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

Multidisciplinary Cardiovascular Annals
Article DOI: 10.5812/mca.106202
Published in: Multidisciplinary Cardiovascular Annals: In Press(In Press); e106202

Peer Review Report for "Analysis of Failure Modes in Anesthesia for Cardiac Surgery Using the Healthcare Failure Mode and Effects Analysis (HFMEA) Technique"

Author(s): Afshin Farhanchi, Zohreh Rahimi, Ehsan Saghehei, Farshad Farhani Deljoo

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	8 Jun 2020
Revised Date:	14 Dec 2020
Accepted Date:	23 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.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 20 Jul 2020

Dear EIC,
There are some shortcomings that should be corrected by the authors:
- Please use a full phrase instead of HFMEA in the title.
- Please separate the Result section from the Discussion
- Clearly present items of errors in 4 steps of cardiac anesthesia in detail.
- Please more discuss and compare your results with others.
- Scientific writing need to improved (Please use SRQR of COREQ guideline)
- It is necessary to explain HFMEA methodology to readers.
- Your findings are specific to your center, please explain them in the Discussion.
- In the Discussion section applicability, weakness, and strengths of HFMEA should be added.
Thanks.

Alireza Alizadeh Ghavidel: EIC | **Revision** (0) — 21 Jul 2020

Dear Authors,

Thank you for submitting your valuable manuscript. I would like to inform you that the article needs major revision according to our expert reviewer.

Regards

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.

Respond to the Editor

Dear Editor:

We greatly appreciate for your kind consideration and the thoughtful comments provided by the reviewers our manuscript. We have revised the manuscript on the basis of reviewers' comments for your reconsideration (The changes were done with red font). Response to reviewers' comments is appended below point by point.

We look forward to your positive response.

Yours sincerely,

Response to Editor's comments

****

Comment 1: Please use full phrase instead of HFMEA in the title.

Answer: In your opinion, the full phrase of Failure Mode and Effect Analysis was included in the title.

Comment 2: Please separate Result section from Discussion

Answer: In your opinion, Results section was separated from Discussion.

Comment 3: Clearly present items of errors in 4 steps of cardiac anesthesia in detail.

Answer: In your opinion, the cases of errors were clearly identified and explained in the discussion section. Necessary changes were made to the text.

Comment 4: Please more discuss and compare your results with others

Answer: In your opinion, the results of this work were compared with others in the discussion section.

Comment 5: Scientific writing need to improved (Please use SRQR of COREQ guideline).

Answer: The text of the article was scientifically and grammatically corrected.

Comment 6: It is necessary to explain about HFMEA methodology to readers

Answer: In your opinion, additional content was added to the method.

Comment 7: Your findings is specific to your center, please explain it in Discussion

Answer: According to the findings of the study in our center, the protocol of tranexamic acid was modified, the documentation of findings and care of patient during anesthesia and design of anesthesia sheet were modified. New monitoring was purchased for the center and using. The speed and accuracy of work during anesthesia increased by staff briefing session. Necessary changes were made to the text.

Comment 8: In Discussion section applicability, weakness and strengths of HFMEA should be added

Answer: The most important disadvantages of this method are time consuming and essential extensive and detailed information for methods modification, but it has a very high accuracy. Necessary changes were made to the text.

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 15 Dec 2020

Dear EIC,
I read the revised manuscript. The authors answered all questions and corrected the requested items. The manuscript could be accepted in this step.
Sincerely yours;

Alireza Alizadeh Ghavidel: EIC | **Revision** (1) 23 Dec 2020

Dear authors,
Thank you for revising the manuscript. It's my pleasure to inform you that the associate editor has been convinced by your responses and the manuscript will be published in the near future.
Regards