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To
The Editor
BMC Medical Education

Sub: Submission of revised version of manuscript number MS: 1100291472444591

Student feedback on the use of paintings in Sparshanam, the Medical Humanities module at KIST Medical College, Nepal

Dear Editor

I am submitting the revised version of the manuscript titled Student feedback on the use of paintings in Sparshanam, the Medical Humanities module at KIST Medical College, Nepal

The manuscript has been thoroughly revised in the light of the reviewer’s comments.

Reviewer 1: John C Mclachlan

Comment 1: The manuscript has been copyedited by Dr. Huw Morgan, a GP educator and medical educationist from the United Kingdom. We have
acknowledged his help in the Acknowledgements section.

Comment 2: The qualitative research methodology has been described in detail in the Methods section.

Comment 3: The Discussion section has been rewritten keeping in mind comments by different reviewers. The repetition has been decreased. At the same time Discussion has been modified according to the comments of other reviewers.

Comment 4: The conclusion has been modified. We have emphasized that participants were satisfied with the module.

Reviewer 2: Johanna Shapiro

Major compulsory revisions:

The discussion has been substantially modified and rewritten in many places. New references have been added and we have tried to make the discussion more focused.

We thank the reviewer for her appreciative remarks.

The second paragraph on page 12 has been removed.

The sentences about low male participation in the study have been shifted to the limitations paragraph at the end of the Discussion.

The issue of why interpretation of art may be difficult for medical students has been covered in the last paragraph of page 12 continuing to page 13.

The reason why we were interested in students visiting the literature, arts and medicine database has been described on page 13, paragraph 2.

The point about writing stories and poems has been shifted to its own paragraph just following the one on advantages of learning through paintings towards the end of the Discussion section.

The sentence beginning with median scores has been deleted.

The point about the study being carried out in a single institution in Nepal has been mentioned at the beginning of the Limitations paragraph.

Minor essential revisions:
The language corrections kindly pointed out by the reviewer have been carried out. The manuscript has been copyedited by Dr. Huw Morgan, a GP educator and medical educationist from the United Kingdom. We have acknowledged his help in the Acknowledgements section.

Other revisions:

Suheadings have been used in the Results section.

Page 4 the meaning of Sparshanam has been clarified.

Page 6. The list of paintings has been put in tabular form as table 1.

Page 7. The importance of method of financing has been noted on page 7. There was no significant difference between self-financing and scholarship students and we have mentioned this in the Results and tried to explain it in the Discussion section in a separate paragraph along with gender.

The significance and implications of students visiting the NYU database has been mentioned on page 12, paragraph 3 continued on to page 13.

Page 11. The sentence has been added.

Page 12. The reason for low response rate of male students may not be linked to gender and a possible explanation has been put forward in the first paragraph of page 15.

The detailed description of the paintings has been omitted.

Page 13, the significance of visiting the NYU database has been explained.

In all tables where relevant both numbers and percentages have been given. In table 4 (which has now become table 5 with addition of a new table) means and SD and p values have been added.

Discretionary revisions:

The suggested paper has been added in the text and cited in the references.

Page 6 examples of how groups have been named have been provided.

The word ‘also’ has been added.

Reviewer 3: Mehmet Ali Gulpinar
Discretionary revisions:

General comments: The study was not carried out in the classic method of a qualitative study.

Abstract: Modifications have been carried out to the abstract.

We thank the reviewer for his comments about the Introduction.

We have carried out modifications to the Methods, Results and Conclusion in the light of comments by the reviewer and other reviewers.

The revisions and modifications have been carried out using a blue font in the manuscript. If any further modifications and clarifications are required we shall be happy to oblige

Hoping for a favorable consideration

Thanking you

Yours sincerely

Dr. Shankar & coauthors