Reviewer’s report

Title: Pharmacy academics’ perspectives towards Interprofessional Education prior to its implementation in Qatar: a qualitative study

Version: 0 Date: 14 Aug 2018

Reviewer: Gary Rogers

Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting study that explores the opinions of mid-level and leading academics in a Qatari pharmacy school in relation to the implementation of interprofessional education and collaborative practice.

The study appears to have been generally well conducted but the paper needs significant revision before it will be ready for publication. Firstly, I would like to see a little more description of the actual process employed for the qualitative analysis. The reference to Braun and Clarke’s paper on thematic analysis is welcomed, but Braun and Clarke provide for multiple variations of methodology and it would be important to know exactly what the authors of this paper did to analyse their data.

The findings are currently a little hard to make sense of as the subthemes seem to be focused at quite detailed level and there is relatively little synthesis of these granular findings into larger, meaningful themes. The relative paucity of quotations in the findings, which is necessitated by the sheer volume of lower-level analysis, also leaves the reader without a real sense of how the findings have been drawn from the data. I would recommend another look at the analysis to derive fewer sub-themes, each with more evidence of support from quotations. It may be best to do this in a table similar to the Table 1, but with at least one included quotation to support each subtheme, then simply summarise this in a narrative way in the text. Sometimes a diagram can also help to provide a visual representation of the findings at a higher level that makes them more readily comprehensible to a reader.

Unfortunately, the Discussion section also needs quite a lot more work. At present it is largely a reiteration of the findings, with a few added references. The authors need to compare their findings with what was known and has been reported prior to their paper, explicitly comparing and contrasting their findings with those of prior authors, noting where they agree and where they differ. For this paper, it would be particularly interesting to know how the findings from a study in this culture differ from similar studies undertaken elsewhere. The findings around concern regarding mixed-gender education and the cultural dimensions of practice hierarchy would be particularly interesting to delineate in this fashion.

Finally, there are a few minor typographical and grammatical errors that should be corrected before resubmission.
This paper could represent an important contribution to our understanding of IPE implementation globally and I would strongly encourage the authors to revise their paper and resubmit.
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**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
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