

Editor's Comment:

I have read the article intitled "Physical retraining in heart failure: evaluation of 30 patients at the Abidjan Institute of Cardiology (Ivory Coast)" and I have the following observations:

- The article is not well written, because a lot of results are presented in the "discussion" section;
- Many graphs and tables are not interpreted or discussed in the text.
- English language is not good enough for a scientific article
- Into the text are mentioned some references with numbers 144, 262,263....etc) but those numbers do not exist in the references.... the references stopped at no 47. This is not allowed in a scientific paper

For exemple:

Short-term results of rehabilitation in heart failure

- The recruitment of women was 20% in this study, which is comparable to the 28% found in the HF-ACTION Study (133). The COACH study showed a higher percentage of women with 38% (261). Despite some variability in proportions, women appear to be less represented than men in the rehabilitated heart failure population [144,262, 263]. The references cited do not exist.
- Some references are not related to the article.
- Many ideas are unclear

I have marked in red and yellow the things that are not clear enough.

The article cannot be published in this form. MAJOR revisions are needed.

Editor's Details:

Dr. Irina-Iuliana Costache
Associate Professor, "Gr. T. Popa" University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Iasi, Romania