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Reviewer’s report:

It's a very interesting study on the effects of of quadratus lumborum continuous block on pain and functional recovery of patients undergoing liver resection. To my knowledge this is the first randomized study on the use of this block in hepatic resection.

It is a well designed and well executed study, although I would like to make some observations.

From the methodological point of view this study has an inevitable limit: as described by the authors for problems related to anaesthesiology technique, it is not possible to carry out a double-blind study. This undermines the value of the study, but, as mentioned, this obstacle can not be overcome. However it would be good if the authors specified better how randomization was performed. The statistical analysis was well done, as well as the calculation of the sample size, the choice of statistical tests was adequate: the simplest tests are always the most reliable.

The results are well illustrated, the good randomization is confirmed by the analysis of the preoperative characteristics, that show no difference between the two groups. Table 5 is, in my opinion, unclear. It is the most important table of the study, it would be good to make it clearer.

The discussion is well done, the arguments are well exposed and even the justification of the difference in pain only during the cough and not at rest, appears absolutely convincing.

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.
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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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