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Reviewer's report:

General comments

This is an interesting article about perceptions of interprofessional team work in a small sample of pharmacy and medical students in Texas. The paper needs more reasoning and clear focus in the introduction in order to qualify for an international journal. The Medicare's Annual Wellness Visit Clinic is some kind of intervention that may be known for Americans, but it requires much more description for an international public. Some details from it can be read from the discussion, but more needs to come in the introduction/methods.

Further, there is redundant abbreviations that makes the paper a difficult read. I would suggest to limit most of the abbreviations (IPE, IPCP and TTUHSC is OK) to the method and result chapters. All abbreviations should be totally removed from the abstract!

Major compulsory revisions

1) The Introduction needs restructuring, the major reason for this study starts in the last paragraph for page 4. This should be lifted forward on the expense of the general stuff about education and practice in teams in North-America, that may be shortened. The reason for using the three domains in your instrument should also be accounted for in more detail. It is referred to some reviews in the beginning of the discussion, what instruments and questions were asked in these studies? Did you have any hypotheses about outcome of these domains among pharmacy and medical students a priori?! – This could also be linked to the contents of the “AWV intervention”. What could be expected?!

2) Methods:

There should be more details here about the AWV clinic that could complete what is written in the introduction.

The face validity of the 20-item instrument is poorly described, why these items? Are there other validated instruments that resemble your items/domains? E.g. Role Clarity is a much used concept in occupational health and psychology research. Some items were inspired from a Scale of Attitudes toward collaboration that has not been linked to a reference in the text – only below the table?!! The lack of reasoning for face validity also applies to the final three items, included by chance...?

3) Discussion: This should start with a short description of your major findings.
These finding should then be validated with findings from other studies. There may be important original findings in the referred reviews that either support or contrast your own! You have some discussion of your findings at the bottom of page 10 and page 11 to 12 which is good, but all this is internal validation. The paper also needs external validation.