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**Reviewer's report:**

1. **Is the question posed by the authors well defined?**
   
   Report: Yes.
   
   The authors want to answer the question of preemptive analgesic effect of ketorolac and parecoxib in patients undergoing major lumbar spine surgery.

2. **Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
   
   Report: Yes.
   
   The randomized controlled is well accepted study design to prove the efficacy or effectiveness of any medical interventions.

   The authors described in detail of essential information on materials and methods of randomized controlled study.

3. **Are the data sound?**
   
   Report: Yes.
   
   The authors followed the basic need of how to conduct the randomized controlled study. The statistical part is appropriate to the data.

4. **Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?**
   
   Report: Yes.
   
   The authors followed the CONSORT recommendations for reporting RCT.

5. **Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?**
However, the authors did not show the detailed of significant pain scores of 0 and 1 hr.

Figure 2 showed line graph of significant pain scores at 0 and 1 hr of ketorolac and parecoxib. However, the significant pain scores at 1 hr of ketorolac may not reach minimally clinically important different.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
Report: Yes.

The authors still cannot prove the concept of preemptive analgesia.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Report: Yes.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Report: Yes.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
Report: Yes.

Reviewer's decision
Major compulsory revision
NONE

Minor essential revisions
Pain score in the text using verbal numerical rating scale.

Pain score in Figure 2 using VAS

Discretionary revisions
Given detail of the pain scores so that the readers can make decision whether the statistically significant different of pain scores also clinically significant.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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