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Reviewer's report:

General comments:
A well designed trial. Nice with a control group when there are two active comparators. There are 6 measurements under the primary outcome, I would have liked the authors to have chosen 1 time point as the primary outcome. The spinal anesthesia is still active during the first 3 assessment points.

Major compulsory revisions
The method have to be described in detail:
1) How did the table of random numbers lead to group allocation?
2) Who prepared the study medication and who administered the study medication?
3) Was the person, who administered the study medication blinded?

Statistical section:
1) Which post hoc analysis are you referring to.
2) All secondary outcomes should be Bonferroni corrected

Results:
1) Please list the results for the primary outcome first

Discussion:
This section should be thoroughly revised
1) The authors exaggerates the results of the study. There are only a significant difference in the primary outcome parameter at 1 and 2 hours postoperatively, they can not conclude that there are an effect for the first 6 hours postoperatively.
2) Nearly all VAS scores are below 3 in all 3 groups. Please discuss the clinical relevance of your findings.

Discretionary revisions
Discussion:
The sections about pain management in children and regional anesthesia should not be part of the discussion
Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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