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Reviewer's report:

This is a prospective randomized trial assessing the anesthetic efficacy of pelvic plexus block for transperineal template-guided prostate biopsy compared to periprostatic nerve block or no block.

The manuscript is nicely written and easy to follow. The findings are of interest to all urologists and radiologist performing prostate biopsy.

I have few comments:

-Title and abstract:

1- Title is generic and not reflect what is being discussed and conducted in this study. Consider revising. To be more specific include the fact that this is a randomized clinical trial in the title.

2- Please include the enrolment period in the abstract.

3- Please use terms consistently through out the manuscript (lignocaine vs lidocaine).

-Introduction:

None
-Methods:

1- What concealment method was used to conceal the randomization group till the procedure?

2- Was there an independent safety monitoring board and Independent Data Monitoring Committee (IDMC) involved in this trial?

3- How did you calculate sample size for the trial?

4- Authors state Mann-Whitney or Kruskal-Wallis tests were used to compare groups. The extend of statistical analysis was limited to basic descriptive methods. I am highly interest to see if pain and satisfaction score were related purely to method of local anesthesia used or other factors play a role. This could be easily assessed using a linear or even logistic regression model.

5- Keruskal-Wallis test was used to compare medians, based on table 2 it appears a pair comparison between groups was conducted. This type of comparison is advised against as the risk of type 1 error increases with each comparison. I would suggest comparing the 3 group medians and use post-hoc test to identify the group that is different (Dunn's test).

6- Did you exclude patients with rectal pathology including absence of rectum or anal stenosis?

7- Pictures worth thousand words. I would suggest including actual pictures demonstrating the 3 techniques used.

8- Please indicate if the visual analog scale and visual numeric scale have previously been validated in patients undergoing prostate biopsy (include reference).

-Results:

1- In table 1, 2 and 3, I recommend omitting F, Z and χ2 values.

2- Please include in table 1, the amount of lidocaine used in each group and compared them. This is especially important to assure that the difference in pain and satisfaction scores is just not due to the fact that group 2 and 3 received a higher dose of anesthetic.

3- There is no table S1! This is likely a typo.
-Discussion:

1- Majority of the initial segment of discussion should be moved to introduction section (paragraph 1 and 2). I would advise starting with the brief review of the findings of the study and discuss them.

2- Please discuss the limitations of the study in separate paragraph.

3- I am surprised that authors believe "recall bias" may have influenced the pain and satisfaction scores considering the relatively short time period between biopsy and scoring!

Thank you!
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