

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

Therese Zink

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

A cross-sectional study that was designed, piloted, and distributed to final years of two student cohorts, Med/Dental and Pharmacy, was conducted. The objective of the present study was to evaluate the knowledge and attitudes of pharmacy, medical, and dental students regarding various aspects of IP education and also to explore their views about IP collaboration.

Here are some suggestions to improve the manuscript:

Introduction sets the stage well.

## Methods

- Study area: If word count is a concern, we could eliminate "In 2004, students of the three colleges had to enroll in a foundation year with common courses. However, later the system changed, and the pharmacy study plan was modified to include a separate first year of pharmacy instead of the foundation year." This sentence doesn't add much because we learn later that the only common courses shared by students of the three colleges are principally elective courses.
- You describe the study years of the pharmacy students; should you do the med and dental students as well?
- After the description of the questionnaire, add that answer options were agree/disagree/neutral.

## Results

- You contradict yourself. You say: 1) fifth-year pharmacy students and 2) fifth-year medical and dental students, pharmacy and medical/dental students at 2 universities. 70% return rate. Later you say: A total of 250 students were approached and invited to participate in the study, but only 209 students voluntarily participated and filled in the questionnaire, producing a response rate of 83.6%. Choose one.
- Ideally, I'd like to see you compare P and M/D students who said they had shared courses and/or research and those who did not for the Section 3 IP questions. If numbers are too small to do this, then add it as a limitation.
- In presenting results, it would be easier to follow if you organized like you have the paragraph that starts Table 3 shows... Table 4 ... Table 5 shows and summarize the main points. The repetition of (table 5) in parentheses was hard to read.
- Again, MD students admitted a willingness—what %?

Table 2 is confusing: The subtitle says questions to pharm students, but the questions sound like MD questions (Will you be willing to consult a pharmacist for the best treatment schedule for your patient?)

These sentences in your discussion belong in our results. "About half of the respondents from the three colleges claimed that they shared common courses. Here, it must be mentioned that participants in our survey were not asked to list the courses they shared. However, going through the study plans and time schedules for each college, it became clear that the only courses that some students may have shared were elective courses taught by healthcare and non-healthcare faculty."

Discussion:

Usually, you want to start the discussion with a brief summary of your findings, then connect how it does or does not align with the literature. Yours is quite long. I would organize the following topics:

1. Research showing the impact of pharmacists as HC team members

2. Your study findings - brief summary of the highlights

- knowledge

- attitudes

- ethics

3. Issues related to lack of shared classes/research at the school and research that suggests the importance of this.

Limitations: agree lack of nurses, sample size, lack of data collected on reported shared classes, and comparison of M/D and pharm who did and did not share classes.