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Reviewer's report:

Thank you, even though it is old data it is an interesting article, however, it needs revision especially the method section.

Page 3 line 5 you need to check what the reference shows.

Page 5 line 8 You have not used the symbol ® after Ropivacaine nor after Morphine in your text, sometimes you start with uppercase and sometimes with lowercase. You need to be consequent.

Page 6 line 9 you describes whom was paged for study inclusion during office hours and after office hours until midnight. So you did not include patients from midnight until office hours starts? Why? If you had included all patient, could that affect the study result?

Page 6 line 16 you mention the pain assessment instrument and on page 8 line 12 you mention a pain instrument with a reference but you need to explain the instrument. It seems not to be a well-known instrument. You also mention VAS did you use VAS or NRS?

Page 9 table 1, the number of patients with diagnose of dementia seems to be high in the intervention group and very high the control group. How sure can you be that your result regarding incidence of delirium?

Page 10 table 2 the numbers looks mixed up in the postoperative SPMSQ higher percentage of patients with 8-10 in the control group compared to the intervention group

Page 11 table 4 why have you changed from reporting 4 groups of SPMSQ to 2 groups.

Page 11 line 9 No serious adverse events were reported. Which AE and SAE were you looking for? Did you have any in you protocol?

Page 13 line 1 and 3 you suddenly uses name as references instead of numbers
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

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.

No

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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