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Author’s response to reviews:

12 Mar 2019

Esther Fagelson
BMC Medical Education

Dear Ms Fagelson,

Response to reviewers’ and editor’s comments for manuscript entitled "Acceptance of interprofessional learning between medical and pharmacy students in a prescribing skills training workshop: Pre-post intervention study" (MEED-D-17-00661R2)

Thank you for the Reviewers’ and Editor’s comments. We have amended the manuscript accordingly and the following is our point-by-point response to their respective comments:

Editor Comments:
1. Please read and address the comments provided by Reviewer 2 which can be found below.

Sure. It’s done.

2. We noticed that the corresponding author information provided on your title page is different to the one you indicated in the editorial submission. Please amend one so that they match.

We have amended the author information indicated in the editorial administration (where “50603 Kuala Lumpur” is missing) to be the same as that on the title page.
3. Please remove the response to the reviewers comments file from the file inventory as it is no longer needed at this stage of the editorial process.

Done.

4. At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Additional files should remain uploaded as separate files. Please ensure that all figures, tables and additional/supplementary files are cited within the text.

Done as instructed.

BMC Medical Education operates a policy of open peer review, which means that you will be able to see the names of the reviewers who provided the reports via the online peer review system. We encourage you to also view the reports there, via the action links on the left-hand side of the page, to see the names of the reviewers.

Reviewer reports:

Sharla King (Reviewer 2): I appreciate the author's thoughtful responses to the reviewers' comments. My only suggestion is with the survey itself to include a note that the word 'workshop' can be replaced with activity or experience or other appropriate word so that anyone wanting to use the survey is very clear they can alter that word. Alternatively, change to the word to activity/experience rather than workshop.

Thank you for the suggestion. A sentence on page 19 of the manuscript (Line 400-402) says that: “However, the term ‘workshop’ in the SAIL-10 is a generic term and can be substituted with other interprofessional activities, such as research project or assignment, and be used to assess such activity.”

In addition, a footnote is inserted in Table 1, which reads: N.B. The word “workshop” in this instrument may be replaced by another word that appropriately describes the IPL intervention used.