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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)

- Supply more information on how You calculated Your power: Which predicted difference ? Which variable ? etc.... What about power if Your result is negative (as it is). Is Your power still valid then ???

- Why did You use lidocaine 1% without opioids: This is not good practice anymore. We now use less concentrated solution with additives. I understand this might have to do with the fact You live in a developing country. However as a result this reduces the relevance of Your work for the international reader. But is it really that difficult to add some fentanyl (it is a cheap drug) and reduce the dose of lidocaine (which might make it possible to perhaps safe money) ?

- Your discussion is unstructured and chaotic and needs considerable revision. I would advice You to let the paper be read by a native English speaking person.

- Your result is quite remarkable: despite significant motor weakness no effect on labour outcome was noted. I believe You should explain more in depth why You find a result which contradicts most other studies that used high concentrated solutions of local anaesthetic.

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

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

There are a lot of English grammatical and stylistic errors.

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Reject because scientifically unsound

Level of interest: An article of insufficient interest to warrant publication in a scientific/medical journal

Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

Statistical review: Yes

Declaration of competing interests:
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