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Title: Psychosocial Issues Discovered through Reflective Group Dialogue between Medical Students

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to review this qualitative research study. This manuscript brings a timely and much needed qualitative perspective of medical students' reflective experiences of psychosocial issues amongst patients and their family during a pediatric clerkship.

My comments are intended to guide the authors and strengthen and enhance the manuscript for future publication.

Title: Appropriate

Abstract: The abstract is well written and includes all necessary information. However, I suggest in Background you write: This study sought to determine psychosocial (p. 3 line: 43) to make it clear to reader your research aim. Authors should also set the content and include that this study was completed as part of paediatric clerkship. The results section uses different themes that in manuscript. This is confusing and should be changes for consistency (p. 3, line: 55-57). I also think the conclusion needs a sentence to relate back to why this study is important and informs medical education.

Keywords: include the words; Biopsychosocial model.

Background: well written, provides content and rationale for project. However, I think last paragraph (p. 8, Line: 143-149) needs to be re-worded. I suggest clearly repeating the
purpose/aim of the research and explain concept of narrators, peers and teachers role (p. 8: line 147) in more detail.

Methods: Again clarify in this section the role of the narrator (p. 9: line 9) e.g. whose story is being told? The patient or the medical students? Under group discussions please include more information e.g. What is Gibbs reflective cycle and how was it used? Did you include reflective prompts in reflective writing assignments and/or group discussions, if so what were these? Was the reflective assignment assessed and was this completed before or after the group discussion? How long did each of the six group discussions go for?

Results: Theme 2: Diverse patient perspectives (p. 12 line 228) What is "should not drive a nail to prevent…" In theme 4 you mention on p. 15:line 268-269 providing resus among family members with sick elderly relatives and I was unsure how this fits with BPS in a paediatric setting. I suggest you move final paragraph (p. 15: line 277-282) to discussion section as this is not part of results.

Discussion: There was quite a lot of discussion around effect and role of mass media (p. 17; Line 319-322, however this was only briefly mentioned in theme 6. I suggest you should include some more information in theme 6 result section to mirror discussion points. The Gibbs reflective cycle is mentioned on p.18 Line 340 but not defined or explained in background/or methods section. How does this reflective cycle relate to your findings and the importance of fostering reflective capacity in medical students so they can consider BPS model of care. I suggest when you mentioned Interprofessional practice (p. 20: line 365-368 and link it to delivery of holistic medical care you find a suitable reference on the advantages of interprofessional team work in health ( e.g. A best evidence systematic review of interprofessional education: BEME Guide no. 9). Fix some grammatical errors e.g. P. 22 (line 403-408 sentence too long etc).

Conclusions: I think this section can be strengthen. On p. 25 Line: 458 you mention level 2 Kirkpatrick evaluation model. This needs to be referenced and explained in main text further.

Congratulations on a well written manuscript on an important and under researched area.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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