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**Reviewer's report:**

* Major compulsory revisions
1. The research questions are contained in the background and are inadequately defined, especially 1) & 3): "other activities" need expanded, and uncertainty about participants judging the study's goals.
2. The results need to be laid out more clearly and in relation to the aims. Most results emerge in the discussion.
3. Assumptions are made and judgemental comments such as "decline in attitudes". There was an opportunity to use the results to challenge accepted notions that Dr centrality is counter productive to IPL. Perhaps focus groups to examine the results might have contributed to the body of knowledge & not reinforced what is already perceived.
4. The interventions are poorly defined and seem too wide ranging in relation to the responses (each respondent replied once on average).
5. The RIPLS tool implemented seems to be the undergraduate version. Why was the postgraduate version not used? (see reference 25).

Minor essential revisions.
1. Reference 25. should be " Reid R,..." and not "Reid B,..."
2. define terms used such as "professionalism"
3. Clarify statements such as "making gains in IPC"
4. Consider developing the discussion in relation to the results. States that "no improvement in attitudes...", yet results indicate increased communication and trust. The issues of some project gains & reduction of interprofessional rivalries should be developed to challenge established definitions of IPP

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.