



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMMR_13110
Title of the Manuscript:	Screening for Vascular Disease in Pulmonary Rehabilitation
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Please, add allocation of responsibility between authors. Please, consider reclassification methods (such as net reclassification improvement) to be reassay a score validity</p> <p>If there any ethical issue, please clarify.</p>	<p>-See the Authors' Contributions section. The allocation of responsibility between authors was in the manuscript I submitted but for some reason was not in the original research article that was sent to the both of us (pg. 9).</p> <p>-See the consideration of net reclassification methods under the Study Limitations and Implications section (pg. 8).</p> <p>-There were no ethical issues, which are affirmed by the sentence under the Ethical Approval section (pg. 9).</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		