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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript.

The results of this study are important in understanding of best practice of PO analgesia in CS patients.

Authors understand the present state of the issue and this is reflected in Background section.

Objective of the study is stated in the end of "Background" section as a hypothesis.

The study methods are defined clearly in "Materials and methods" section.

Results are clear.

Figures and tables are relevant to study results.

The discussion of study results is sufficient enough and explain all the findings.

Conclusion is clear and corresponds to study results.

References are relevant to study topic.

Other remarks (minor):

Page 7, lines 40-41:

There were no differences in motor block recovery; however, the sensory block levels of the single group were HIGHER than those of the double group at postoperative 1 and 6 h.

According to the next sentence in the text and the study results stated in the Table 4, sensory block was higher in the "Double" group. So I suggest to change this sentence to "There were no differences in motor block recovery; however, the sensory block levels of the single group were LOWER than those of the double group at postoperative 1 and 6 h.

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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