**Title**: Breaking Ban: Assessing the effectiveness of Belgium’s gambling law regulation of loot boxes

**Recommendation**: Revise and resubmit

My feedback on the stage 2 manuscript is as follows.

1. I don’t think the point about the study possibly causing a game to be removed is worth saying, but it could be included in a footnote.
2. Did anything come from the request to the Belgian Gaming Commission mentioned in the stage 1 manuscript? A response or a lack thereof should be in the results.
3. The author is using the terms “non-preregistered” and “exploratory” in a way that seems interchangeable. If that is the case, the same term should be used throughout to be consistent. All of the non-registered/exploratory tests should also be in one heading at the end.
	1. Regarding the simulated casino game coding, which I think was also not registered, the coding sheet or reproducible way in which those were coded should be provided.
4. I’m not sure how useful the reviews in Figure 4 are because I don’t know how they were selected.
5. The author should provide a codebook or readme for the datafile because the variable labels are not immediately obvious.
6. The discussion is much too long, taking up about 20 pages of the 50 page manuscript. I got the sense that the results were being treated as more of a launching off point for several tangential points, policy comparisons, and so on. I think the discussion should be cut down by about half. For example, the points about the good and the bad of banning (e.g., forbidden fruit) could all be dealt with in about a sentence each.
7. Should Belgian court on page 32 be Belgian courts?
8. Is this too strong (page 36)? “From a public health perspective, a complete ban of the product or ‘eliminate choice’ is the most restrictive regulatory intervention for addressing potential harms.”
9. Is it a bit repetitive to say ultra vires, beyond its powers and without legal authority in the same sentence? (page 40)

I always sign my reviews,

Jason Chin (ORCID: 0000-0002-6573-2670)