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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper which evaluates a four-year intervention concerning implementing interprofessional learning and collaboration in the Australian Capital Territory.

Although a well written paper I think the readers would benefit from some clarification of the interventional initiatives because it is not so easy to evaluate the results when the intervention is unknown.

Major compulsory revision

1. Page 5 ‘Methods’ line 5 and the rest of the paragraph. Here some explanations / examples of content and form of interventional initiatives are needed.

2. Page 7 ‘Results’ line 1 and continued. Please explain what is included in ‘substantial IPC improvement’, ‘feedback sessions’, ‘educational workshops’ and ‘other interventional activities’.

3. Page 11 limitations. Please also mention that we do not know anything about e.g. the respondents’ age, gender and profession. I might have been the young nurses that answered the questions one year and the consultant physicians that responded another year.

Minor essential revision

4. Page 4. In the last paragraph the words ‘interprofessionalism’, ‘cross-professional’ and ‘interdisciplinary’ are used apparently random. I would prefer consistence in the wording.

5. Page 5 under ‘Survey samples and procedure’ you could consider moving the answering percent to the results section. In the same paragraph you write ‘Of the 74 % who did not check ……’ This is a pure guess. You can delete it or leave as you find most convenient.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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