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Reviewer's report:

Discretionary revisions
This is a well conducted study. The stats look ok. Minor quibbles are:

Masking - in the methods it states that both patients and staff were blinded to the type of anaesthesia used but the last paragraph of the discussion on lack of masking as a weakness appears to conflict with this - suggest clarification.

Randomisation - a brief description of the randomisation method (block randomisation using ???) should be added to the methods

Discussion - a common criticism of the use of visual analogue scales in pain quantification relates to how much of a difference is clinically (as opposed to statistically significant). My own feeling is that any reduction in pain is a good thing. A brief rehearsal of these arguments could be included in the discussion and would probably be more relevant than the comment under masking about multiple surgeons (this is actually a strength of the study rather than a weakness is patients were randomised between surgeons).

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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