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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for addressing most of the issues raised from my previous review of this paper. This is a valuable study to be reporting and I hope my further comments will be taken as a means to enhance its quality for others.

There are still a few issues that need to be attended to:

1. The use of acronyms: there are many acronyms in this paper two are troublesome and need to be written out. MDs is commonly considered to mean physicians in this paper it is mental disorders. Also CIP does not seem to be stated in full earlier in the paper. On pg. 10 line 9 you use IV's these are considered an intravenous' by most health professionals.

2. issue between reliability and validity of instruments: While you have addressed the reliability of all the instruments used there is no discussion of their actual reported validity. On pg. 10 line 24 you state "all instruments were validated" ones. But there is still no discussion on how they were validated. This is crucial when you are then reporting on your findings. Also as recommended by Tabachnick & Fidell (2012) when using validated instruments it is crucial to then retest your findings to determine if they continue to align with the validated fit of the validated and reported this measure. There is not attention to this issue yet in the paper. At best the comparisons between the reliability of your findings as compared with those reported should have been stated.

4. missing values: You report that you have less than 5% missing values (a value that allows for retention of the missing entries) but on pg. 10 line 50 that you replaced missing values with "means". Please explain why this was done as it contradicts your statement on pg. 11 line 20.

5. importance of team building to collaborative practice: On pg 13 para starting at line 14 you discuss issues that might relate to the findings around individual and structural characteristics. What is missing is the systematic reviews done by Rosen and Salas that specify the importance of taking teams outside of practice to build them for IP collaborative practice.

6. age of health professionals: on pg. 15 para starting line 44 you address potential issues that might relate to individual characteristics with age of respondents. You discuss about the younger professionals but miss a very important issue that since about 2012 all health professional programs are now accredited for teaching interprofessional education as one of their standards. A reference for this is AIPHE. see http://solr.bccampus.ca:8001/bcc/items/59facb1e-c138-17e9-e47d-57acd95d89e9/1/

7. Conclusions: While you provide a conceptual framework for your study (see figure 1) it does not seem that you actually ran the model to determine its fit with the data or whether any post hoc analyses were done to see if there were any mediators or moderators. These points need to be added to the imitations, or as further studies needing to be done in this part of the paper. While you ran regression analyses between your groups and the concepts, it would be valuable to state whether your actually ran the conceptualized model for its fit overall.
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