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Reviewer's report:

The authors have done a reasonable job addressing my concerns.

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.

2) Tables 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.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
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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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Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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