

## Response to Reviews

Thank you for your careful review and pointing out errors for us to improve the manuscript.

*Reviewer #1,*

Well managed cases. Although a high risk procedure but if done meticulously and followed rigorously can be an alternative bypass as has been done.

→ I appreciate your thoughtful review.

*Reviewer #2*

Thank you for the article. While several case reports have been published with regards to OA-MCA bypass, there aren't many and its clinical benefit should not be underestimated. Hence, the importance of this article. The author successfully explained the challenges in relation to harvesting a suitable graft artery and illustrated the steps involved clearly. Both cases were also explained sufficiently with the end results clear to see with the aid of cerebral angiography. I would suggest to include the recovery time of both patients (days before discharge, etc.) to demonstrate the patient's recovery. There were only a few grammatical errors ('patent' instead of 'patient', no 'specific' findings should be replaced with no significant findings, etc.) and sentence structure errors.

→ I fully agree with all the points you pointed out, including problems with grammar and the follow-up period, and will reflect the corrections.

- Grammatical errors ; 'patent' exchanged to 'patient', 'no specific findings' replaced to 'no significant findings'.

for Case 1,

"The patient was discharged without symptoms in a week" is added.

for Case 2,

"The patient was discharged without any symptom aggravations in a week" is added.