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Reviewer's report:

Paper of interest in helping to understand place of aptitude tests in selection. Well written and of appropriate length.

Minor Essential Revisions

Some minor typos in text and references e.g. curricula not curriculums, and use of Capitalisation.

Lead into results section is a bit bald - lists the tables first. Maybe embed the first 2 paragraphs further down.

Discretionary Revisions

For readers outside UK it would help to understand roughly how the three tools are used together to make selection decisions - e.g. are they combined into a score, or used as a threshold. You state that UCAS has no value, but presumably you do think that applicants to medical school must meet a certain academic standard - is this measured using the UCAS?

Despite your correlations, the R2 still are pretty small and concordant with the only other large study of its type, again based on data from 2 medical schools, which also found very low predictability of a similar test UMAT.


Incidentally you might better refer to UMAT in your paper, as it is the tool used in Australasia to select into undergraduate programmes. GAMSAT is used for entry to graduate programmes and contain science questions (similar to MCAT).

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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