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Reviewer's report:

I think this protocol contains very interesting and important subject. The authors will search studies comparing peripheral nerve block to general anesthesia for an upper limb surgery in various databases, and will investigate the impact of peripheral nerve block on functional recovery (primary outcome) and on many other useful secondary outcomes. With systematic review of selected articles, the authors will summarize the available evidences comparing functional recovery with peripheral nerve block versus general anesthesia. The authors will also check various biases and the quality of evidences.

# Comments

- Keywords. Regional anesthesia, general anesthesia.

- Background. General anesthesia is still performed frequently for upper limb surgery, and some patients may benefit from general anesthesia. In my opinion, description of benefits from general anesthesia is also helpful to show the aim of this protocol.

- Methods. There will be some articles containing no data on the primary outcome (functional recovery) but data only on the secondary outcomes. Will you include these articles for analysis on secondary outcomes?

- Whether ultrasonography was used or not is very important on success rate or complication rate, so please consider analyzing the impact of ultrasonography.

- Line 188: PubMed/MEDLINE.

- Line 213: please check the sentence.

- Line 228: unclear -> high

- Line 237: a period

- Line 263: 16,17 -> 16, 17

- Line 293: Do you have any reason to choose year 2008?
References. Please follow the citation style and the reference style.

PRISMA-P. 11a is empty.

Thank you for your manuscript.
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