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Reviewer's report:

I have some comments and questions listed below

1- Have you registered the study in website such as clinicaltrials?

2- Why did you choose fentanyl as a caudal additive for supraumblical or laporoscopic surgery?

3- Why did you prefer etomidate and succinylcholine?

The unwanted side effects of succinylcholine are well known. More important, viable alternatives to succinylcholine now exist for intermediate or long surgical procedures. With short-acting non-depolarizing relaxants available, succinylcholine is obsolete for routine anesthesia care.

4- I did not understand that how did you calculate sample size? Which did you use the mean of?
   (The pilot data showed that the mean ± SD of the non-block group, the ROP1.0 group and the ROP 1.3 group were 1.87±0.35 μg/kg, 1.57±0.32 μg/kg and 1.29±0.29 μg/kg respectively.)

5- How long do you observe patient in PACU? (minimum time) Is this safe that less than 30 minutes stay in PACU especially children with caudal block? Which criteria do you use to discharge patients from PACU?

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:

Needs some language corrections before being published

**Declaration of competing interests**
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:
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