

Dear Editor, below is a point-to-point response for reviewers.

**Reviewer's code:** 03547918

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This is an interesting article on a major topic. Cardiac rehabilitation is a key component of the treatment regime for patients with heart disease. It has been recognized that cardiac rehabilitation improved the prognosis of patients suffering from ischemic heart disease or heart failure. Nevertheless, the attendance of patients is low, less than 1 in 4 eligible patients participated in a cardiac rehabilitation program. To increase participation in cardiac rehabilitation, a home-based program should be advantageous. In this context, telerehabilitation is a promising tool. The authors have performed a nice article on this topic.

**Response:** Thank you for your review.

---

**Reviewer's code:** 03722832

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Reduce the syntax errors

**Response:** Syntax errors have been reduced throughout the text. Thank you for your review.

---

**Reviewer's code:** 00227375

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This is an interesting review about feasibility, efficiency, and safety of remotely monitored cardiac telerehabilitation compared to traditional center-based cardiac rehabilitation. Twelve randomized controlled studies were enrolled in this review. This manuscript is nicely structured and well written. I have no question about this manuscript.

---

**Response:** Thank you for your review.

---

**Reviewer's code:** 02584466

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

A. The content and conclusions of the report are well thought. I have one minor suggestion: The information provided in the text, Results section, and in Figure 3 should be exactly the same. That 652 studies were excluded from further analysis and the reasons for their exclusion should be added to the text. B. The English of the report needs extensive revision. Several passages are difficult to understand.

**Response:** A: The information in the Results section of the text has been added and modified B: The English has been revised throughout the text. Thank you for your review.

---

**Reviewer's code:** 03849140

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The paper can be accepted on its current form. **Response:** Thank you for your review.

---

**Reviewer's code:** 03702209

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This is a narrative review of whether Telerehabilitation (TR) and mobile technologies are becoming potentially suitable alternatives through which it is possible to fill the gap over limited participation and specialist supervision. Based on this review article, TR could be an effective and safe alternative form of rehabilitation for the heart disease population compared to traditional center-based programs. Most of the TR interventions currently published provide a comprehensive approach, indicating significant development and step forward in this field of study. Our research evidence supports the implementation of TR, which may have an impact on addressing access barriers in

cardiac rehabilitation programs. It would have been better if the authors performed a meta-analysis. Also the authors need to explain in more detail why some studies have been excluded. This technique has many limitations in developing countries where the elderly are not capable to use high tech technology. This should be mentioned in detail by the authors.

**Response:** An explanation of why studies were excluded was added in the text.

A limitation where older people are unable to use high technology was mentioned in the section - study limitations. Thank you for your review.

---

**Reviewer's code:** 03846820

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Dear author, This review paper represents results of the comprehensive analysis which is aiming to examine recent literature on the use of remotely monitored cardiac TR and evaluate its efficiency, utilization, and safety of these interventions. The article is written with the good English-speaking adduction of the arguments. The article is sufficiently novel and very interesting to warrant publication. All the key elements are presented and described clearly. The most discussable options in the article are: 1) Would you please kindly correct all your minor typos and grammar errors throughout the manuscript. **Response:** Minor misspellings and grammatical errors have been corrected throughout the manuscript. Thank you for your review.

---

**Reviewer's code:** 00397579

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Batalik et al systematically reviewed telerehabilitation for chronic cardiac condition. This manuscript focuses an important topic in modern healthcare. It is well-written, comprehensive, objective. Its' publication in the World Journal would be a great contribution to the literature. Minor points: 1. Page 6, para 5, line 2: there was an extra word "exercises" 2. Page 7, para 3, last line: "Mortality was defined as a severe adverse

event, and assessments were included". This sentence is confusing. Please clarify it. 3. Figure 3, first para under RESULTS: the numbers did not add-up. Please clarify 4. Page 8, last para, line 3: "... in 6 trials, and in 6 trials, it was ...." This sentence is confusing, please clarify. 5. Page 12, para 3, line 1: "competition", it might be a typo for "completion". Please check

**Response:**

1. page 6, para 5, line 2: the duplicate word "exercise" has been removed.
2. page 6, para 5, line 2: "Mortality was defined as a serious adverse event and assessments were included". This sentence has been modified and reworded.
3. Figure 3, first paragraph in RESULTS: numbers have been clarified.
4. Page 8, last paragraph, line 3: "... in 6 attempts and in 6 attempts it was..." This sentence has been modified and reworded.
5. Page 12 (3), line 1: "competition", the word has been corrected.

Thank you for your review.

---