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

Shiraz E-Medical Journal
Article DOI: 10.5812/semj.97662
Published in: Shiraz E-Medical Journal: 21(9); e97662

Peer Review Report for "Over Medication and Waste of Resources in Physicians' Prescriptions: A Cross Sectional Study in Southwestern Iran"

Author(s): Mohammadreza Heydari, Morteza Mehraeen, Hassan Joulaei

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 1 Sep 2019
Revised Date: 31 Dec 2019
Accepted Date: 17 Jan 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: Reviewer | Revision (0) 5 Nov 2019

Dear AE,
I read it carefully. It discusses the waste of resources due to non-compliance with clinical guidelines by physicians. It assesses the physicians' prescriptions in a typical disease (Streptococcal sore throat) to show that prescriptions could be less costly.
I believe that this topic is interesting enough, especially in low and middle-income countries. My majors' concerns are as below:
• The first paragraph of "Background" needs to be rewritten; as is it seems that just financial resources are limited;
• The manuscript seems to be translated verbatim/literally from a non-English language and needs English language editing and also re-writing of some informal words [Prescriptions were priced, ….].
• The cited references in the "Introduction" and "Discussion" sections need to be updated as the manuscript is submitted to be published in 2020.
• Use of the hypothetical patient is a limitation of the study which must state in the manuscript.
• In the manuscript the word "budget" has been used. While the use of this word is not accurate in this study.
• Statement of "based on the data published from Shiraz University of Medical Sciences in

2016” in the “Study design” section is incomplete and needs an exact number.
• In some part of the manuscript state that “Standard treatment of the disease was determined based on the opinion of the professors”, while it was claimed that the prescriptions are compared to standard treatment based on clinical guidelines.
• It is better than mean, median, mode, min, and max insert in Table 2.
• Table 3 is confusing. Need correction.
• In “Results” please add international currency in a parenthesis.
• Although out of pocket is important, it can change based on the insurance coverage. It isn’t noted in the manuscript.
• In Table 4 add a row that shows the total.
• In the “Results” section was stated that “We did not find any relation between cost of medication and other factors”, What factors and with what statistical analysis have been investigated? These should also declare in the “Method” section.
• I saw an unnecessary wordiness in the “Results” section which lengthens this part of the manuscript. Two pages of “Results” can be summarized in a table [just a suggestion for the authors to improve their manuscript with lesser word count which makes their paper more precise and easier to understand].
• The authors stated in the conclusion that: " patients out of pocket payments are high ", but they did not perform any evaluation in this regard!
• I think the authors should suggest some practical solutions for the important topic of waste of resources much more than they provided now in the conclusions. I mean this section is recommended to be more conclusive.
Minor comments:
• (pg. 4 line -22) Participation in this project: Participation in this project
• (pg. 6 line -5) “using appropriate statistical tests” isn’t necessary.
• The second line of the “Results” section, age of their work experience: work experience
• (pg. 5 line 12) typo "Anesthesiology"
• (caption of Table 4) typo " deviation "
• The manuscript needed technical modifications according to the journal's style/format
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 26 Nov 2019

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) 29 Nov 2019

Dear Author,
The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to reviewers' request.
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.

Dear reviewer

Thank you for your scientific and accurate point of views. I and co- authors read your comment carefully. Most of them can help us to improve our manuscript. We try to correct all of them .

My majors' concerns are as below:

•The first paragraph of "Background" needs to be rewritten; as is it seems that just financial resources are limited;

The first paragraph was rewritten; Line 30 and 31

• The manuscript seems to be translated verbatim/literally from a non-English language and needs English language editing and also re-writing of some informal words [Prescriptions were priced, ….].

The complete English rewriting and editing was done and a certificate was sent.

• The cited references in the "Introduction" and "Discussion" sections need to be updated as the manuscript is submitted to be published in 2020.

The majority of references were new. Some of the work remained because it was done in Iran and no other references were available. Line 242-246 and 257-259 and 281-291.

• Use of the hypothetical patient is a limitation of the study which must state in manuscript.

It is added in manuscript. Line 223-224

• In manuscript the word of "budget" has been used. While use of this word is not accurate in this study.

All words were corrected. Line 7, 71 and 212

• Statement of "based on the data published from Shiraz University of Medical Sciences in 2016" in "Study design" section is incomplete and need exact number.

The accrue number is write. Line 77 and 78.

• In some part of the manuscript state that "Standard treatment of the disease was determined based on the opinion of the professors", while it was claimed that the prescriptions are compared to standard treatment based on clinical guidelines.

The text book guide line is added. Line 88-91

• It is better that mean, median, mode, min and max insert in Table 2.

Because its report the frequency of prescription by the number of prescribed drugs, add of mean, median and.....is impossible.

- *Table 3 is confusing. Need correction.*

It is corrected.

- *In "Results" please add international currency in a parenthesis.*

In all calculation it is added. Line 158-182

- *Although out of pocket is important, it can change based on the insurance coverage. It isn't note in manuscript.*

It is explained completely. Line 225-227.

- *In Table 4 add a row which show the total.*

Because it is showed quartile the total not meaning.

- *In "Results" section was stated that "We did not find any relation between cost of medication and other factors", what factors and with what statistical analysis have been investigated? These should also declare in "Method" section.*

It is explained. Line 142 and 143.

- *I saw an unnecessary wordiness in the "Results" section which lengthens this part of manuscript. Two page of "Results" can be summarized in a table [just a suggestion for the authors to improve their manuscript with lesser word count which makes their paper more precisely and easier to understand].*

We tried to summarize everything we could in the tables, but due to some differences in groups and subgroups it was not possible in other cases.

- *The authors stated in the conclusion that: "patients out of pocket payment is high ", but they did not perform any evaluation in this regard!*

It is explained completely. Line 225-227.

- *I think the authors should suggest some practical solutions for the important topic of waste of resource much more than they provided now in the conclusions. I mean this section is recommended to be more conclusive.*

It is explained completely. Line228-231.

Minor comments:

- *(pg. 4 line -22) Participation in in this project: Participation in this project*

  It is corrected. Line82

- *(pg. 6 line -5) "using appropriate statistical tests" isn't necessary.*

  It is omitted. Line 95

- *The second line of "Results" section, age of their work experience: work experience*

  It is corrected. Line99

- *(pg. 5 line 12) typo "Anesthesiology"*

  It is corrected. Line102

- *(caption of Table 4) typo "deviation"*

  It is corrected. Line133

- *The manuscript needed technical modifications according to the journal's style/format*

  Manuscript modifications according to the journal's style/format

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: EIC | **Revision (1)** 17 Jan 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.