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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript has improved dramatically and is now much more coherent and clear. I learned a lot and think that it will interest readers.

- Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures or the wrong use of a term which the author can be trusted to correct) I would advise the authors to revise the tenses used in the different sections of the article: please the past tense when describing the methods and results p2, line 35, line 39, p 6 line 118, p 17 line 383, p 18 line 401, 402, 410
- p 19 line 419: how to deal instead of how deal
- P7, line 133: open-ended instead of open
- p17 line 367: it is not clear to me why suddenly why participants mention that systematization could allow medical students to move away from am purely experiential knowledge - did they discuss training issues in their own context?
- p 18 line 391-393: does it mean that the authors consider Italy to be a "monocultural" country? This should be more explicit and referenced.
- p 19 line 424: doctors minimize conflicts by acting in patients' best interest: what does it mean? How does it translate in practice?
- p487 line 480-483: the sentences are not clear

Finally, I think that it would help to have (in a box) a segment of a "argumentation theory" based dialogue between a doctor and a chronic pain patient in order to illustrate how argumentation theory looks like in practice.

Once these modification and clarification made, I consider the manuscript as suitable for publication. The last version should be revised by an English-native person.