

The manuscript at hand addresses an important issue, the compliance of the mobile game industry with UK self-regulation loot box measures. This work is timely and will make a great contribution to literature and policy concerning gaming consumer protection. That being said, I have found that the manuscript may be improved in the following areas.

- The scope of the present manuscript concerns loot boxes purchased with real currencies as opposed to in-game obtained currencies. Although this distinction is common in the literature, I believe it warrants elaboration and think the proposed work would benefit from recording data on all possible avenues of purchasing loot boxes (i.e., whether players have the option to purchase the loot box with in-game currencies in addition to real currencies). I believe this is informative due to the fact that the gambling-like characteristics of loot boxes persist irrespective of the currency used to obtain them. The value of any currency, whether real or virtual, is learned. Therefore, beyond the concerns for parents' wallets, psychological effects of loot box purchasing may span across the currencies used to purchase them.

Furthermore, the psychological effects of loot boxes may even be strengthened for purchases with in-game obtained currencies, as opposed to money. Players who have invested many hours into obtaining the said in-game currency may perceive this to be a much larger investment than money, especially when the money comes from their parents' wallet. While I understand that the distinction between real-world and in-game currencies is common, I believe it would be worthwhile collecting information on the currencies that can be used to obtain loot boxes (money, in-game, both) for each of the 100 mobile games.

- Despite resource constraints and stakeholders' heightened interest in the highest-grossing mobile games, the sample size rationale is insufficient. A power analysis/simulation would be helpful in determining which effects the study would be sensitive to, especially in consideration of the fact that precise decision cut-offs are given for all hypotheses (ll. 245-254).
- For Hypothesis 4 the decision-criterion is different to the preceding hypotheses. Please add a brief explanation for this change.
- Overall, the manuscript would benefit from some type-editing. This includes breaking up long and convoluted sentences; using accessible language as opposed to unnecessarily complex words; and using precise and objective wording. Some examples below:
 - ll. 152-155 Convoluted sentence structure
 - ll. 171-174 Complicated wording
 - ll. 196-198 Subjective/moral wording