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**Reviewer's report:**

This is a nice paper dealing with the recognition of the lateral cutaneous nerve using sonography in a large serie of volunteers. So it is an article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests. One interesting point is that the authors were able to identify constantly the LFCN in their study, certainly thanks to the use of a high frequency probe (18 MHz). The paper is well written.

**I-Major Compulsory Revisions**

To my opinion there are some points to clarify before publication.

**Background**

Q1: The authors should describe in more detail the course of the LFCN, especially the path between the Sartorius and the tensor fasciae latae muscles, as this point is a major point of the paper.

**Materials and methods**

Q2: The author should describe in more detail the criteria used to identify the lateral femoral cutaneous nerve.

a- How can they be confident that the nervous structure assed is the LFCN and not another nerve structure, for example a nerve branche of the genito-femoral nerve?

b- If the authors rely on the criteria established by previous papers they should be stated.

c- The criteria used to identify the inguinal ligament have to be described.

**Results:**

Q3: Asymptomatic neuromas of the LCN are very common (about 6% in imaging and anatomical studies). It is not stated if the authors found such neuromas.

a- Can the authors clarify this point?

b- The authors should discuss this point in the discussion section comparing their results to previous published studies.
Discussion

Q4: It is not stated in the text if the main operator (JA) realized an intraobserver study.
   a- If yes, the data should appear in the results section / If not, this point has to be stated in the discussion.

Q5: The authors should also compare their results concerning the mean distance between the LFCN and the anterior superior iliac spine with the data published in literature (even in anatomical studies).

II- Minor Essential Revisions

- Background:
  There is a spelling mistake for "injures". This has to be change for "injuries"

- At the end of the paper
  I think that the authors wanted to write “References” instead of “Conference”

Discretionary Revisions:

- In the manuscript and in the figures legends it would be better to write “tensor fasciae latae muscle” instead of “tensor fascia lata”.

- Figure 3 appears not very demonstrative. Indeed it is difficult to see the LFCN as an “hypoechoic structure with hyperechoic dots within it”. May be the authors should change this figure for another one.
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