Reviewer’s report

Title: Students’ perception of interprofessional education in the bachelor program "Interprofessional Health Care" in Heidelberg, Germany: an exploratory case study

Version: 0 Date: 17 Sep 2017

Reviewer: Flemming Jakobsen

Reviewer's report:

Thank you for letting me review this qualitative study about: Students' perception of interprofessional education in the bachelor program 'Interprofessional Health Care' in Heidelberg, Germany.

The paper is clearly structured and well written. I will not recommend any major revisions. However, I have a few issues I recommend the authors to consider.

Background

You say: In countries like Canada, UK or Sweden… I suggest that you add Denmark (see P 6 - 7 in ref (3))

I suggest that you formulate a clear aim in the end of the background (like you do in the start of the discussion). This will make it more clearly for the readers what it is all about.

You refer to (13), but again, to help the readers, please elaborate a little on the content of the program, either here or in the methods setting. This will improve the readers understanding of what the outcome is resulting from. E.g., are you working with role-play, seminar, simulation, theoretical or clinical learning? How often and how long time are the students together? In the results section we are informed that the bachelor students also have courses together with the medical students - we ought to have been informed about this earlier. In addition, the teachers' professional background and training in teaching in the IPE setting may of relevance.

Method

Maybe you could elaborate a little on the 'qualitative approach'. As I see it, you have performed an explorative case study (Yin, R. K. (2014). Case Study Research : Design and Methods. London: Sage)

To describe and analyze the students' perception of the program. You could also add one or two lines, where you argument for the suitability of this approach here.
Why not insert the initials (VS & JM) instead of 'two interviewers'?

23 - 26 are almost identical with 54 - 56

'was developed and slightly adapted' why and how was it adapted?

Why both audio and video recording? Did you e.g. use the video recording for analysis of gestures or other physical expressions?

Who analyzed the transcripts?

Results

Table 1. A table must be intelligible without reference to the text, so please include an explanation of the abbreviations. The table would be more informative if you in a parenthesis after each profession included the number of that profession. As I see it, the format of table 1 & 2 does not live up to the journals standard.

Did all students participate in the interviews?

It would give a richer picture if you could add profession to the quotations.

Discussion

'Some students described different levels of medical knowledge as a difficulty'. It is an interesting but not unknown problem that students can be bored, when they have to listen to the other professions for what they find to be too long time. I suggest that you discuss this and include examples from the wider literature about others experience about this including suggestions for how to overcome the problem or even to use it as pedagogical approach by letting the students teach each other about issues from their own profession.

On you report students difficulties based on missing relevance of interprofessional learning because of little contact to other health professions in their future professional practice. I suggest that you include these difficulties in the discussion, including suggestions for how to make the teaching realistic and relevant to the students' future professional work.

Similar problems from the clinical setting have been described e.g in


P11 L16 & 23 I can see that the abbreviation 'VE' is used in the report you cite - but please avoid abbreviations here and spell the words out

P12 L 15 'conversations in the breaks are more effective'. You could include the Contact Hypothesis including intergroup friendship that may facilitate positive emotions and lead to more positive attitudes to the other group. See e.g.


P12 L36 I think 'not' has fallen out

P13 L17 'whereas learning with each other stille provided some challenges' Why - do you think? Was it because of the pedagogical approach? The topics? Other? Please discuss this and - if possible - include other / similar findings from the litterature.

P13 L 54 'This could be due to their pioneer status'. Can you relate this statement to other researchers' findings?

P14 L 4 According to P10 L25 - 27 your students were interested in more shared lectures with the medical students. Of course I here get curious about the medical students' opinion on this subject, but I understand that this is not included in this study. However, you could include examples described in the litterature concerning this issue.

Strength and limitations

I miss your considerations concerning transferability
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
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