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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?: No

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?: No

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:

In their manuscript, the authors describe an episode of liver failure, apparently attributed to Quetiapine. The manuscript sent to me electronically did not have the liver biopsy figure attached.

The authors need to detail all the doses of all the medications that the patient was taking prior to the onset of liver dysfunction.

It is important to know whether the patient was still on Pramipexole or not.

At the end of the case report it is commented that the patient had mildly elevated liver enzymes, but I think it would useful to specifically state what the results were.
The authors need to improve the English and grammar within the manuscript. For example, in the first paragraph of actual case report some of the sentences are in the present tense, while others are in the past tense. A major re-write is needed.

When talking about pressure measurements, the authors need to be aware that the case report may be read by non-hepatologists in addition to hepatologists. An explanation of the pressure measurements is needed – e.g. ‘21/13 (18) mmHg’ – this needs explaining so that a non-hepatologist can understand.

Minor points:

Last sentence of introduction needs to emphasise that the ‘potentially dangerous adverse events’ refers to liver injury.

Abbreviations: in the lab results section – abbreviations need to be explained and units of all measurements need to be added, e.g. g/l for immunoglobulin levels.

In the Discussion section the second paragraph contains a four line sentence which is far too long and needs breaking down.

In the sixth paragraph of the discussion there was a sentence starting “According to King’s College prognostic criteria…”, but this sentence does not make sense and needs further clarification if it is going to be included.

A comment is made of “a third case from Texus”, and this needs referencing.

**Declaration of competing interests:**

Please note I declare that I have no competing interests’