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Reviewer's report:

This is a very interesting report on the use of bipolar radiofrequency ablation for refractory perimitral flutter, which despite advances in ablation techniques, is a usual clinical problem in our labs given the rapidly increasing number of patients that undergo atrial fibrillation ablation.

To make a long story short this case is of clinical importance, since it may be used as a hypothesis generating report capable to enforce research in this field. In this concept, the authors should have been more focused on the safety of the described technique. Worrying reports on ventricular rupture and injuries of the coronary arteries have been previously reported and of course cases of conduction block, which may not be that relevant in the case of mitral isthmus ablation. However, the authors need to provide more information in the discussion section regarding their precautions to increase safety during the procedure in relation to the complications reported in the literature.

Minor points of criticism could be that the authors need to report if they tried to locate and ablate the Marshall vein before applying bipolar RF. Ultimately, they need to clarify whether they consider that bipolar RF ablation can be more effective and safe in comparison to other techniques like anterior line ablation.

Finally, the authors should comment further whether the usage of steerable sheaths and contact force sensing ablation catheters, which are affordable taking into consideration that intracardiac echocardiography was used in this case, might have eliminated the need for bipolar RF ablation.
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