

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_120295
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of cardiac rehabilitation in post-myocardial infarction: a case report
Type of the Article	Case report

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:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Since the Myocardial Infarction is number one cause of death, knowledge regarding cardiac rehabilitation is essential now; as it plays an increasingly important role in the management of coronary artery disease.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Importance of cardiac rehabilitation in post-myocardial infarction.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Many short abbreviations are used in the abstract as well as in the case report: they need to be expanded when used for the first time.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Can be modified by adding: 1) Present limitations of cardiac rehabilitation 2) Future prospect of cardiac rehabilitation	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The present article is single case report: it can be improved by case series by studying 20 to 30 patients and noting down their improvement after cardiac rehabilitation.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	Most of the references are old: new references (less than 5-year-old) are very few. New recent developments need to be added. New recommendations of American Society of Cardiologists may be included.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There are numerous abbreviations in the present case report: need to be expanded when using for the first time.	
Optional/General comments	Case series on cardiac rehabilitation or Review article on cardiac rehabilitation is better than single case report.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sankappa. P. Sinhasan
Department, University & Country	All India Institute of Medical Sciences (AIIMS), Guwahati, India