

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Cardiovascular Diseases</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCD_73884
Title of the Manuscript:	Physical retraining in heart failure: evaluation of 30 patients at the Abidjan Institute of Cardiology (Ivory Coast)
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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

## 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>All references that appear in the body text (bibliography references, tables, and figures) are not in progressive order: Authors have to reorder them with coherence. (For example: reference indexed 9 is cited between 1-4, 14, 15 and before 3) Tables 2,3,6,8,9,10,12 aren't described in the body text.</b></p> <p><b>Result section have to be revised: the description of study population , is part of methods as physicians description.</b></p> <p><b>There are too many tables, that don't improve reading but mislead attention from the text you have to remove all tables that are not fundamental to the paper. Also physician description is unnecessary (as also table 4)</b></p> <p><b>Authors have to correct the number of patients included in the study, it is stated 30 but in the results section it is said that 1 refused to participate in the study, 2 were not reached and 2 died; patients appear to be 25</b></p> <p><b>The authors must review, in addition to the order of the citations made, also the numbers of the same, there are numbers that do not appear in the bibliographic list! (133?261?263?....)</b></p> <p><b>Reference 41 does not seem relevant</b></p> <p><b>In materials and methods, an appendix 10 is cited which is not there.</b></p>	<p>Tutti riferimenti che compaio nel testo (alla bibliografia, alle tabelle,e alle fiure) non sono in ordine- dovete riordinarie con corenza. Tutti riferimenti che compaio nel testo (alla bibliografia, alle tabelle,e alle fiure) non sono in ordine- dovete riordinarie con corenza.</p> <p>reference 3 is removed since it is between reference 1 and 4</p> <p>in this study we preferred to start our results from the description of the population and doctors for the good understanding of the article</p> <p>we believe unless otherwise stated that the methodology allows us to understand the approach and the means used to make the study so please accept that our results begin with the selection of patients</p> <p>we believe that all tables are relevant for the understanding of the article</p> <p>initially we have 30 patients after we retained 25 in the article from the binary variable we considered the 25 patientshey allow readers to fully understand the article</p> <p>the bibliography stops at 47 then you said that the 41 was not relevant we removed it and put away the others there are now 46 bibliographic references left</p> <p>if Annex 10 has been cited and is not in the text it was doubt a typing error so do not consider the annex cited which does not exist</p> <p>the bibliography has been revised making it easy to read for mistakes English is difficult in our French-speaking countries we will make the effort to correct them and help us to correct them</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p><b>Paper is interesting and the discussion section is well conducted but previous sections need some major revision to improve reading and understanding</b></p> <p><b>The bibliography section needs to be revised. Authors must correct typos.</b></p>	<p>the bibliography has been revised making it easy to read for mistakes English is difficult in our French-speaking countries we will make the effort to correct them and help us to correct them</p>

### PART 2:

	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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>LIKE ANY SCIENTIFIC WORK THERE ARE ALWAYS ETHICAL QUESTIONS: THE AGREEMENT OF PATIENTS ON THEIR STATUS THE CONFIDENTIALITY OF RESULTS AND THE CENTRALIZATION OF RESULTS</p>	<p>yes we have questions of ethics since the article has been validated by the medical and scientific direction of the heart institute of Abidjan</p>