi study" has certainly benefited from the revision process. In general, the authors have done a good job in addressing some of the concerns raised by my initial review. However, their feedback is partially not unambiguous (e.g. the lines mentioned in their response letter do not always fit to the corresponding lines within the manuscript). In addition, three aspects should be considered before publication:

1. I have spotted another limitation that should briefly be mentioned in the discussion section: No participant had a Torres Strait Islander background (p.7) although that cultural subgroup was in the focus of this research project.

2. Referring to Comment 8: Simply removing the word "Although" does not change the contents, saying that at least a number of 23 experts seem to be ideal as a Delphi panel. In my opinion, this statement cannot be derived from the cited reference. To sort out any misunderstanding, please directly quote from Akins et al., 2005).

3. Comment 7: I still disagree with the authors' assumption that a guideline with 225 items is practical to use. Therefore I suggest to further point out the need to validate the guidelines with appropriate methods (this should be elaborated with one or two sentences on p. 17, line 418ff).
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.
Not relevant to this manuscript

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