

1. To reviewer 1: Unfortunately, there is not much constructive criticism from the reviewer 1. To add the structure to the article we added this sentence in the abstract: "The format of this review begins with relevant research from the basic sciences and follows through with a pertinent review of clinical trials". There is very limited data on the topic of effects of electronic cigarettes on cardiovascular system that's why we had to combine basic science research with clinical trials. In regards of paragraph about pregnancy that was the only relevant study we found, there are no studies on cardiovascular effects of electronic cigarettes on humans. If reviewers and editors think that paragraph about pregnancy be better removed we can do so. The conclusions are based on limited data available.
2. To reviewer 2: We changed the formulation that electronic cigarettes cannot be recommended at this point as less risky alternative. We went through all references and made sure they are correct.
3. To the science editor: we added a figure summarizing effects of regular tobacco cigarettes. We obtained the permission from the publisher to use the figure. Copyright statement should accompany the figure. If needed we can forward you the email from the publisher with permission to use the picture. We also added 2 tables summarizing some of the studies. Concerning references we removed one of them as the publication was retracted and we added PMID and DOI numbers. Reference number 1 doesn't have DOI, auto-analyzer modified the reference 1 and removed some of the text. We added text back to the reference 1.