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Reviewer reports:

Reviewer #2: Page 2 line 46….I would not use "softer"

Suggestion : For medical students in lectures, narratives may be particularly relevant in promoting humanistic aspects of medicine, including professional identity, and empathy.

Thank you for this suggestion, I think this is better and have changed as you suggest

Page 12 line 43. use of first person. the editor should decide what is best

"I used a mixture of key questions with subsequent items depending on responses; some suggestions for prompts including reading them relevant passages of their lecture in which they used narrative; and used mainly open-ended questions (see question quide)."

Thank you, this now reads: “The interviews were based on a mixture of key questions with subsequent items depending on responses; some suggestions for prompts including reading them relevant passages of their lecture in which they used narrative; and used mainly open-ended questions (see question quide)”.
There are other places in the paper where the voice is not clear…first vs third etc.

I have changed all references to “I” and converted them to “The Author” or the study or other appropriate third person reference as requested throughout the paper.

Page 18 line 10-11 I do not have a key to read these colours

Here is an example of a narrative which I have identified and parsed according to Labov’s structural model (colours relate to the colours of clauses in the diagram):

The example of Labov’s structural model is in the appendix so I think the reviewers were unable to see it. I have decided that it is not essential to include a detailed explanation of how I parsed each narrative using this model, so I have deleted all the coloured examples – only Labov’s model itself remains as an illustration to show the model I used to identify story units.

The paper reads much better but continues to be long…. < Further edits regarding length are suggested.

Agree: bearing in mind all the suggestions for inclusion from reviewers, I have managed to shorten the paper by 716 words from 7602 to 6886 words.