

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 65705

**Title:** Brugada syndrome associated with out-of-hospital cardiac arrest: A case report

**Reviewer's code:** 02630177

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Thailand

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-03-18

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-04-09 04:09

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-04-19 05:49

**Review time:** 10 Days and 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

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

To the editors/authors, This case report indicates a successful clinical intervention of Brugada syndrome type 1 patient. Some points need clarified and revised. 1. Normal values of blood chemical parameters (and possible others) should be added following each measured parameter, e.g., CK-MB 75 IU/L (normal...). This will be useful for non-clinical readers. 2. Final diagnosis and differential diagnosis look similar. It should show only differential diagnosis since all history and clinical investigation were reported. 3. Discussion is too long. The first paragraph that repeated the introduction should be deleted. The previous reports should be minimal. I would suggest the authors revise the discussion to include what new or specific clinical findings and interventions compared to previous reports. If possible, the possible linkage among Brugada syndrome and other clinical abnormalities of this patient should be added. 4. Conclusion should indicate what new or specific clinical findings and interventions of this case did. 5. English should be carefully rechecked and revised.