Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Research in Cardiovascular Diseases**
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	

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)

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	**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 exemple: 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.** **Result section have to be revised: the description of study population , is part of methods as physicians description.** **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)** **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** **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?...)** **Reference 41 does not seem relevant** **In materials and methods, an appendix 10 is cited which is not there.**	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	**Paper is interesting and the discussion section is well conducted but previous sections need some major revision to improve reading and understanding** **The bibliography section needs to be revised. Authors must correct typos.**	

Review Form 1.6

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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Elisa Dr Rizzi**
Department, University & Country	**C. Massaia Hospital, Italy**