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**Reviewer’s report:**

I enjoyed reading the revised paper and I am happy that the authors have satisfactorily addressed my comments. I think that it is ready to be published subject to some careful proof reading to ensure the English is perfect.

For example:

the use of the word 'warrant' 4th line up on page 4 may not be correct (? replace with require, or need);
'discriminate' in the middle of page 9 should perhaps read 'discriminate between' or 'differentiate between';
'What indications the robot should be used' on page 16 could be replaced by 'the indications for which the robot should be used';
'which do not require to compare investments' top of page 17 could be 'did not require comparison of investments...'

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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