

Reviewer 1

Fahrettin et al. measure the changes in vessel diameter and overall flow rate of the brachial artery after electrical stimulation of different nerves. The results prompt that the Brachial artery receives an equal amount of sympathetic innervation from the Median and Ulnar nerves. The experimental design is clear and innovative. Some issues need to be corrected and further classified regarding the improvement of paper quality. The significance of the study for differentiating the specific nerves innervating the blood vessels needs to be further explored and elucidated, and the relevant content needs to be presented in the introduction section. Does the sample size of this study need to be expanded? The sample of 15 cases combined with this statistical method does not lead to a convincing conclusion. If the sample size for this study cannot be added, the narrative of the results needs to be modified. In the discussion section, innovative and further analysis of the experimental data is needed, and after concluding that the ulnar and median nerves are equally innervated, the clinical significance and its guidance for future research need to be discussed.

Answer: Discussion section is revised according to recommendations.

Reviewer 2

The title should be added to manuscript text before the abstract. 2. The author(s) should add the references of the following information (The sympathetic nervous system is primarily responsible for controlling the peripheral arteries. However, there is currently insufficient information to determine which artery receives more postganglionic sympathetic innervation from which peripheral nerve. As we know, there are two post-mortem reports comparing the sympathetic fiber intensity of Median and Ulnar nerves). 3. The author(s) should identify abbreviations as (USG, LOQIC, MEB, EMG, and EP). 4. I recommend adding the ethical approval number if available.

Answer: A new reference article and ethical approval number have been added.

Reviewer 3

Manuscript title, abstract & method is Fine. Result section can be shortened and can be made concise by revised good quality tables. Discussion is not very impressive. References are less considering academic writing. No mention of Ethical approval number or trial registry. Video has not anonymity of operator and subject. Certificate of non native English has no details.

Discussion section has been revised and ethical approval number is added.

Reviewer 4

If author can include some methodology part in the title it will be more informative for author. there are few places with grammatical errors. please go throughout the manuscript and correct accordingly. please mention the limitations of the study caption of the table is placed above the table and for fig it is place below.

Answer: Grammatical errors are corrected, limitations are expressed in the discussion section

Reviewer 5

first of all, I would like to thank the authors for their excellent article. some points have to be taken into account: - The abstract section does not include study objectives. - Introduction and the whole article have limited number of references, please increase the number of references. - There are several sentences without citation/s. This may give an idea about telling self opinions, and this is not accepted. - References are almost old, they need to be updated. - The language needs to be edited.

Answer: Number of references are increased, citations are added. English is edited.