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This is an interesting paper which will make a contribution to the field of IPE. The sample size is very small, and represents a small scale evaluation, so the major contribution needs to be about the learning from this process to ‘upscale’ the pilot, and general contribution to wider knowledge about the implementation of IPE programs (which is currently limited in the literature). To be most useful, a bit more information is required. I have outlined these under the ‘major essential revisions’ section below.

Major compulsory revisions

There are some internal inconsistencies with goals of the program. The abstract and the findings suggest that the goals are to effect the division of tasks and responsibilities. However on p7 of the manuscript, it refers to increasing collaboration between professionals. One of my concerns with IPE / IP practice is that there tends to be a focus on the implementation, without a clear understanding of what the purpose of the approach. The paper needs more clarification of the purpose, and internal consistency of the goals of the IPE program implemented here.

The paper would be strengthened by providing more information about how the IPE program was developed (based on what principles / theory/ literature)? For instance, some of the feedback related to the mode of delivery – how was this mode determined, and what learning can be taken away from this?

Table 1 requires more explanation in the text – and if possible, a different form of presentation. Can this be made more visual, for instance (eg maybe use lines rather than numbers in the table if this is possible)?

The conclusions / discussion need to reflect back more on the processes of implementation than the outcomes of implementation due to the small sample size. For instance, what would they do differently based on these findings? This should reflect back on the way the tool / approach was developed.

Minor essential revisions

Overall, this is a well written manuscript. However, there are a couple of places where there are some punctuation and pronunciation errors, and where some minor changes would improve the readability. Eg Under the heading “Advice to improve the program” the first sentence reads “Different advices were given to improve the program.” There are several other examples like this in the text
which require correction.
Discretionary revisions
Nil
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**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published
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