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Reviewer's report:

p6 line 3: 'open-blind' is a confusing concept. Later on in the text the 'blinding' is explained in detail. I suggest deleting 'open-blind

p6 line 9: 'signed' i/o 'assigned'

p6 line 17: criteria of ineligibility should be changed to exclusion criteria

p6 line 23: 'administered systemically' is confusing. Do the authors mean oral medication, parenteral medication or anything that is not topical?

p7 line 3: what does the 72h refer to? prior to the first treatment? or any other time

p7 line 9 - 11: the sentence containing 'not included' should be moved to the section referring to the exclusion criteria

p7 line 23 - 25: The wording of this sentence is mildly confusing. A better option would be: four injections of local anaesthetic (2mL of 0.5% lidocaine) one week apart.

p8 line 4: 'four sessions weekly' -- is it four sessions in one week for several weeks or one session per week for four weeks?

p8 line 20: five blocks of six patients. Please clarify if in one block of six patients there were always three patients assigned to the study group and three patients to the control group

p9 line 1: same comment: explain the block randomisation better, either on p8 or here.

p9 line 3: 'control of vies' -- I recommend to change this to 'blinding sequence' or something similar

p9 line 18: [25 13776]? probably just [25]

p9 line 20: NTT should read NNT

p9 line 22: change to level of statistical significance at p<.05

p10 Participant flow: this section needs to include a better explanation of how the number 14 per group is achieved, referring to the figure only, is not standard practice I would have thought.

p10 line 21: 'risk of pain maintenance' I am not sure what is meant by this

p10 line 22 & 23 should be moved to the discussion
p11 line 9: along time = progressively?
p11 line 22: 'even after the end of treatment' should be deleted. the follow-up period is by definition after the treatment.
p12 line 11: 'the drug has a low affinity for the local anaesthetic' -- this sentence does not make sense, please reword
Tables 2&3: percentual = percentage? -- quartile with no 'h'

compulsory revision:
please consider statistical calculations using 15 as the denominator, as 15 is the 'intent to treat' number of subjects
please clarify the timeline of the study: the treatment is provided over several weeks in both groups. at what point in time does the 'follow-up' period start. This is not explicitly stated.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.

Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests