

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

Maria Pramila D Costa¹

¹ Ministry of Health, Sultanate of Oman

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Peer Review Report

• First look

- The manuscript addresses a valid research question.
- The language is simple and easy to comprehend.

• Title

- The title is clear and concise, but some variables are missing, such as knowledge and barriers.

• Abstract

- The abstract is self-sufficient and without any citation.
- The abstract is summarized well; however, based on the revision, to be considered.

• Introduction

The introduction and the background lack what is known from the previous literature, hence lacking clarity in the gap identified. The importance of the collaboration of Pharmacy students is only emphasized, while the role of other health professionals is overlooked. What is the importance of the study, and how students are going to benefit from IPEC environments can be added, which gives a solid ground to draw the purpose of the study.

Studies that support knowledge and attitudes are **outdated** as there have been plenty of IPEC studies in the last 10 years, including from Middle East countries. (Paragraph 2)

In Paragraph 3, the University of Sharjah is only addressed, while the background of Ajman University is lacking.

Knowledge and Barriers are not addressed in the title and the introduction, but this can be seen in the methodology.

The suggestion is to add more review literature supporting the background and the study variables.

- **Methodology:**

1. Study area: It is evident that an elaborative explanation of the Pharmacy curriculum is addressed, whereas the medical and dental curricula are not given much importance. It should cover the other programs as well. What is in common and how the other programs also benefited from the study. Also, explain the nature of the second setting of the study, like what programs are conducted, geographic distance from each other, whether there is any collaboration between the two universities of any sort, and whether the entry level requirements and exit levels are the same for all the participants, etc.

2. Study Population:

- What study design was used?
- Are there any sampling criteria?
- What sampling technique was used?
- Were the tools prepared for the study or adopted from a previous study?
- The psychometric properties of the validated tools are not addressed at all, as there are several standard tools for attitude and perception for IPEC and IPC available.

Suggestions: The above-listed study concept should be addressed appropriately.

- It would be better to specify if there is any reference number for the ethical review approval.

Results:

Standard format of addressing the results should be consistent throughout the manuscript.

In the first paragraph of the Results, please give frequency outside the parenthesis and the percentage in the parenthesis in the text. It is correct in the table. This should be followed in consequent tables 3 and 4 as well.

Table 2 is confusing.

The first few questions seem to be addressed to the medical students (questions 2, 3, and 4).

Please revise and check Table 2. The table title shows both participants, while the table shows only pharmacy students' responses. Reference: Table 1: N=80

The hypothesis of testing significant difference, I believe, through ANOVA/T-test gives better interpretation, while Table 7 is about association where the chi-square is apt for it. I think based on the normality of the data, the author can choose parametric or non-parametric analysis here. Kindly recheck.

There is inconsistency in mentioning the variables in the discussion such as perception is used instead of attitudes (3rd paragraph in the discussion). Levels of knowledge are not addressed exclusively in the results.

- All tables are cited consecutively in the text. However, Table 2 title needs to be reconsidered.

- **Conclusion** of the study should be distinct from the suggestions and the future recommendations
- **References**

Inconsistent referencing in some places. If APA is followed, it should be followed throughout.

The overall rating of the article is 3 out of 5. There is a scope for improvement of this manuscript before accepting it as a final version.

Peer reviewer's best wishes to the authors