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Reviewer's report:

This is a methodological statement about a randomized clinical trial, aimed to assess if a personal activity tracker will improve, after 8 weeks, the performance at the 6 minutes walking test, in patients referred to a cardiac rehabilitation programs. The secondary outcome will be the improvement in cardiovascular risk factors, in Quality of life, and in psychological status. The paper follows SPIRIT 2013 statement, and the study protocol is completely described.

Some minor considerations:

ABSTRACT:

Method section, after "220 patients" specify that all patients will be undergoing a complete cardiac rehabilitation program

Specify, in the abstract, that the intervention will last 8 weeks and that outcome measure will be performed immediately after the cessation of intervention: PA activity habits is a long-term goal, so it is important to specify, even in the abstract, how long intervention and follow-up will last in order to facilitate the retrieval of the work from an internet search.

METHODS:

In the "secondary outcome" section (page 20) there is a list of self-reported data that will be collected. These include adherence to cardiac rehabilitation therapy. These outcomes do not answer to any of the hypothesis described at page 8. Authors might explain why they included those secondary outcomes in the study.

Page 23, line 15: typing error: "Declarations"
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
Acceptable

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?
If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.
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I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.
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