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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper. I agree with the authors that facilitating future health professionals to develop and nurture the practice of interprofessional collaboration is of critical importance for optimizing patient outcomes. A study to explore barriers and facilitators to interprofessional education delivery within the Pharmacy Faculty in Qatar offers perspectives from a region that differs geographically and culturally from existing research, the majority of which have focused on education in the "Western" world. However, I have a number of concerns about the quality of the study as outlined below.

Title: The title is somewhat generic and offers limited enticement for the reader. While one might be 'interested' in the perspectives of others, I feel I may not be sufficiently enticed to read further. The Authors might like to consider highlighting the study findings in the title.

Abstract: The abstract is poorly written, contains a number of grammatical errors, did not clearly define the study methodology or the study participants and repeated information unnecessarily. Please review and restructure.

Manuscript

Background: Contains grammatical errors and fails to provide justification for the current research. Information to strengthen this section are presented elsewhere in the manuscript. In addition to the specific suggestions below, please consider restructuring this section.

P1
Line 12 - This sentence does not make sense. Please clarify.
Line 33 - "These mechanisms are very different and hence health policy..." What are 'these mechanisms' and how are they 'different'?

P2
Line 2-6 what does 'usually' mean?
Lines 47-53 how do the training environments differ? How might they be 'uncomfortable' and how was their 'not enough knowledge' tested?

P3
Lines 10-12 what were the two activities? Were individual members of the Pharmacy Faculty interested or were the activities an institutional initiative?
Aim: There are two aims stated yet the author states 'the primary aim' which infers a singular aim

Method: The method section is poorly constructed and lacking vital information.
- The authors have not clearly identified the roles of the participants or provide justification for their segregation into the two groups.
- The authors refer to a 'hierarchy' but do not provide clarification about why this is important. Are there differences in perceived status between those who deliver the teaching and are engaged in practice when compared with those in administrative roles? This confusion is further compounded by reference to both groups as being 'academics' and the use of the word 'faculty'.
- The recruitment process is unclear. If the participant recruitment and consent process was previously reported, please provide a brief summary.
- Was an interview guide used facilitate discussion? If so, please provide examples of the guiding questions.
- How was the data 'thematically' analysed? Did the authors use an inductive or deductive approach?
- Only two focus groups were conducted and the authors made no mention of data saturation. Was data saturation reached? How was this determined? Did the authors consider conducting one-on-one interviews with some of the participants? If not, why not?
- Were the interviews conducted in English? If so, were the interviewees fluent in English?
- Please include the ethical clearance code for the project

Results: There are grammatical errors, inconsistent use of coding for participant identification and presentation of information that belonged elsewhere e.g. in either Background or Discussion sections present through out. I found this section difficult to read. I urge the authors to consider restructuring this section.

Discussion: This section contains information that should have been presented in preceding sections e.g P14, Lines 9-25 should have been presented in the Background or Methods section, P15 Line 40-60 should have been presented in Background section. Overall, it is difficult to assess the quality of the discussion section due to the issues identified above. I also question the authors' assertion that they were able to address the study limitations (limited participant numbers and limited participant roles), by way of the having the group discussion take place over a two hour period.

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

No

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

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

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
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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