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Reviewer’s report:

The manuscript reads better with English language edits. However, multiple issues still need to be addressed. 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.

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

Background:

The line "Although the original…remain uncertain" does not make any sense.

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

Methods:

Please specify when group allocation was disclosed to the participants.

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.

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

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.

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.

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

Discussion: Points are repetitive, needs to be cut down.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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