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Reviewer's report:

This is a randomized blinded trial of no block to two different doses of caudal block for urologic upper tract surgery ranging from surgical site near the kidney (pyeloplasty) to surgical site near the bladder (ureteral reimplantation). Overall, I appreciate the attempt to study the effect of caudal block on laparoscopic urologic surgery.

I am assuming that the anesthesiologist who managed the patient intra-operatively was blinded to what the patient was randomized to. I believe that this is stated on Page 7, line 12, but could be made more definitive.

Page 7, line 36, all patients were given ondansetron prior to case completion, this may have an effect on differences in post-operative nausea and vomiting. Including this as part of the discussion in comparison to previous studies could be beneficial.

It does not appear that scheduled post-operative ketorolac or other NSAIDs were utilized, allowing this study to better address the differences in need for post-operative pain medications between groups. This could be added to the discussion on Page 13, Line 48.

In regard to the discussion:

Line 19, Page 12: Citation 14 investigated the effect of caudal block on upper urinary tract robot assisted laparoscopic surgery. It seems inaccurate to say this is the first to investigate this question.

Line 38-39, Page 13: (Faasse's study or previous studies?) This needs to be clarified. Similar in line 50-51.

Conclusion:

Line 34, Page 15: I am unclear what this line means: "Caudal block with 1.3 mL/kg of 0.15% ropivacaine is optional."

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 recommend additional statistical review
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Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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