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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for taking the time with conducting the study and writing the article. The manuscript at hand highlights an interesting dynamic in post graduate medical education that might be overlooked at times. Below are my comments by sections:

1- Abstract:
- Over all well described.
- Aim was too vague to draw on for readers approaching this manuscript, I would suggest rephrasing it to better highlight the primary aim of the study.
- There were no Keywords, I would recommend for authors to have a look at the journal policies and add keywords in alphabetical order.

2- Background:
- Some acronyms, G.P for example, have not been introduced to the readers.
- In paragraph 2 line 27, 2016), is written which did not make sense. I would recommend either explaining or removing it.
- There have been few statements that lacked proper citation or were not cited at all, please review and amend accordingly.
- In page 1 paragraph 3 lines 48 to 56, this sentence I think it might fit better in the paragraph about aims of the study page 2 paragraph 2.

3- Methods section:
- The authors did not specify any inclusion or exclusion criteria about study participants, the number of invited study subjects per sub group was not identified nor the reasons study subjects did not participate in the study.
- Have all the investigators conducting the interviews been trained to mitigate the inter-interviewer differences.
- Between focused groups and on phone interviews, subjects who had the phone interviews had more time to discuss with the investigators, this might cause a bias in the results obtained, could you please explain this point.
- In analysis section, line 57, the authors mentioned about "interview guide", what is this and how is it related to the interviews condition. And were all interview conducted in English, or was it translated once it was transcribed? and could this have caused some issues to be missed in translation?
- The level of experience for each of the study participants could it be a confounding factor in IPE and IPC, this was not highlighted. Please specify this.

4- Results:
- I would recommend that a general summary of the transcribed interviews to be added as a supplementary file.
- The authors had in few instances go on to discuss their results in the results section, I would recommend that this take place in discussion section.

5- Discussion:
- is there any role for IPE and IPC among each sub group, e.g among senior GP trainees and juniors.
- If each group was introduced to the other group job description, would this help in promoting more IPE and IPC among healthcare team?

6-References:
- 11 out of 18 references are older than 5 years, I would highly recommend using the most recent evidence.

7- Other general remarks:
- The authors did not specify any recommendations based on their work, and no future plans for further work.
- There has been scattered grammatical and punctuation mistakes throughout the manuscript, please review.
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