

Responses to the comments of Reviewer 03476514

Response to comment: We thank the reviewer for making this point. As the reviewer has stated, we should add the relevant related articles. We have added the literatures. (revised manuscript, ref #7, 9, 10)

Responses to the comments of Reviewer 02887553

Response to comments: We thank the reviewer for making these points. First, we should apologize the spelling mistake, we wanted to mean 'navel' not 'naval'. (revised manuscript, page 3)

Second, as the reviewer has indicated, we have deleted Figure1 and Video1. (revised manuscript)

According to reviewer's suggestion, we have edited the abstract as a Case Report. (revised manuscript, page 2)

Finally, our manuscript has been checked by native speaker. (see "language certificate" as an attached document)

Responses to the comments of Reviewer 02549885

Response to comments: We thank the reviewer for making these points. First, as the reviewer has stated, direct injection with percutaneous approach seems to be much easier, but procedure with ultrasound image and transperitoneal approach is more reliable and has high reproducibility. Visual recognition of muscle layer by ultrasound makes more secure injection and enclosed liquid space of analgesia.

Second, we can't say 'This analgesic technique should be considered as a new...' in discussion session. So we have changed part of the discussion as follows: 'Our novel analgesia technique has potential use as a regimen for postoperative pain of various laparoscopic surgeries.' (revised manuscript, page4)