International Journal of Research in Medical Sciences
Rojo PLM et al. Int J Res Med Sci. 2025 Jun;13(6):2714-2718
www.msjonline.org
pISSN 2320-6071 | eISSN 2320-6012

DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.18203/2320-6012.ijrms20251674

Review Article

The diagnostic challenge of type 3 Brugada pattern: clinical implications and provocative testing strategies

Pedro Luis Matus Rojo[1]*, Donaldo Emiliano Silva Lopez[2], Héctor Daniel Zamora Andrade[1], Pedro Emmanuel Escárzaga López[1], Celina Guadalupe Camacho Mascareño[1], Erick Adolfo Meza Soto[1]

[1]Autonomous University of Sinaloa, Los Mochis General Hospital, Los Mochis, Sinaloa, Mexico
[2]Monterrey Institute of Technology, Monterrey Campus, Nuevo León, Mexico

Received: 08 April 2025
Accepted: 09 May 2025

***Correspondence:**
Dr. Pedro Luis Matus Rojo,
E-mail: felixosuna10@hotmail.com

ABSTRACT

The Brugada syndrome (BrS) is a channelopathy associated with an increased risk of sudden cardiac death (SCD), characterized by distinctive electrocardiographic (ECG) patterns. While type 1 Brugada pattern is diagnostic, type 2 and 3 patterns are non-diagnostic and require further evaluation. The type 3 Brugada pattern, characterized by a <2 mm saddleback ST-segment elevation followed by a positive T-wave, poses significant diagnostic uncertainty due to its dynamic nature and overlap with benign ECG variants. Provocative testing with sodium channel blockers (e.g., ajmaline, flecainide, or procainamide) is often necessary to unmask a diagnostic type 1 pattern. However, the indications, timing, and safety of pharmacological challenge remain debated, particularly in asymptomatic individuals or those with low pretest probability. This review explores the diagnostic dilemmas of type 3 Brugada pattern, analyzes risk stratification criteria, and provides evidence-based recommendations on when to perform provocative testing. Key considerations include clinical history, family history of SCD, syncope of unknown origin, and the presence of arrhythmic symptoms. A structured diagnostic approach is essential to avoid both underdiagnosis and overmedicalization in this clinically ambiguous population.

Keywords: Brugada syndrome, Type 3 Brugada pattern, Provocative testing, Sodium channel blockers

INTRODUCTION

Brugada syndrome (BrS) is an inherited arrhythmogenic disorder linked to mutations in cardiac sodium channel genes (primarily SCN5A), leading to abnormal depolarization and repolarization dynamics. The syndrome is stratified into three ECG phenotypes: type 1 (coved ST-segment elevation ≥2 mm followed by a negative T-wave), type 2 (saddleback ST-elevation ≥2 mm with a positive or biphasic T-wave), and Type 3 (saddleback or coved ST-elevation <2 mm). Among these, only type 1 is diagnostic of BrS, whereas types 2 and 3 necessitate further investigation.[1,2]

The type 3 Brugada pattern is particularly enigmatic due to its low amplitude and transient presentation, often mimicking normal variants or secondary causes of ST-segment changes (e.g., electrolyte imbalances, myocardial ischemia, or autonomic tone fluctuations). Consequently, clinicians face a diagnostic conundrum in determining which patients warrant provocative testing to elicit a type 1 response. Current guidelines recommend sodium channel blocker challenge in cases of suspected BrS with non-diagnostic ECG findings, but the decision to proceed must weigh the risks of false positives, proarrhythmia, and unnecessary interventions against the potential benefit of identifying high-risk individuals.[2,3]

This article examines the clinical significance of the type 3 Brugada pattern, discusses the pathophysiological mechanisms underlying its variability, and synthesizes existing evidence on provocative testing protocols. Special emphasis is placed on patient selection, contraindications, and emerging biomarkers that may refine diagnostic accuracy. By integrating clinical, genetic, and electrophysiological data, we aim to provide a structured framework for optimizing diagnostic yield while minimizing risks in this challenging patient subset.[4]

EPIDEMIOLOGY AND CLINICAL MANIFESTATIONS

BrS is a genetically determined cardiac channelopathy with a heterogeneous global prevalence, estimated to affect approximately 1 in 2,000 to 1 in 5,000 individuals, though this may vary significantly across populations due to differences in genetic predisposition and diagnostic ascertainment. The syndrome exhibits a strong male predominance, with a male-to-female ratio ranging from 8:1 to 10:1, a disparity attributed to the modulating effects of testosterone on cardiac ion channel function, particularly the transient outward potassium current (Ito), which plays a pivotal role in the pathogenesis of BrS. Geographically, BrS demonstrates a higher prevalence in Southeast Asia, where it is implicated in a substantial proportion of sudden unexplained nocturnal death syndrome (SUNDS) cases, often manifesting as ventricular fibrillation (VF) in otherwise healthy young males during sleep.[4]

The clinical presentation of BrS is highly variable, ranging from completely asymptomatic individuals incidentally diagnosed through routine ECG screening to catastrophic events such as aborted SCD or syncope of arrhythmic origin. The type 3 Brugada pattern, characterized by a subtle saddleback ST-segment elevation of less than 2 mm followed by a positive T-wave in the right precordial leads (V1-V3), presents a particular diagnostic dilemma due to its low penetrance and intermittent nature. Unlike the diagnostic type 1 pattern, which exhibits a coved ST elevation with terminal T-wave inversion, the type 3 pattern is often transient, fluctuating with autonomic tone, fever, or pharmacological influences, further complicating its detection and clinical interpretation.[5,6]

Symptomatic patients may report palpitations, nocturnal agonal respirations, or syncope, typically occurring at rest or during sleep, a phenomenon linked to the vagal predominance and reduced sympathetic drive that exacerbates arrhythmogenesis in BrS. However, a significant proportion of individuals with a type 3 ECG phenotype remain entirely asymptomatic, raising critical questions regarding the necessity and timing of provocative testing. The risk of malignant ventricular arrhythmias in these patients is not negligible but remains poorly quantified, as the natural history of type 3 BrS is less well-characterized compared to its type 1 counterpart. Familial clustering of BrS, particularly in cases with pathogenic variants in SCN5A or other susceptibility genes, further underscores the importance of systematic evaluation, as asymptomatic carriers may still harbor an increased risk of SCD. Given the dynamic nature of the Brugada ECG patterns, clinical decision-making must integrate not only the resting ECG findings but also the patient’s personal and family history of arrhythmic events, as well as the potential triggers that may unmask or exacerbate the phenotype. Fever, for instance, is a well-documented precipitant of arrhythmias in BrS, and its presence may warrant urgent evaluation even in the absence of a baseline diagnostic ECG. Thus, the epidemiology and clinical manifestations of type 3 Brugada pattern necessitate a nuanced, patient-tailored approach to risk stratification and diagnostic intervention.[7,8]

CURRENT IMPLICATIONS IN THE DIAGNOSTIC CHALLENGE OF TYPE 3 BRUGADA PATTERN AND THE ROLE OF PROVOCATIVE TESTING

The diagnostic ambiguity surrounding the type 3 Brugada pattern carries profound clinical implications, particularly in risk stratification, therapeutic decision-making, and the ethical considerations of widespread provocative testing. Unlike the unequivocal type 1 pattern, which mandates immediate attention due to its well-established association with SCD, the type 3 phenotype exists in a diagnostic gray zone, where its clinical significance remains uncertain without further investigation. This uncertainty poses a significant dilemma for clinicians, as the decision to pursue sodium channel blocker challenge-a procedure not without risk-must be carefully weighed against the potential consequences of missing a life-threatening arrhythmogenic substrate. Current guidelines, while providing a framework for evaluation, often lack granularity in addressing the subtleties of type 3 presentations, leaving physicians to navigate a complex interplay of clinical judgment, electrophysiological expertise, and individualized risk assessment.[9,10]

One of the most pressing concerns in the management of type 3 Brugada pattern is the risk of false-positive and false-negative results during pharmacological provocation. Sodium channel blockers such as ajmaline, flecainide, and procainamide, while effective in unmasking a concealed type 1 pattern, can also induce arrhythmias in susceptible individuals, including ventricular tachyarrhythmias that may require emergency intervention. This inherent risk raises critical questions about the appropriateness of provocative testing in low-risk populations, such as asymptomatic individuals with no family history of SCD or arrhythmic events. Conversely, the failure to perform provocative testing in high-risk patients-particularly those with unexplained syncope or a strong family history of BrS-may result in missed opportunities for preventive interventions, including implantable cardioverter-defibrillator (ICD) placement in appropriately selected cases. The challenge, therefore, lies in identifying the subset of patients in whom the diagnostic yield of provocative testing justifies its inherent risks, a decision that must be informed by a comprehensive evaluation of clinical history, baseline ECG characteristics, and ancillary diagnostic modalities such as signal-averaged ECG or genetic testing.[11,12]

Emerging research has begun to explore alternative strategies to refine diagnostic accuracy in type 3 Brugada pattern, including the use of high-lead ECG systems, exercise stress testing, and advanced imaging techniques to detect subtle structural or functional abnormalities associated with arrhythmogenesis. However, none of these modalities have yet supplanted the sodium channel blocker challenge as the gold standard for diagnostic confirmation. Furthermore, the increasing recognition of "Brugada phenocopies"-conditions that mimic BrS ECG patterns in the absence of an underlying channelopathy-adds another layer of complexity, necessitating a thorough exclusion of secondary causes before attributing ST-segment abnormalities to a true BrS.[12]

Ethical and medico-legal considerations further complicate the diagnostic pathway, as the implications of labeling a patient with BrS extend beyond clinical management to psychological, occupational, and insurability ramifications. A misdiagnosis, whether false-positive or false-negative, can have far-reaching consequences, underscoring the need for a judicious and evidence-based approach to provocative testing. In light of these challenges, ongoing research into novel biomarkers, risk prediction models, and genotype-phenotype correlations holds promise for refining diagnostic algorithms and optimizing patient selection for provocative testing. Until then, the management of type 3 Brugada pattern remains a delicate balancing act, requiring a multidisciplinary approach that integrates clinical acumen, electrophysiological expertise, and a patient-centered perspective to navigate the uncertainties inherent in this enigmatic condition.[12,13]

RIGHT VENTRICULAR INVOLVEMENT IN BRS: PATHOPHYSIOLOGICAL AND CLINICAL CORRELATIONS

The intricate relationship between BrS and right ventricular (RV) pathophysiology represents a fascinating paradigm in contemporary cardiac electrophysiology, blending elements of ion channel dysfunction with distinctive structural-electrical interactions. The syndrome's characteristic ECG manifestations predominantly localize to the right precordial leads (V1-V3), suggesting a particular susceptibility of the RV outflow tract (RVOT) to the underlying pathophysiological mechanisms.[14]

At the molecular level, the RVOT myocardium exhibits a unique electrophysiological profile characterized by: Enhanced transient outward potassium current (Ito) density and reduced sodium current (INa) availability. Distinctive action potential morphology with prominent phase 1 notch. This intrinsic heterogeneity creates an ideal substrate for development of transmural voltage gradients under conditions of impaired sodium channel function, as occurs in BrS. The resulting dispersion of repolarization facilitates the development of phase 2 reentry, the proposed mechanism for VF initiation in affected patients.

Structural and ultrastructural studies have revealed subtle but significant abnormalities in the RVOT of BrS patients, including:[14]

1. ***Histopathological alterations***
2. Focal fibrosis, reduced connexin-43 expression, and mild fatty infiltration without meeting criteria for arrhythmogenic cardiomyopathy.
3. ***Microstructural disarray***
4. Disorganization of the subepicardial myocardial layers with altered gap junction distribution.
5. ***Regional wall motion abnormalities***
6. Demonstrable by cardiac MRI and echocardiographic strain imaging.

The predominance of RV involvement in BrS may be explained by several interrelated factors:[14]

- ***Developmental biology***
- The RVOT originates from the secondary heart field, which demonstrates distinct transcriptional regulation of ion channel genes.
- ***Wall stress dynamics***
- The thin-walled RV experiences greater mechanical stress variations that may modulate channel function.
- ***Autonomic innervation patterns***
- The RVOT receives denser sympathetic innervation with unique responsiveness to autonomic modulation.
- ***Thermoregulatory sensitivity***
- The anterior position of the RV makes it more susceptible to temperature fluctuations affecting channel kinetics.

Advanced imaging modalities have provided compelling evidence of RV involvement:[14]

- ***Cardiac MRI***

- Demonstrates regional RVOT hypokinesis and late gadolinium enhancement in 30-40% of BrS patients.

- ***3D electroanatomic mapping***

- Reveals prolonged conduction times and low-voltage areas in the RVOT epicardium.

Contrast-enhanced echocardiography

Shows microvascular dysfunction in the RVOT subepicardium.

The clinical implications of RV involvement in BrS are profound:[14]

Diagnostic considerations

The dynamic nature of RVOT electrical activity explains the fluctuating ECG patterns and the effectiveness of high precordial lead placement.

Risk stratification

The extent of RV structural involvement may correlate with arrhythmic risk.

Therapeutic targeting

Epicardial ablation of the RVOT has emerged as a potential treatment strategy for refractory cases.

Differential diagnosis

Distinguishing BrS from early arrhythmogenic RV cardiomyopathy remains challenging yet crucial.

Recent research has identified a potential continuum between "pure" channelopathic BrS and forms with subtle structural RV changes, suggesting that the traditional dichotomy between electrical and structural heart disease may require reconsideration. This spectrum hypothesis posits that varying degrees of sodium channel dysfunction combined with microenvironmental factors could lead to progressive RVOT remodeling in susceptible individuals.[15]

Future directions in understanding RV involvement in BrS should focus on-developing advanced imaging biomarkers of RVOT vulnerability, elucidating the molecular pathways linking channel dysfunction to structural changes, refining epicardial mapping and ablation techniques and investigating genotype-phenotype correlations in RV manifestations

The recognition of RV involvement in BrS has transformed our understanding of this condition from a purely electrical disorder to a more complex entity with distinct anatomical-electrophysiological interactions. This paradigm shift continues to inform diagnostic approaches, risk assessment strategies, and therapeutic innovations for this potentially lethal but fascinating syndrome.[15]

CONCLUSION

The diagnostic conundrum posed by the type 3 Brugada pattern epitomizes the intricate challenges inherent in the stratification of arrhythmogenic risk within the spectrum of channelopathies. As an ECG entity that resides in the nebulous interstice between definitive pathology and benign variant, its clinical interpretation demands a judicious synthesis of electrophysiological expertise, comprehensive risk assessment, and nuanced understanding of its dynamic manifestations. The imperative to distinguish between inconsequential repolarization anomalies and a potentially lethal substrate for VF underscores the critical role of provocative testing, yet the deployment of sodium channel blockers must be tempered by an awareness of their proarrhythmic potential and the psychosocial ramifications of diagnostic labeling. Current evidence suggests that the decision to pursue pharmacologic challenge should be predicated not solely on the presence of a type 3 pattern, but rather on a holistic integration of clinical history, familial predisposition, and the pre-test probability of a true BrS phenotype.

The absence of a universally validated risk stratification algorithm for type 3 Brugada pattern perpetuates a landscape of clinical equipoise, wherein the threshold for intervention varies across institutions and practitioners. This diagnostic ambiguity is further compounded by the evolving recognition of Brugada phenocopies, genetic heterogeneity, and the incomplete penetrance of pathogenic variants, all of which necessitate a circumspect approach to avoid both overmedicalization and underdiagnosis. While provocative testing remains the cornerstone for unmasking diagnostic type 1 patterns, its application must be meticulously tailored, with particular vigilance reserved for individuals exhibiting high-risk features such as unexplained syncope, nocturnal agonal respirations, or a family history of SCD.

Future directions in the diagnostic delineation of type 3 Brugada pattern will likely be shaped by advances in molecular genetics, enhanced ECG imaging modalities, and the development of refined risk prediction models that incorporate both clinical and subclinical markers of arrhythmic susceptibility. Until such innovations achieve widespread validation, clinicians must navigate this diagnostic gray zone with a balanced perspective-one that acknowledges the life-saving potential of timely intervention while remaining acutely attuned to the ethical, legal, and psychological dimensions inherent in the diagnosis of a condition with such profound prognostic implications. Ultimately, the management of type 3 Brugada pattern epitomizes the art of medicine in its most essential form: the careful calibration of uncertainty against actionable knowledge, always with the paramount objective of optimizing patient outcomes while minimizing harm.

Funding: No funding sources
Conflict of interest: None declared
Ethical approval: Not required

REFERENCES

1. Brugada P, Brugada J. Right bundle branch block, persistent ST segment elevation and sudden cardiac death: a distinct clinical and electrocardiographic syndrome. J Am Coll Cardiol. 1992;20(6):1391-6.
2. Antzelevitch C, Brugada P, Borggrefe M, Brugada J, Brugada R, Corrado D, et al. Brugada Syndrome. Report of the Second Consensus Conference. Circulation. 2005;111(5):659-70.
3. Kamakura S. Epidemiology of Brugada syndrome in Japan and rest of the world. J Arrhythmia. 2013;29(2):52-5.
4. Juang JM, Huang SK. Brugada syndrome-an underrecognized electrical disease 843 in patients with sudden cardiac death. Cardiology. 2004;101(4):157-69.
5. Derval N, Simpson CS, Birnie DH, Jeffrey SH, Vijay C, Jean C, et al. Prevalence and characteristics of early repolarization in the CASPER registry: cardiac arrest survivors with preserved ejection fraction registry. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2011:58(7):722-8.
6. Priori SG, Wilde AA, Horie M, Cho Y, Behr ER, Berul C, et al. HRS/EHRA/APHRS Expert Consensus Statement on the Diagnosis and Management of Patients with Inherited Primary Arrhythmia Syndromes. Heart Rhythm. 2013;10(12):1932-63.
7. Kapplinger JD, Tester DJ, Alders M, Begoña B, Myriam B, Josep B, et al. An international compendium of mutations in the SCN5A-encoded cardiac sodium channel in patients referred for Brugada syndrome genetic testing. Heart Rhythm. 2010;7(1):33-46.
8. Nademanee K, Veerakul G, Nimmannit S, Chaowakul V, Bhuripanyo K, Likittanasombat K, et al. Arrhythmogenic marker for the sudden unexplained death syndrome in Thai men. Circulation. 1997;96(8):2595-600.
9. Horie M, Ohno S. Genetic basis of Brugada syndrome. J Arrhythmia. 2013;29:71-6.
10. The Gene Connection for the Heart. Genetic mutations and inherited arrhythmias.
11. Gehi AK, Duong TD, Metz LD, Anthony JG, Mehta D. Risk Stratification of Individuals with the Brugada Electrocardiogram: A Meta- Analysis. J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol. 2006;17(6):577-83.
12. Bezzina CR, Barc J, Mizusawa Y, Remme CA, Gourraud JB, Simonet F, et al. Common variants at SCN5A-SCN10A and HEY2 are associated with Brugada syndrome, a rare disease with high risk of sudden cardiac death. Nat Genet. 2013;45(9):1044-9.
13. Raju H, Papadakis M, Govindan M, Rachel B, Chandra N, O'Sullivan A, et al. Low Prevalence of Risk Markers in Cases of Sudden Death Due to Brugada Syndrome. Relevance to Risk Stratification in Brugada Syndrome. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2011;57(23):2340-5.
14. Gray B, Gnanappa GK, Bagnall RD, Femia G, Yeates L, Ingles J, et al. Relations between right ventricular morphology and clinical, electrical and genetic parameters in Brugada Syndrome. PLoS One 2018;13:e0195594.
15. Frustaci A, Priori SG, Pieroni M, Chimenti C, Napolitano C, Rivolta I, et al. Cardiac histological substrate in patients with clinical phenotype of Brugada syndrome. Circulation. 2005;112(24):3680-7.

Cite this article as: Rojo PLM, Lopez DES, Andrade HDZ, López PEE, Mascareño CGC, Soto EAM. The diagnostic challenge of type 3 Brugada pattern: clinical implications and provocative testing strategies. Int J Res Med Sci 2025;13:2714-8.