



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Cardiology and Angiology: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CA_48994
Title of the Manuscript:	Unmasking Brugada syndrome with oral flecanide provocation. A case series of three patients.
Type of the Article	Case study

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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	<p>Authors should first correct grammatical errors like Fleca(i)nide in all the paper, and look better ECGs, then reconsider conclusions.</p> <p>Anyway, in addition to grammatical errors, I also remind authors not to overdiagnose BrS (which is quite common these days.....). Of course, the pre-probability test is all in these cases. This is favorable to the authors, in fact here they have a high index of suspicion of BrS. Both history of sudden death (familiarity) and syncope are present, and even two out of three patients are symptomatic for syncope. If, however, we base ourselves only on the ECG tracing, I feel I can observe that in the first case the ECG is negative for Brugada in both tracings; in the second case the ECG is really doubtful for BrS, while only in the third case the ECG is unequivocally positive. However, considering that the pre-test is high for cases 1 and 2, it would have been useful to repeat a conventional test with Ajmaline (a little more sensitive than Flecainide per os). For case 3, it would have been useful to complete the clinical procedure with both an electrophysiological test (EPT) for risk stratification and genetic test as well.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Take note of grammatical errors and correct them.</p> <p>The background is correct.</p> <p>The abstract, case report series, and discussion are quite adequate.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>I've read with interest the article titled "Unmasking Brugada syndrome with oral fleca(i)nide provocation. A case series of three patients" by unknow authors. Well, I have to say that the topic is really interesting. In fact, there are a lot of literature about it, as authors have well reported.</p>	

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)	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Massimo Bolognesi</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Sports Cardiology Medicine Centre, Italy</i>