

Review of: "Attitudes, and Knowledge of Pharmacy and Medical/ Dental Students towards, and Barriers to Inter-Professional Education and Collaboration in the United Arab Emirates"

Dr Purvi Bhagat¹

¹ B.J. Medical College

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you for submitting your work to this portal. It is important work in the field of interprofessional relationships. Please find my inputs on your current submission below:

1. Title appears to be unclear and grammatically incorrect. You may want to rewrite more clearly and aptly phrased. Would also recommend to place the word "Knowledge" first and "Attitudes" later for the obvious chronology that lies between them.
2. The study being done in 2018, I wonder if the presented results would be different and relevant in the current times!
3. Abstract: The objective may be aligned with the title. Methods may mention the tool which was used (questionnaire) and its format (online / physical). Could not gather the relevance of the result "were living with their families" and "were self-sponsored" with respect to the study. The results for medical and dental students may be further segregated as they are different specialties. The barriers to IPC may be enumerated. The knowledge domain, which is also one of the objectives, needs to be addressed. The current conclusion does not align with the study objectives. It may be written in alignment with the title, objectives, and results. Nursing students have not been a part of the study population, so its mention may be avoided.
4. Introduction: Abbreviations, when used for the first time, may also be written in their expanded forms. The statements "Four colleges..... students share many elective courses, and scientific and extracurricular activities" and "The only courses shared by students of these colleges are few elective courses" appear contradictory.
5. Methods: Study design needs to be mentioned. In the study area, historical and non-relevant aspects may be avoided. The abstract mentions a study on final year students, while here, it mentions 4th year of pharmacy and 5th year of medical as well, which are apparently not final years. Were there any open-ended questions in the questionnaire? If yes, please mention their analysis and results. The consent should have been informed written consent and not just verbal.
6. Results: The abstract mentions that 212 students participated (and 209 were analysed), whereas results mention 209 participated – please verify. The results for medical and dental students may be further segregated as they are different specialties. Abstract and Discussion mention "More than half of the participants were between 21-23 years" while in results, it mentions "20-24 years" – please verify.

7. Table 1: There are many values which are mentioned as 'missing', but the abstract also mentions that incomplete questionnaires were excluded – please clarify. Please explain the rationale for studying 'accommodation' and 'tuition fees'. Writing full forms of P, MD, and % may provide a more scientific and technical outlook to the article and for the readers.
8. Discussion: Some components have not been mentioned in Results. Please check and align both sections and avoid those which are not in alignment with study objectives. Some sentences are duplicated - please rectify.
9. Limitations: The inherent limitations of self-reported questionnaires need to be mentioned.
10. Conclusion: It may be written in alignment with the title, objectives, and results.
11. The terms IP relationships, IP education, and IP collaboration have been used interchangeably throughout the manuscript. You may please check and use them appropriately.
12. The article has some typographical and language errors which you may want to rectify.

Best wishes....