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Reviewer’s report:

This is an interesting paper that makes a useful contribution to our understanding of interprofessional education and theory driven evaluation.

This paper presents the first part of a theory driven evaluation, that of making explicit the program theory. The paper is well written, data have been gathered from a comprehensive range of sources and the paper provides valuable insight into the mechanisms through which education interventions work. Where the paper is weak is in the explanation of how the different data have been brought together to illuminate the program theory and discussion of the limitations of the study.

Compulsory Revisions

1. The methods section describes the sources of information accessed by the researchers and how data were collected and analysed. The results of the thematic analysis in terms of the categories and themes generated need to be included in the paper - a figure could be used for this.

2. The results section needs some explanation at the beginning of what is to be presented in the section and why and how the results have been synthesised into these groupings.

3. The source of the quotes from the date (results section) must be made clear.

4. The authors need to discuss the limitations of this approach to evaluation and their study.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. I think the results are being presented under 4 (not 5) headings, but the use of bold font and italics for the ‘Components of the intervention’ sub-heading is confusing.

Discretionary Revisions

1. There does not appear to be any consistency in the use of quotes in the ‘Validation of the program impact theory’ section (p20-22). None are used to illustrate the first and final theme, one is used for theme 2 and themes 3 and 4 have two.
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