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Author’s response to reviews:

RESPONSE TO EDITOR

1. Overlap in Methods

We note that the current submission contains some textual overlap with other previously published works, in particular:


While we understand that this is work that you have previously published, and some of the same ideas are contained in these publications, please be aware that we cannot condone the use of text from previously published work.

Please re-phrase these sections to minimise overlap.
Additionally, if this study uses methodology from a previously published work, please provide a summarizing statement in the methodology together with a citation to the original paper.

Answer: Dear Editor, although the methodology of the current study is similar to the previous work, they are not completely the same. There are several differences in the methodology of these two studies (such as; the previous study was a single-blinded study, however, the current one was conducted as a double-blinded study. ESP block was performed while the patients were under general anesthesia in the previous study. In the current study, the patients were in sitting position, etc.). However, I added a sentence as “The patients were placed in a sitting position for the ESP block interventions. ESP block interventions were performed similar to a previous study (8).” to the methods section. In addition, I rewrite some sentences in the Methods section.

2. Please remove these statements from the Title page – Conflict of interest, Funding, Running head.

Answer: The statements are removed.

3. Alongside the rest of the trial registration information as part of the abstract, please state whether the trial retrospectively or prospectively registered.

Answer: The sentence is revised as “Clinical trial registration: The study was registered prospectively with the Australian New Zealand Clinical Trials Registry (trial ID: ACTRN12618001334291at 08/08/2018).”

4. Ethics approval – XXV: We note that you have stated in the Ethics approval and consent to participate statement of the Declarations that, ‘This study has been approved by Muğla Sıtıkı Koçman University Clinical Research Ethics Committee with decision number: XXV.’ Please provide the full ethical approval number.

Answer: Dear Editor,

Following revisions, the ethical approval number of the study is now “02-07”. This is the full version of our Scientific Study Ethical Committee (Muğla Sıtıkı Koçman University, Muğla, TURKEY) Approval number. The sentence “The study was approved by Muğla Sıtıkı Koçman
University Clinical Research Ethical Committee with the decision number 02-07.” is added to the “Ethics, consent, and permissions” part.

5. Consent for publication – n/a

Currently, the statement in your “consent for publication” section of your declarations is incorrect. Consent for publication refers to consent for the publication of identifying images or other personal or clinical details of participants that compromise anonymity. Seeing as this is not applicable to your manuscript please state “Not Applicable” in this section.

Answer: The sentence is revised as “Consent for publication: Not applicable”

6. CONSORT

In accordance with BioMed Central editorial policies (http://www.biomedcentral.com/submissions/editorial-policies#standards+of+reporting), could you please ensure your manuscript reporting adheres to CONSORT guidelines (http://www.consort-statement.org/) for reporting clinical trials. This is so your methodology can be fully evaluated and utilised. Please include a statement within your manuscript to indicate that your study adheres to CONSORT guidelines and include a completed CONSORT checklist as an additional file when submitting your revised manuscript.

Answer: The sentence “The study adheres to CONSORT guidelines.” is added to the Methods section and a completed check-list is submitted with the revised manuscript

7. Clean manuscript

At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours.

Answer: The clean version of the revised manuscript is submitted to the system.