SDI Review Form 1.6

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)

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment** *(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)*
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.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	*comment received as separate word files*	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer