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

Christiana MacDougall[1]

1 Mount Allison University

Thank you for the opportunity to review this work.

I found the paper very interesting and important as it addresses university student behaviour as a specific subset of the young adult population. I have some comments here for your consideration – some are curiosities and some are areas where I was a bit confused.

1. I would like to hear more about why there is a negative connotation associated with gambling or betting – is it associated with, risk, immaturity?

2. Intro: para 5: A suggestion on language: It is doubtful that anyone spends "all their waking time" doing any one thing. I get the point is to drive home how much gambling takes over someone's life, but this colloquial phrasing feels out of place in the article. I would simply say "the majority of their day" or "a high number of hours" or something along those lines.

5. Procedures: How did the 125 students opt out of participating in the setting described?

6. I am confused about the difference between: "students whose income of parents was not able to sponsor them at university" (associated with participation in gambling) versus "students whose tuition was paid by parents, a relative, and the government" (also associated with gambling). These feel contradictory to me. Can you elaborate on how these are different especially with respect to parental income/wealth?

7. I also found the argument/discussion around psychosocial functioning to be confusing. Perhaps a few more sentences to explain more fully. I think you are saying "we asked if poor psychosocial functioning is associated with gambling, whereas others looked to see if gambling was associated with poor psychosocial functioning" but then the statement "emphasizing that these are not psychosocial risk variables" is confusing.

8. Regarding antisocial behaviour, I am unclear about this: "However, those who indicated that they did not have the antisocial behaviour under study were much higher than those who had the risky behaviours that predicted participation in gambling (n=530 (81.6%) vs n=119 (18.4%) and (n=603 (81.4%) vs n=137 (18.6%). **This can be interpreted along with Stuhldreher, Stuhldreher and Forrest's (2007) observation that for any illegal or undesirable behaviour, people tend to underreport.**" (emphasis added.)  This may be my own lack of quant analysis showing, but the argument is not

clear to me. There is a relation between the behaviours and gambling. Can you perhaps explain more clearly why the assumed underreporting is relevant?

I very much enjoyed reading this and I hope you find these comments useful to your work. I consider myself "mildly quantitative" so some of my questions may be obvious to a truly quant scholar. I leave this to your discretion but offer my comments as an opportunity for potential increased clarity so scholars such as myself and benefit from your work.