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Dear Editor

We'd like to thank the reviewers for their further comments. Below we have responded to the specific changes requested by the reviewers. We have highlighted the further revisions in the revised submission.

All three reviewers have commented on how effective the revised version reads and two of the reviewers (Reviewers 2 and 3) are happy for the paper to be published as it is.

'I would personally consider the manuscript appropriate for publication.' Reviewer 2

'I have read the other reviewers' comments, the authors' response and the revised manuscript. They have done an excellent job and I have no further recommendations. I consider it worthy of publication as is'. Reviewer 3

Review 2 requests a clarification of our discussion on extracurricular activities. Our focus is on the mechanisms behind professional identity formation. In line 166-175 or more specifically in lines 173-5 we describe that these mechanisms behind professional identity development also operate when students undertake appropriate extracurricular activities. We present data that shows that certain extracurricular activities leads to self-actualisation and changed horizon in the participants. We have revised the sentence in line 173 to make this point clearer to the readers. We have provided a definition for ‘dry run in lines 38-9 and 171 and we feel this provides a differentiation between ‘invitation to participate’ and ‘dry run’.

Only reviewer 1 has an issue with the words transference and counter transference. Even though reviewer 2 has commented on it, he is happy for the manuscript to be published in its current form. If reviewer 1 would like to suggest alternative terms, we would be happy to consider it but we are concerned that this may alter the paper and make it unacceptable to the other two reviewers. On reflection, we still feel that the current terms (transference and counter transference) are the most appropriate to describe our data.

We thank you sincerely for your time in considering the revised version of the paper for publication.

Yours sincerely

Pirashanthie Vivekananda-Schmidt, James Crossley and Deborah Murdoch-Eaton