



Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
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>)



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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	This study was carried out to assess a cardiac rehabilitation program using the Borg RPE scale. The result was that enrolled 15 patients showed significantly improved 6 minute walk test. Let me congratulate their continuing efforts to improve the patients' status. In the abstract and conclusion, the authors described "improved heart function", however, no data related heart function are mentioned. As far as I know there have been no reports which showed improved heart function by cardiac rehabilitation. This study may be the first article. The authors are encouraged to revise the manuscript to add the data of heart function, and discussion.	The reviewer is correct – we took some liberty here – and have changed "heart function" to exercise capacity measured as 6MWT and thus reducing possible risk of future adverse cardiac events" We took results on the 6MWT as an indication of improved heart function. However we have rephrased this section See above comment
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	*comment received as separate word files*	