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Reviewer's report:

There are still some errors, apparently produced by the format transfer. For example, there are words that run together, and other words that have gaps in them. Please fix these errors.

There is still a need for some copy-editing. For example, there are some run-on sentences and some awkward phrasing.

Finally, there are some unsupported (and possibly illogical) statements that should be deleted or referenced with citations.

More specific suggestions are below, on a page-by-page basis:

p. 2: The fact that the Supreme Court has ruled affirmative action legal does not render it an obligatory commitment, but rather a choice for universities. “Legal commitment” should be changed to some other phrase, such as “legal option.” Also, this phrase should be followed by a comma, so as to not apply that the commitment or option is for the Supreme Court.

Middle of page: “fostersan exceptional”: change to “fosters an exceptional…”

p. 3: second line: fix “groupsand ”; fix “classes,” where the second “s” is superimposed on the first.

third line: “ninetieth” – spelling – should be “nineteenth”

Middle of page: fix “CarnegieFoundation …. Flex ner’s”

Assertion that Flexner “claimed” to visit the schools is derogatory and implies that he may not have visited them. Unless there is evidence that he made false claims, eliminated the phrase and simply say that he “visited” the schools.

Phrase “in a prominent and caustic approach” should be moved to just after the word “summarized.” He summarized his findings in this way; however, he did not visit the schools “in a prominent and caustic approach.”

Is “caustic” too strong a word? Sounds very derogatory. His report was certainly strongly worded, but I’m not sure it was caustic.

Last sentence is a run-on-sentence: Add the word “or” before “otherwise.” Change comma to a period after “nonexistent.” Eliminate “or alliance.” Final phrase, “all adding additional prestige to the MD title” should be changed to a full sentence (e.g., “These changes added the prestige to the MD degree”). Also, eliminate the redundancy by removing either “adding” or “additional.” This is an example of sloppy writing that must be carefully edited prior to publication.

p. 4: Middle of page - Put a colon after “consequences of affirmative action implementation.”
Eliminate the word “effectively” in the next sentence.

Toward end of page: Change “promoting of tolerance” to “promoting tolerance.”

p. 5: First paragraph – use parallel structure in “Not only is there a need to train…., but there is also the need…” Change the word “necessity” to “need.”

Second paragraph: Fix “the traditional.” Also, I’m not sure you need the word “standard” after “traditional.” Seems redundant.

p. 6: “exceptional academic” “that make” – fix these mistakes

last paragraph: “intercession” is not the right word – find a better word

Final line: “There is an abundance…” not “There are an abundance” – incorrect grammar; subject and verb need to agree.

p. 7: “policy would” – fix this

p. 8: First full paragraph: “Though such expectations” … “policy to” … “diversification” – fix all of these mistakes

There is also a substantive issue here. Is there any justification for the statement that “such expectations have decreased since the U.S. Supreme Court has held affirmative action constitutional…”? Has there been any survey or poll of public opinion? If there is no hard evidence, this statement should be removed, or phrased as conjecture.

Paragraph under “Percentage Plans”

First sentence: Change “have banned” to “had banned.” Presumably, these bans have been lifted following the Supreme Court decision.

A few lines below: Fix “without” – letter “i” and “t” overlap

Commission on Civil Rights “have” found no improvement in diversity – change “have” to “has” for subject-verb agreement, or simply eliminate “have/has” from the sentence.

p. 9: Top of page: Statement that “legal standing of percentage plans is being challenged on the same grounds as those used against affirmative action” – Is this still true? Are the plans still being challenged? I would think that, after the Supreme Court’s decision, such challenges would no longer be in court. This statement may be moot after the Supreme Court’s decision.

Middle of page: “by GPA” – fix this

Last paragraph of page: “Many studies propose…” Change “propose” to “conclude” or “suggest” or “provide evidence”?

p. 10: In subheading, fix “Research Promoted”

p. 11: Eliminate parentheses around the two sentences in the top paragraph, beginning with “Though racial preference exists…”

Middle of page, below “Classroom Diversity is Favored”: Fix “that exposure” and “greater tolerance”
p. 12: OK

p. 13: Second paragraph – Fix “thatthe” and “unfairlyrejected “

“many others have filed amici curiae” – eliminate “have” since this is now over and done with – it is now in the past, so simple past tense should be used.

Bottom line of page – Fix “thatsaid” You can simply eliminate the word “said,” now attached to “the”.

p. 14: “‘underserved populations’ from reports.” Eliminate “from reports.”

Fix “notablybenefit t he”

Eliminate “Summary” subheading. The following paragraph is still part of the conclusion. What’s the difference between a “conclusion” and a “summary”? There is no need to have both.

Just under “Summary,” fix “U.S.medical” by adding a space after “U.S.”

p. 15: Fix “thehealth”

References: proofread for completeness and typos.