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Author’s response to reviews:

REVIEWER 1

1. Please delete "44 patients" from the result part. Those 2 patients are already in exclusion criteria, you can not say that you have included and then excluded them. Just write 42 patients were enrolled and there is no dropout. Otherwise, it will not be clear and not be same as the methods part (21 patients in each group).

Answer: The sentence is revised as “Totally 42 patients were enrolled into the study and there was no dropout (Fig 1).”

2. Please also correct Figure 1 accordingly. Include 42 patients and no exclusion.

Answer: Fig 1 is revised according to your comment.
3. On the other hand; when you use author name in a sentence, please place the ref number after the name. If there is no name, put the ref no at the end of the sentence. Review the whole manuscript considering this suggestion.

Answer: The manuscript is revised according to your comment.

REVIEWER 2

1. Page 20, Line 51: Please revise the sentence as "in the last two years, ..."

Answer: The sentence is revised as “ESP block has been used for postoperative analgesia of several painful conditions since 2016.”

2. It is hard to say that table 3 and 4 give important data about the study. i am not sure whether they should be published within the article. Yet, the final decision is yours.

Answer: Dear reviewer, I revised the tables according to the request of one of the reviewers. Therefore, I have to keep them.

3. I am satisfied with the revision process. Yet, i still believe that the manuscript needs revision in terms of language. there are still many grammatically incorrect sentences throughout the manuscript.

Answer: Dear reviewer, the language of the manuscript has been edited by Scribendi.com on your first request. The edited version is revised again by another professional native speaker.
1. I do not believe that the authors have correctly analyzed their data: they use "a repeated measure test" (we are left to guess which one) and also apply the t-test to all time points. Also, the results of the repeated measure test are not reported in a standard way. Again, the authors are encouraged to use RMANOVA. A better approach would a mixed effect model. That said, I do not disagree with their interpretation: the authors conclusions will likely be the same... so maybe it is OK.

Answer: I replaced the repeated measures analysis with (NRS, HR, MAP) as you requested.

2) Tales 1-4. Instead of writing "Group I and Group II" the authors should write "0.375% bupivacaine and 0.25% bupivacaine" This makes the Tables easier to read and interpret for the reader.

Answer: Dear reviewer, the names of the groups were “Group Low Dose and Group High Dose” in my original manuscript and tables. Although I am completely agreed with your suggestion, one of the reviewers requested a revision on the names of the groups (as Group 1 and Groups II) during the first assessment process. Therefore, I revised all my tables in this way.