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Reviewer’s report:

This is an interesting paper, which adds to the body of knowledge concerning undergraduate student attitudes to interprofessional education. The question is well defined, the discussion and conclusion are well balanced and supported by the data, and the limitations of the work are clearly stated. The title and abstract convey the findings of the study accurately. However, there are some methodological problems which need to be addressed, as well as issues concerning the writing style.

Discretionary revisions

1. It would be easier for the reader if more detail was provided in the text about how the factors and individual statements were scored.

2. Again, for ease of reading, the authors might like to consider limiting the information provided in Tables 4a to 5b to that concerning the results reported in the Results section.

Minor essential revisions

1. There are inconsistencies and errors in the citations in the text. The authors occasionally appear to be attempting to combine the Harvard and Vancouver styles of referencing. Please note that Pollard et al’s work is based in the University of the West of England, Bristol, and NOT the University of Bristol, which is a different institution.

2. The material in the Methods and Results sections would be improved by re-ordering. I would suggest the following order in the Methods section: discussion of the instrument used, including details of the new factor analysis and Cronbach’s alphas; description of the proposed sample, excluding the response rates; ethical issues; data collection; data analysis, excluding details of the new factor analysis and Cronbach’s alpha, but including methods used to compare demographic data, as well as those used to compare responses to the RIPL Scale factors/statements. The Results section could start with reporting of the response rates, and the analysis of the student groups in terms of demographic factors, before moving on to reporting the results of the scale analysis.

Major compulsory revisions

1. There are numerous language errors in the paper, which detract from its
quality. I would recommend that the authors enlist appropriate support to raise their written English to the required level. In this regard, I would suggest using the word ‘gender’ instead of ‘sex’.

2. The re-ordering of the RIPL Scale is not satisfactory in terms of numbers of items per factor, or in terms of Cronbach’s alpha, for three of the factors. Only the ‘Team Player’ factor is satisfactory. I would suggest that either the other three factors need to be extended and tested by the addition of more statements; or the authors could consider reporting only on responses to the ‘Team Player’, and additionally provide and discuss results for individual statements not included in that factor as appropriate.

3. The authors have only reported their results concerning the reliability of the new factors. Please explain how the ‘Team Player’ factor’s validity was established.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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