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1. This is a well-written paper describing an important study on cardiac rehabilitation (CR), the results of which will be awaited with great interest.
2. I offer the following comments for consideration by the authors:
   2i. Abstract - remove 'Exercise-based' from the beginning (the authors state in the background that CR - even psycho-education - reduces mortality!
   2ii. In the section 'home-based C' the reference numbers cited [22, 25] for the Heart Manual are wrong - should be [20, 24].
   2iii. In the section 'cost and cost-effectiveness of CR' I agree that there is insufficient data on this, but one study has been done on costs of CR in England and Wales by Alistair Gray et al (JRCPhysLond 1997).
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