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Reviewer's report:

Interesting topic.

The following additions are suggested:

Title: please add prospective, randomized study

Abstract: Add the sentence containing the information about major known problem in the area. Please add in line 3: The aim of this study is …

Background. Line 9-12 please rephrase the sentence (unclear for reader)

Methods:

p4 Line 24. repeated cesarean section
p5 Line 9. rate (instead of "speed")
p5 Line 60. comfort scale reference. Origins of scale, Cut off values
Who was responsible for the comfort scale measurement?

Results

p7 Line 4: epidural was converted to (instead of they were changed to general anesthesia)
p7 Line 17: New sentence: The usage of remifentanil
p7 Line 19: erase and New sentence: The number of patients with ketamine...
p7 Line 27: and (instead whereas)

Discussion

p8 Line 15: erase obvious visceral
Please discuss comfort scale that was used in the study
Please discuss 2 cases of respiratory depression in parturients. Cause? How it was solved? How it can be prevented?
Please discuss 2 cases of neonatal resuscitation? causes? Prevention?
Please give suggestions how to prevent possible complications of remifentanil?
Please discuss risk/benefit ratio
Any other studies using measuring comfort during remifentanil infusion in repeated CS?
Any other studies discussing comfort during repeated CS?
Any other medications then remifentanil? What about dexmedetomidine?
Why did you choose ketamine?
Discuss possibility for double blinded study
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.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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