

Review of: "Gambling Prevalence and Factors Associated with Gambling Participation among University Students in Uganda"

Munenori Katayama

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Overall Comments

Considering that most studies narrowly focus on the psychological and biological factors of people's gambling behavior, I believe the study provides important insight in emphasizing the need to focus on social factors promoting problematic gambling. The study can be seen as evidence that preexisting financial/social disadvantages and other structural inequities need to be addressed if the scientific community truly aims to address gambling-related harms of people who gamble for financial motives. I, therefore, value the work the author has conducted in this research, and the results which were discovered, although I feel some points and further discussions need to be addressed for the readers. Detailed comments on the research follow.

Point-to-Point Comments

Introduction

1) Some background information on the general socioeconomic status of college students in Uganda may be helpful for readers outside Uganda to understand the study population.

2) Why did the author decide to study the relationship between gambling for financial motives and antisocial behavior? What was the intention?

Methods

1) How was the sample size calculated? Moreover, why did the author choose random sampling when all participants were accessible? Why not distribute the survey to all students if the author aimed to discover real-world data?

2) The description of USEPP should be moved to the section where it is first mentioned.

3) If the original USEPP defined antisocial behavior with 5 items, you cannot say that you measured antisocial behavior by extracting only 4 items from the scale, as it is statistically validated with the 5-item structure. Moreover, I find it quite surprising that the developer of the USEPP stated the act of gambling for financial gain is an "antisocial behavior". I believe some types of problematic gambling may be considered antisocial, but is that valid for people who gamble for financial motives? I feel the author needs to discuss beforehand what the author refers to as being "antisocial" in their study, and that the applied scale accurately measures the concept the authors intend.

Results

1) In the methods section the author states that each item of USEPP is rated on a scale from 0 (not at all) to 3 (strongly agree) and only the gambling participation question was modified into a yes-no style. But Table 1 in the results section calculates the 4 questions of USEPP in a yes-no style as well. Which is true?

2) A line explaining the first question of the USEPP may be missing after the line "Antisocial behavior" of Table 2

Discussion

1) This is only a suggestion, but I feel an additional discussion on the need to address social inequalities as measures to prevent problematic gambling could be beneficial to emphasize the value of this research.

Overall, I found it very interesting to read this paper. Thank you for the opportunity to review, and I hope this research receives the attention it deserves.