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Sub: Submission of second revised version of manuscript

Dear Editor

We are submitting the second revised version of the manuscript which has been thoroughly revised in the light of reviewers’ comments. The response to specific comments is as follows.

Reviewer John Mclachlan

We thank the reviewer for his comments. The quotes from student participants have been put in quotation marks. Where the quotes have been paraphrased then it has been mentioned in the text. We have also mentioned this towards the end of the Methods section.

Reviewer Johanna Shapiro

Major compulsory revisions:

We have tried to tie in the stated objectives of the module and the findings of the student survey on the use of paintings as suggested by the reviewer. The percentages and statements suggested by the reviewer have been interpreted in the Discussion. This has been done on the last paragraph of page 13 continued onto page 14 and the first paragraph of page 15. Possible reasons for small number of respondents stating the use of paintings were in line with module objectives and its implications for future modules have also been discussed.

We have tried to focus the Discussion mainly on interpreting the results of the present survey as suggested by the reviewer. The sections on ‘Art in medical education’ and ‘Visual arts and clinical skills’ have been shifted to the
Introduction. These sections have been shortened. We first give a broad perspective of the use of arts in medical education and visual arts and clinical skills and then go on to describe our module.

We have tried to link the results of the study with selected studies from the literature regarding visual art and development of empathy and other characters.

1) A section linking the use of paintings and the module objectives has been added (last paragraph, page 13, page 14 and first paragraph, page 15 as already mentioned). Possible reasons for only few respondents explicitly stating the use of paintings met module objectives has also been added. We have already speculated why our students found it difficult to interpret paintings in the section ‘Interpretation of art in Nepal’. The potential clinical implications of study findings have been discussed on page 16, paragraph 1.

2) As suggested by the reviewer the section has been left unchanged.

3) The authors have speculated on potential clinical implications of the study findings (page 16, paragraph 1).

4) The paragraph regarding gender and financing differences has been shortened (page 17, paragraph 2).

Minor essential revisions:

The name of the module and why it was chosen is explained in the Introduction section. The title may not be directly connected to paintings which were only one of the learning modalities used in the module (page 5, last paragraph).

We apologize for misspelling the name of the reviewer which was a typo and it has now been corrected (page 7, first paragraph).

We unfortunately did not study the participants’ perception of the exercise on using role-plays or poems/songs to interpret paintings. This has been mentioned in the study limitations (page 17, paragraph 3). We have also mentioned this in the Methods section of the Abstract.

We have removed the references to the NYU database from the Results and the Discussion. This was a point we wanted to study but we have not been able to do so properly and interpret the results in a convincing and useful manner.

The headings have been reorganized and activities connected with paintings have a separate small paragraph.

The differences paragraph has been given its own subheading and has been partly rewritten.

The order of references has been changed due to the different modifications carried out. Two references have been added in support of the statement on page 17.

On page 27, table 3 we have mentioned the number of respondents in the bracket following each statement. In addition we have also carried out the formatting changes requested to ensure the manuscript conforms to the journal style.

The current modifications and clarifications have been carried out using red font
in the manuscript.
Hoping for a favorable consideration
Thanking you
Yours sincerely
Dr. Shankar & coauthors