**OPEN PEER REVIEW**

## Open Peer Review (OPR)

As a new feature for progressing towards transparency, we decided to open a new window for all of our editors as well as authors titled "**Open Peer Review**". We hope by this new facility, our reviewers will be more motivated and authors will be more satisfied with the review process. We believe that publishing our peer review reports could make a transparent and clear environment for all our efforts within a journal, but not all reviewers tend to publish their comments.

## What is "Open Peer Review" process?

An "Open Peer Review" process is making the details of all review process (including reviewers, associate editors, and EICs comments) as "Public" as it is agreed by EIC, Authors, and reviewers.

## Advantages of "Open Peer Review" process

- More transparency, constructiveness and tactful comments of the peer review process: leads to an increase in the quality of reviews
- More motivations for all involved roles in the review process
- Authors' satisfactions from the review process: Increases honesty between authors and reviewers
- Education of both authors and new students
- Prevents reviewers from following their individual agendas and leading to the detection of reviewers' conflicts of interests

You can find out more at:
https://sites.kowsarpub.com/kowsar/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Journal of Medical Education
Article DOI: 10.5812/jme.111595
Published in: Journal of Medical Education: 20(1); e111595

# Peer Review Report for "Dealing with Futile Treatments Based on the Humanistic Approach"

**Author(s):** Parham Pooladgar, Shabnam Bazmi

## Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 24 Nov 2020
Revised Date: 15 Dec 2020
Accepted Date: 19 Dec 2020

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

**Leila Afshar**: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 27 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
This is a well-written manuscript on an important issue, however, it would be better than the authors mentioning the educational impact of the problem and proposing some educational policy or strategy for managing the medical futility problem.
Another point is that what was the author's purpose of reviewing the guidelines on the topic? in my opinion, it would be better to have a critical review on them or it would be better if they could mention the educational impact of the other countries' guidelines.
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: Associate Editor | Revision (0) — 8 Dec 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs major revision.
Kind regards,

**REFEREE**: EIC | Revision (0) — 8 Dec 2020

Dear Author,

Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs major revision. Please follow their comments as requested.

Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

## Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

Reply to reviewers:

Thanks for your attention to our article. We are interested to emphasize on teaching some topics such as medical futility during the course of medical education. In this submission we tried to show this importance and by presenting the policies in other countries show the way to reach a policy for our country. Unfortunately we could not find any artcle to show this subject directly but in revised document we presented the importance of the problem and by adding some new references we tried to answer the reviewers comments.

The changed parts are written in Red font.

Thanks a lot

**OPEN PEER REVIEW**

**Revision (1)**

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

**REFEREE**: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 19 Dec 2020

Dear AE,
The revision is acceptable, however the manuscript needs native editing.
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 19 Dec 2020

Dear EIC
Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.

**REFEREE**: EIC | **Revision** (1) 19 Dec 2020

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.