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Which of the following best describes what type of case report this is?: An unexpected event in the course of observing or treating a patient

If other, please specify:

adverse drug reaction report

Has the case been reported coherently?: Yes

Comments to authors:

Has the case been reported coherently?
--------------------------------------
- Yes; simple, but well written

Is the case report authentic?
----------------------------
- No; the authors state at the outset in the introduction that this adverse reaction to TICLID, namely hepatitis and blood dyscrasia has already been reported a few authors. Furthermore, the heading of "cholestatic hepatitis" is erroneous for the toxic liver injury generated by Ticlid in this case. The enzyme pattern reflects a mixed hepatocellular (AST 551, ALT 560) and cholestatic (ALP 821, GGT 449) hepatocyte injury without overt cholestasis as bilirubin was normal!

Is the case report ethical?
---------------------------
- Yes; although rechallenge with Ticlid would have been solid proof of causality between the drug and bone marrow/liver toxicity, a fatal toxicity could have evolved, and the authors wisely did not subject the patient to rechallenge.

Is there any missing information that you think must be added before publication?
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
- Yes; liver biopsy (obtained via transjugular route would have been safe) would have added much information as to causality between Drug and adverse reaction. Furthermore, in vitro lymphocyte testing may have added some
information relating Ticlid to the adverse reactions.

Is this case worth reporting?
---------------------------------
- No; not in present form due to errors and omissions mentioned above

Is the case report persuasive?
---------------------------------
- Yes

Does the case report have explanatory value?
------------------------------------------
- Yes

Does the case report have diagnostic value?
------------------------------------------
- No

Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?
------------------------------------------
- Yes; as a reminder about this potential adverse drug reaction, although the reaction has been reported previously

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?
------------------------------------------
- Yes

Comments to authors
------------------------------------------
see above
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