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Reviewer's report:

General

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1) In the new version of the manuscript authors have created a new Table that compares previous series of NAF with the current series. Please add the paper by Sauter et al (Ref. # 11) which reported a substantially higher collection rate (94-99%) than other reports.
2) In the abstract and conclusions, the authors claim that the collection rate with HALO was similar to the reported manual series. In fact their success rate was 38% as compared to some series that reported rates as high as 65-99%. This should be corrected.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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