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Reviewer’s report:

This is an interesting protocol; the proposed trial has potential to improve the surgical management of a large population of women. Please note the following suggestions:

1. Page 5, line 87 sentence would read better as "A combination of the techniques described above has been shown to reduce.... pain"...

2. Considering the potential impact of BMI, should randomisation also be stratified by two or three BMI categories?

3. Page 8, line 153, control group: is there any time limit involved in the application of abdominal pressure (to standardise this)?

4. Page 8, line 169. More information re these "inputs" would be helpful. Is 48 hours the timepoint expected to show the maximum pain difference between groups?

5. Statistics, pages 8,9: I expected pain incidence to be evaluated by a distribution-based test such as chi-squared or similar, and pain intensity to be evaluated by a two-way repeat measures ANOVA (or similar general linear model).

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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