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Reviewer's report:

General
Thank you for the opportunity to review the revised manuscript. My previous concerns have all been satisfactorily addressed. The paper now contains a stronger statement about its limitations and lack of generalizability, while properly claiming that it raises questions of relevance for other medical educators interested in the medical humanities. The rationale for the choice of course to study, while apparently a matter primarily of pragmatism and convenience, is also now presented in the paper. Similar, the method of selection of students to be interviewed is made explicit, as is the researchers' efforts to interview both mainstream and outlier individuals. It is also emphasized that the content of the interviews was cross-checked with data from field notes, thus increasing the validity of the conclusions. More information about the authors' backgrounds is also provided, which both establishes the different types of expertise which they brought to the project and acknowledges the possibility of bias (in two) as participant-researchers. Finally, although I did not see Reviewer Macnaughton's comments, I did review changes in the manuscript addressing her critiques, and they seemed to me to improve the manuscript in terms of clarity and context.
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