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Reviewer’s report:

I. Reviewer’s report (Please number your comments and divide them into):

a. Major Compulsory Revisions: (The author must respond to these before a decision on publication can be reached. For example, additional necessary experiments or controls, statistical mistakes, errors in interpretation)

1. Background (page 4) – First full sentence at top of page 4, starting with “Limited attention has been paid to GP and pharmacist attitudes towards collaboration.”: This sentence, although acceptable, is followed by a description of existing theoretical models that appear to be well developed and comprehensive in their coverage of the relevant dimensions of collaboration in the primary care setting (including GPs). The need for a new model and instrument to evaluate collaboration between GPs and pharmacists is unclear and requires further development. Precise statements regarding the limitations of existing models related directly to collaboration between GPs and pharmacists are necessary.

2. Background (page 5) – Specific aims 1 and 2 (regarding use of the hyphenated term “GP-pharmacist” in this section and throughout the manuscript): It would be better to refer to this one-dimensional collaboration and collaborative behavior as “collaboration with GPs” and “collaborative behavior with GPs” since this is more specific to the measures used in this project.

3. Discussion (page 11). The most significant limitation of this study is the one-dimensional nature of the questionnaire. Any reference to the impact of the results of this study on policy making, and implications to practice should be framed in such a way so as to emphasize the need for additional research towards a broader understanding of the predictors of collaboration from the relevant perspectives. This point warrants further discussion in this manuscript.

b. Minor Essential Revisions (The author can be trusted to make these. For example, missing labels on figures, the wrong use of a term, spelling mistakes):

1. Abstract, Background – Second sentence of ‘Background,’ starting with ‘Little is known about pharmacist’s attitudes towards collaboration with their GP counterparts…” The next sentence introduces the hyphenated term ‘GP-pharmacist’ collaboration. Since it is understood from the second sentence that the study focuses on pharmacists attitudes only, it would be sufficient to drop
the hyphenated phrase and replace it with ‘collaboration with GPs’ in item 1, and ‘collaborative behavior with GPs’ in item 2.

2. Abstract - Last sentence of ‘Methods’: The one-dimensional nature of the questionnaire should be mentioned more specifically in the Abstract. This can be accomplished by inserting the word ‘pharmacist’ prior to the word ‘attitudes’ as follows: “determine how pharmacists’ attitudes (as measured by the ATCI-P)…”

3. Abstract – Last sentence of ‘Results’: Please confirm that the word ‘surgery,’ when used as a noun in this context, refers to a GP’s primary care clinic or physician office, rather than an ambulatory surgery center.

4. Abstract – Last sentence starting with “Other factors found to predict”: Numeric findings and p-values should be included for these results.

5. Abstract – Last sentence of ‘Conclusions’: Related to the comment above, the questionnaire used in the study captures the pharmacists’ viewpoint only. The word ‘pharmacist’ should be inserted before the word ‘attitudes’ for clarity on this point (i.e., the ‘P’ in ATCI-P is insufficient). It should also follow that the results represent ‘pharmacists’ viewpoints’ regarding models of collaboration.

6. Background (page 5) – Last sentence of paragraph at top of page starting and ending with “Both these models allow for … but provide limited information regarding the variables that predict GP-pharmacist collaboration.” Citations to the underlying literature should be re-referenced here. Also, it is not evident from this sentence and paragraph why information regarding variables that predict collaboration is limited. Please clarify.

c. Discretionary Revisions (These are recommendations for improvement which the author can choose to ignore. For example clarifications, data that would be useful but not essential):

1. Background (page 3) – Second sentence starting with “It is now widely recognized…”: This sentence seems to refer to specific knowledge. Please consider adding appropriate references for this statement as it relates to models of care for the chronically ill (e.g., Bodenheimer T, Wagner EH, Grumbach K. Improving Primary Care for Patients with Chronic Illness. JAMA. 288(14)1775-9. [PMID=12365965].--Part Two. JAMA 288(15)1909-14. 10/16/2002. [PMID=12377092], etc).

2. Background (page 3). Third to last sentence of first paragraph starting with “Research to date has tended to focus on the effect of GP-pharmacist collaboration…”: Please provide references to these outcomes studies, or re-cite references 2-7 from the prior sentence (if these are the intended citations).

3. Background (page 6). Second paragraph starting with “Based on the qualitative interviews and previous research…”: For clarity, citations to this underlying research should be re-referenced (refs 7-25?). Likewise, in the third paragraph, references should be provided to previous studies mentioned in the first sentence.
Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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

Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests.