

# 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"

Khaled Keraa<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Misr International University

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you very much for giving me the chance to review such an interesting topic. I really appreciate the sincere efforts of the authors; however, there are some minor revisions and clarifications that need to be addressed to improve the manuscript.

**Title:** Please include the study design (cross-sectional study) in the title.

**Introduction:** The objectives of the study included assessment of knowledge, attitude, and views regarding IP education and collaboration. The title of the article reported views and attitudes only. In the results, I couldn't find clear (knowledge) questions with clear knowledge levels, e.g., Level of knowledge is ...%. In addition, all the questions are directed to IP collaboration, not education.

**Study area:** The description is very clear and gives an insight into the colleges. The authors reported including students of medical, dental, pharmacy, and health sciences colleges, but in Table (1) of the results, there are three colleges only without mentioning the health sciences college.

## **Study population:**

1. Please add the total number of students that comprise the target population. The authors should have clarified whether they distributed the questionnaire to all students in the target population or chose a sample. In my opinion, in such studies, we should benefit from the finite population of students.
2. Why didn't the piloting of the study include the health sciences college?
3. It would have been better to distribute the questionnaire to professors from different colleges participating in the study, not only pharmacy professors.

**Ethical approval:** Please add the trial registry number (if present).

## **Results:**

1. The authors should have justified why they merged medical/dental students as one cohort.
2. Table 1: There are no students from the college of health sciences.

3. All the tables assess IP collaboration; there is no clear data for knowledge and education.
4. The only variable that influenced IP collaboration was ethnicity; this conclusion is based upon univariate analysis using a Chi-square test. It could have been better to use multivariate analysis to assess factors affecting IP collaboration, putting into consideration the interaction between these variables.

**Discussion:** The main concern is regarding two points: knowledge and education. I see that the study gave a larger weight to views and attitudes towards IP collaboration, not education. The authors stated that the results of the present study demonstrated a reasonable level of knowledge and a positive perception among participants of the three colleges towards IP education and collaboration. What is this level? How was it classified as (considerable)?

**Limitations:** Please elaborate on time constraints that led to a small sample size. Was the study supposed to target all final year students (finite population), or was there a sample size calculation?