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Reviewer’s report:

Zehra et al. compared effectiveness of ultrasound guided paravertebral block (PVB) and tramadol on postoperative pain in patients who underwent PCNL. The manuscript was well-written and the experiment was well designed. I have several minor comments:

1. In the method section, the authors claimed that "If patients had a VAS score ≥ 4, intramuscular diclofenac sodium was administered as a rescue analgesic". In the result, "Thirteen patients (50%) had VAS scores < 4 in group P, while twenty-five patients (92.6%) had VAS score ≥ 4 in group T for the study period". If I understood correctly, the other thirteen patients (50%) in group P should have VAS scores ≥ 4. These patients should have been treated with diclofenac sodium. Yet, the authors stated "no additional analgesic was administered to any of the patients in group P" in the discussion. Did I miss anything? Can the authors explain?

2. Can the author explain more clearly why "perform an evaluation using the pin-prick test would compromise the observer blindness"?

3. Table 1 of the demographic data was uploaded twice.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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