Dear Editor,

We read the comments of our dear reader about our article entitled, “Which social values are considered in Iranian health system?” We want to thank the reader for his valuable notes, and we want to explain some points about the paper. Health systems provide health services to meet the needs of a population through limited resources. This limitation makes it necessary to set priority and allocate resources based on both ethical and technical approaches. So, we aimed to identify the social values applied in the health priority setting of the Iranian health system. In response to our dear reader’s notes:

First of all, as the dear reader implied, we did not deliver a clear definition of social values but we tried to show the meaning of social values by some examples. We mentioned values like fairness, human dignity, freedom, and ... to help readers in having a real picture of social values.

Second comment of dear reader about the paper: “Autonomy of providers as a value has a significant effect on priority setting in the health system of Iran.” In response we should say that “we got most of the information for our study through interviewing. Unfortunately, interviewees did not mention “autonomy of providers” as a value so we did not present this value as a study finding.

Third comment of dear reader: “The authors did not indicate whether the values with highest importance are terminal values or not.” As we explained in the paper, our study didn’t aim to determine the most or least important values. We just tried to identify the values without determining their importance.

Fourth comment of our dear reader was, “Moreover, the human dignity as a potential value considered in priority setting in health system has been mentioned in the first table of the study but unfortunately has been missed in following steps of analysis.” In response, we should say that “the human dignity” and some other values were rejected in the third phase by experts. So, we removed the values that had been rejected by experts in Delphi phases. In other words, experts did not accept some values as important social values and just some values have been sent for accrediting through Delphi.

Finally, our study, like others, had some limitations. First, some interviewees didn’t know the appropriate concept of social values and the interviewer suggested some examples and it is possible that interviewees’ interpretation about social values have been affected through our suggested examples. Second, Parliament Members and administrators were the participants of the study while it was better to interview the public as well.
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