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Reviewer's report:

The background while interesting is a bit long and repetitive. I would ask the authors to provide a more concise outline of the pedagogical theory for using narrative and why it is an important construct for their paper.

Typo page 7 Categorize

Page 7 should be written in prose as a purpose of the paper and not as aims and in outline form.

Page 8, the author uses a first person narrative that is atypical for medical journals, it is also not clear what the person's position has to do with the methods.

Use the Author instead of "I"

The author did not comment on how they might have or participated in "data checking" ie using a triangulation approach to determine if the analysis made "sense" to the participants. The process is not clear on the top of page 12…how persuasive the author was….did the author discuss their analysis with the participants? What was the content of the discussion? Did the process "taint" the data by co-constructing meaning?

Page 13. the use of colors…Labov's model is not clear to the novice reader…it makes the authors findings confusion and difficult to read

It is not clear Labov's model relates to the typology of narratives and vice versa
The result section should be much more concise it is presented in away that does not "develop a story" for the reader…it feels a bit haphazard in its approach to what appears to be interesting and intriguing findings

The conclusion does not clearly tie into the abstract.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**

If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**

If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**

If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**

If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**

Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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