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Responds to the reviewer’s comments:

Reviewer reports:

Vishal Uppal (Reviewer 1): The manuscript reads better with English language edits. However, multiple issues still need to be addressed.

1. The initials of attending doctors have been should be written as CY, YC and YL and not CYY. Have not been modified from the previous version.

Answer: Thanks very much for reviewer’s attention. It’s our negligence. We have revised the name as CY.

2. Conclusions should say "provides another promising option for the lumbar plexus block for the non-obese population.

Answer: Thanks very much for reviewer’s comment. It’s a good advice. We have revised it.

Background:

3. The line "Although the original…remain uncertain" does not make any sense.
Answer: Thanks very much for reviewer’s comment. It’s a good advice. We have deleted this sentence.

4. The meaning of phrase "(only part of image is developed)" is not clear

Answer: Thanks very much for reviewer’s comment. It’s a good advice. We have rewritten this sentence.

Methods:

5. Please specify when group allocation was disclosed to the participants.

Answer: Thanks very much for reviewer’s comment. It’s a good advice. We have specified this information in the method.

6. Beach chair method: "lateral edge of the spine" does not contribute to the formation of beach chair shape. It is the body of the vertebra.

Answer: Thanks very much for reviewer’s attention. It’s our negligence. It is the lateral edge of vertebral body and we have revised it in the manuscript.

7. Why a sensory score of 2 was considered successful block when a score of 2 implies normal pain sensation?

Answer: Thanks very much for reviewer’s attention. It’s our negligence. The score of 2 would have implied no temperature sensation and no pain sensation but normal tactile sensation. We have revised it in the manuscript.

8. Authors state "epidural anesthesia was considered successful" looks like they were trying to achieve the epidural spread. However, it is a side effect. The statement should be revised.

Answer: Thanks very much for reviewer’s comment. It’s a good advice. We have revised this sentence in the manuscript.

9. Authors have not provided the reference for motor assessment scale used. HSS knee rating score seems like a score used to assess recovery after knee surgery, not for assessment of motor block to test success rate of LPB.

Answer: Thanks very much for reviewer’s comment. It’s a good advice. In this study we have used the standard of muscle strength for assessment of motor block to test success rate of LPB, but our expression was not clear. In revision version two, we think of HSS knee rating score may support our motor assessment scale when reviewer put forward this question. Although these two assessments have some similarities, HSS knee rating score does not fit for assessment of motor block to test success rate of LPB. In this revised manuscript, we have revised our motor
assessment scale which makes it clearer and we found this assessment has been used in other research before [1].

10. Sedation protocol should be stated at the end of methods section with the drugs used for sedation and the dose range.

Answer: Thanks very much for reviewer’s comment. It’s a good advice. The sedation protocol in the article refers to 1 mg midazolam after intravenous access was established. We have revised this sentence in the manuscript.

11. Discussion: Points are repetitive, needs to be cut down.

Answer: Thanks very much for reviewer’s comment. It’s a good advice. We have deleted these repetitive parts in the manuscript.