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Reviewer's report:

This is a very important article that provides a methodological framework for developing and testing new tools related to interprofessional learning.

Method:

1. Can you elaborate on the reasoning of why the peer assessed video assessment was added in 2015, and what were the components of the peer assessment?
2. Can you also report on the reliability of the tool? Internal consistency measures and interrater reliability seem to be two applicable measures that could be used.
3. Can you clarify whether the data being analyzed is the dialogue at the workshops, the written comments on the rubric by participants, or both? I think there is some description of it just ahead of the results, but I think it would benefit from being stated outright.

Results:

1. The descriptions and raw quotes are helpful. Can you elaborate more on the changes that were made in a thematic fashion as well?
2. Inclusion of students, especially since they did peer assessment, is fantastic.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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