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Which of the following best describes what type of case report this is?: Unreported or unusual side effects or adverse interactions involving medications

Has the case been reported coherently?: Yes

Is the case report authentic?: Yes

Is the case report ethical?: Yes

Is there any missing information that you think must be added before publication?: Yes

Is this case worth reporting?: Yes

Is the case report persuasive?: Yes

Does the case report have explanatory value?: Yes

Does the case report have diagnostic value?: Yes

Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: Yes

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

The authors reported uncommon complication of pacemaker implantation, malposition of pacing leads. This report is clinically relevant from the following two standpoints.

1. This report could remind the readers of this rare complication. We would take a lesson through the report.
2. The authors provides clinically useful advise to avoid this potentially dangerous complication.

I would suggest the following.

1. Introduction is redundant. Some sentences could be moved to Discussion. For
example, the description about block pattern on the EKG could be transferred to Discussion.

2. The authors decided to leave the lead in position. I think leads should be removed, because leads in the left ventricle may cause serious problems which the authors already described. The authors should describe the decision-making process, and/or its theoretical/literature base.
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