



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
Although the authors commented as if they agreed with this reviewer's recommendation and corrected properly, on the 4th line in the abstract they still referred to the equivalence as a part of their study aims. A similar description is found on line 37. On line 36, the references are incomplete indicating a poor quality of the revising process. The sentence added on line 47-49 is unclear and needs to be rephrased. The first paragraph in the "3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION" (line 136-143) should be placed in the discussion part in the section rather than at the beginning.	We changed the abstract to read ... validated for its ability to be used to assess an appropriate level of exercise, which promotes a positive physiological health outcome... Line 37 was similarly changed We agree when revising the ms this was not noticed and has now been rectified. We thank the reviewer for alerting us to this typo. We clarified the sentence on lines 47-49 as follows: The current study, aimed to investigate whether the Borg RPE scale has the ability to produce positive health outcomes assessed with the 6MWT. We moved this paragraph towards the end of the discussion