

Review of: "Views and Attitudes of Pharmacy and Medical/Dental Students Towards Inter-Professional Education and Collaboration in the United Arab Emirates"

Olanrewaju Olamide Popoola

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This article aims to address a very important factor that influences patient outcomes: interprofessional collaboration. Interprofessional collaboration (IPC) has been proven to reduce medication errors, adverse side effects, and increase optimal health outcomes. Nonetheless, the manuscript can be greatly improved. I have some recommendations to improve the quality of this research manuscript.

The abstract

The abstract followed a structured format with sections for background, objectives, methodology, results, and conclusions, giving it a coherent flow. However, the results section primarily reported demographic data. The article could gain more attention, readers, and citations if some key findings were included in the abstract. Additionally, reporting the factors that statistically influenced perceptions of interprofessional collaboration would make the abstract more informative.

Introduction

Your introduction seeks to outline the crucial role pharmacists play as part of the healthcare team and the significance of promoting interprofessional communication between pharmacists and doctors. However, your introduction would be strengthened and supported by evidence if you provided a reference at the end of each sentence rather than grouping them together at the end of the paragraph. Furthermore, it is essential that you critically review previous research done and published on interprofessional collaboration among students in the UAE and other countries, identify gaps in existing research, and then explain how your current study addresses those gaps.

Method

While the description of the study area is important, incorporating it into the introduction would enhance the overall structure of your article. It seems you are utilizing a questionnaire previously employed in Kuwait. In the introduction, it would be beneficial to identify that some studies have explored the topic of interest in other settings like Kuwait, but no similar research has been conducted at the universities you are focusing on.

Please provide details on how the minimum sample size was calculated. What was the total population size? What confidence level and margin of error were used to determine the minimum required sample size?

Results

Your excellent use of tables presented major findings in a concise manner. In one glance, I was able to compare responses across pharmacy students and medical students. Presenting some of your key findings and statistically significant analyses in your abstract could improve the scientific credibility of your paper.

Lastly, in the abstract, you stated that 212 students completed the form, with a target of 300 responses. However, in the results section, you mentioned receiving 209 responses from the 250 students invited to participate in the research. Please review these numbers again to ensure consistency.

Discussion

You adequately compared results from your study with other findings and demonstrated areas of agreement and differences. Additionally, you highlighted some challenges to interprofessional learning among pharmacy and medical students at the undergraduate level. Furthermore, you proposed strategies to foster interprofessional collaboration between pharmacists and doctors in professional practice through workshops and case scenario exercises. It is also commendable that you consciously employed active voice sentences to convey your ideas clearly and directly.

The discussion sums up the overall relevance of the research and compared it with previous findings. I suggest that the difference in the percentages observed in your research and previous research be stated.

For example, contrary to our result that highlights that the majority (ABC%) of medical students are open to collaboration, Coster et al. (2008) reports otherwise with just 15% of doctors.

The discussion section could be enhanced by improving its overall structure and organization.

Additionally, thorough language editing is recommended to rectify grammatical errors and replace informal language with more scholarly, academic phrasing throughout the text. Addressing these areas would improve the quality and professionalism of your writing.

Limitations

It is commendable that you acknowledged the sample size limitation of this study. However, there may be other potential limitations worth considering. For instance, the Hawthorne effect, wherein participants may modify their responses because they are aware their opinions are being assessed, could have influenced the results. Conducting a second thorough review would be beneficial to identify any other limitations that should be disclosed and discussed. Comprehensively addressing the study's limitations enhances transparency and lends credibility to the interpretation of the findings and their implications.

Incorporating the feedback provided will significantly enhance the quality of the overall manuscript. Precise and

meticulous reporting of the methods employed and the findings obtained is vital to establish the credibility and significance of the research study. Addressing the points raised ensures that the presentation of the work is clear, consistent, and adheres to academic standards, allowing the study's contributions to be effectively conveyed and impactful within the scholarly domain.