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Reviewer's report:

Once more, I read this paper with great interest. Despite the authors' argumentation and some adjustments, a few points should be clarified and revised before publication.

The goal of this paper was to identify characteristics of interprofessional education in the United States. This article consisted in describing these features based on a survey. The authors argue that descriptive studies are important and should be considered. Although this is true, it is not clear in the Introduction what the authors are trying to identify or describe. Based on the previous remarks of the reviewers, the authors should strengthen their introduction, leading to a clear aim or research question. The other reviewer has commented that it might not be suitable to be published as a research paper. This was probably because of the lack of a clear aim. It is not clear why describing different interprofessional education programmes would be substantial from a research point of view.

The Methods section is clearly written and well structured. However, now it is missing the data analysis section. The authors have decided to focus only on the descriptive statistics, which seems more adequate than before. I would like to recommend the authors to add the data analysis section.

The Results section is clearly written and well structured. I would like to recommend the authors to re-structure the article accordingly to their three goals. In that way, it would be easier to make the connections between their goals and the outcomes. It would also help the authors to focus their discussion on the main outcomes. Still, the other reviewer and I have concerns about the response rate. I am wondering whether their findings are representative of the United States or even of the programmes that have an interprofessional education. This would affect their discussion section, which is overstating their results.

In the Discussion section, some phrases overstated their results. For example, the first phrase "IPE is currently being used by over half of our survey participants from GME residency programs", it is not accurate, since their response rate was low. Overall, the Discussion section needs to focus on their findings. The authors assume that their study is representative of IPE programmes but clearly is not, because of their response rate. Also, there some paragraphs that should be moved to the results section. An example is "The top five reasons for implementing IPE are improving collaboration, communication, patient safety, teamwork, and efficiency. These concepts should be at the center when implementing future IPE activities". Another example is "Overall, there did not appear to be many statistically significant differences between
the programs that had implemented IPE and the programs considering it regarding their characteristics, goals, and measured outcomes. These results are encouraging; it appears as though those interested in IPE have practical and feasible ideas for how to incorporate IPE into their programs.” This paragraph is actually strange since the authors did not conduct any statistical analysis. This should be removed from the discussion. The authors raised important questions about the implementation of IPE, and they should discuss more this gap, which is very informative.

Overall, the article needs a major revision of the English. Besides, that are many typos that the authors should revised as well. For example, the phrase "IPE is currently being used by over half of our survey participants from GME residency programs.to our knowledge" has a dot between words.
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