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Author’s response to reviews:

Reply to Dita Aditianingsih, M.D., Ph.D (Reviewer 1 comments): Thank you for your valuable comments.

1-still found plenty of terms using inconsistent English style, such as (but not limited to):
- anesthesia (American) and anaesthesia (British)
- randomized (American) vs randomised (British) - paresthesia (American) vs paraesthesia (British)
- analyzed (American) vs analysed (British) based on the revised title, I assumed that the authors intended to use British style, therefore please unify the rest of the terms with British English style

These terms have been corrected throughout the whole manuscript. Also grammar and redactional, such as (but not limited to):
- Page 5, line 145 "It is" was repeated twice It has been deleted
- Page 7, line 206 "As far as my knowledge goes,..." sounds inappropriate to state. It has been omitted
- Page 7, line 227 "All these findings agree with the results of our study." To "these studies support the findings in our study."
The sentence has been replaced by the new one
- Some paragraphs could be merge such as: Page 8 line 242-245 with line 247-250 and 252-253 They have been merged together Please avoid the use of exaggerating words
- Page 3, line 90: ASA should be defined at first use, and at line 96 "American Society of Anesthesiologists" should be abbreviated;

It has been done
- Page 9 line 274: ASA abbreviation is American Society of Anesthesiologists (not Anaesthesiologist) since this is an organization name
It has been corrected  Page 4 line 121: Please define "LA" abbreviation for first use, and add it to the abbreviation list the full name has been written Some texts in Figure 1 were displaced, please reorder

It has been reordered  Reply to raffaele aspide (Reviewer 2) comments: Thank you for your valuable comments

1) Pag.7: line 206: "…..As far as my knowledge goes, ….." please, do not write in the text in the first person, rivese the sentence  it has been omitted and the sentence has been revised  2) Pag. 8 line 264: "..Additional atudies" &gt;&gt; studies  it has been corrected  3) Conclusion: you change the text but I don't see yellow highlight  it has been highlighted  4) Fig.1: see the attached file, I cannot see well femoral nerve, again first person in caption, please revise. You talk about a needle, but I don't see it in the figure  A more accurate figure has been added  5) Fig.2: I was wrong, writing fig.2 and describing fig.3 in the previous review: revise di figure again, I don't understand what the three white arrows indicate and where is the needle  A more well defined figure has been added  6) Fig.3: finally it is a low definition image, may you upload a good quality one? Please, see the attached file, is that the needle? True or is it an example? Please, explain well  High definition image has been added and the needle is seen inside it

Regarding the linguistic and grammar error, they have been revised