

BPI Review Form 070520

Book Name:	Medical Research and Its Applications
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_883
Title of the Manuscript:	Recurrent episodes of ventricular tachycardia in the patient with LV aneurysms, improved after LV aneurysmectomy
Type of the Article	Book chapter

BPI Review Form 070520

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(If agreed with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. Authors must write his/her feedback here)</i>
Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? Please write a few sentences explaining your answer	The manuscript is important for the scientific community, as it describes a case of recurrent episodes of ventricular tachycardia, that was not controlled by first line treatment. RFA treatment was not effective despite an ischemic substrate for the ventricular arrhythmia.	
Is the title of the article suitable? Do you have any alternative Title in your mind?	Yes, the title of the article is suitable, except the reader gets confused if there were more than one aneurysm present in the LV, because the pleural notation is used in the title, while the text describes only one LV aneurysm	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	The abstract is comprehensive, but abbreviations are used without being explained for the first time (while also lacking a list of abbreviations in the article). Also, in the abstract, it is mentioned that a magnet was placed temporarily over the ICD to avoid further shocks, while this is not mentioned in the article itself. The article informs that ICD interrogation showed that ATP and shock treatments were appropriate. Why then was a magnet placed over the ICD? Was an external defibrillator then applied with chest pads instead?	
Do you think the English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	Yes, the English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
Please provide your comments regarding the appropriateness of different sections of the manuscript.	<p>Introduction: The background information is relevant for the case, and the case is described in an informative and concise manner.</p> <p>Case report and discussion: The case is presented with relevant information and findings. The elevated troponin level was tied to ICD shock, but the reader is left wondering if the runs of ventricular tachycardia itself is perhaps a more likely cause for the elevated troponin level. Furthermore, one should probably comment on the fact that a LV aneurysm can give rise to a VT with LBBB morphology, when one would expect it to be a RBBB morphology if the ischemic substrate is located in the left ventricle. The presented ECG has a somewhat atypical LBBB pattern with an electrical axis pointing upwards, and this is in keeping with the apical location of the aneurysm, and so would explain also the LBBB pattern despite the origin of the arrhythmia being in the left ventricle still. I think that this should have probably been mentioned in the discussion section of the paper.</p> <p>Conclusion: Good summary of case and main points.</p>	
Do you think that the references in the manuscript are proper, recent and sufficient? If you have any suggestions, please write here.	The references are proper and perhaps sufficient, but no new references have been added.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kjell Hoeyland
Department, University & Country	Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Norway