



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_CA_8936
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of a cardiac rehabilitation program based on the Borg RPE Scale and six-minute walk test
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	The authors attempted to evaluate the effect of the cardiac rehabilitation program utilizing the Borg Rating of Perceived Exertion (RPE). The aim of the study was to examine the equivalence of this method compared to others. The data was carefully analysed. However, this reviewer disagrees that the presented information is sufficient to reach this conclusion; it is uncertain whether this program is more effective, less effective, or equivalent to the standard protocols. How do the authors determine that it is advantageous (line 254) when one does not know the difference in the outcome?	The paper clearly indicates that the aim of the study was to show whether using the Borg RPE scale can lead to improvement when measured by 6MWT. This is an important aspect of rural health care as in rural CR the Borg RPE scale is used to prescribe exercise and 6MWT used to verify any improvement. However up to our study no reports have shown whether there is indeed an improvement following CR when the Borg RPE scale is used. We have also removed "equivalent" as we agree with the reviewer that this has not been investigated here
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 16, a period is missing after "(CVD)". Lines 48-50, please reconsider the locations of commas. Line 216, "be" is missing before "employed".	We fixed these.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		