

Answer to reviewer comments

Reviewer 1

Main comments: - The review is well written and the sections well identified. I believe it may be helpful for the reader to include a table with a summary of the classical and non-classical risk factors. - Pathophysiology (histology, pathology) of the CAD in young people should be specifically addressed in a dedicated paragraph. - Spontaneous dissection that typically affect young women is missing in this review. It is an important entity with specific pathophysiology that should be included. Minor issue: Check the rates of recurrent myocardial infarction reported in the text (89% and 96.6% at 5 years follow-up from -ref 61). It looks too high for me. This refers to survival free from MI. -Several references lack the year of publication: 61, 62. Please check.

1. A paragraph on pathophysiology has been written highlighted in yellow
2. A paragraph on spontaneous dissection has been written highlighted in yellow
3. Minor issue- checked –found to be correct
4. Year of publication added

Reviewer 2

In this review of Aggarwal et al. the epidemiology and the etiology of coronary heart disease of young people is represented. The subject of the review is of general interest. The manuscript is well written. However, I have some comments: "There are more than 180 risk factors found to be associated with CAD in younger people. Only few important and newer risk factors are Discussed in the review. "(Page 6) Here is missing a reference. By what criteria each other risk factors have been selected in this review? Why are these factors are important, especially for younger patients? A table of risk factors would be helpful. General: Are there any special diagnostic and therapeutic implications of the finding that coronary heart disease can also occur in young patients? Here a discussion would be advisable. Some minor errors: for example, arcus senalis (page 7)

1. As the reference could not be located the language has been modified and highlighted in yellow
2. A table has been included as table 2
3. Arcus senilis on page 7 has been corrected