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Author's response to reviews:

Revisions:
I would like to thank both Dr. Paice and Dr. Grover for their comments and recommendations. I found their reviews to have excellent detail and insight.

Reply to comments of Dr. Grover
1) Dr. Grover's calculation is correct and the manuscript has been changed. Similarly, the overall rate of inaccuracies should read 9.8% rather than 9.9%. I did not find any other calculation errors, other than the adjustment that was made in calculating the 95%CI for each of these. I am not sure of the cause of my initial miscalculation but I would thank Dr.grover for excellent attention to detail.

2) Change made to say attempts... have not been reported.

3) Changed to read 28.6% of those applying to any EM residency program

4) References notated.

5) Initial use of NRMP, ACGME, RRC spelled out with corresponding abbreviation listed.

6) Change made from USMLE to LCME.

7) Clarification made and last sentence removed.

8) Change made from "resident" to applicant

Reply to comments of Dr. Paice:
3) Title changed to read "Identifying Inaccuracies..." with later clarification that later stages of the project seek to impact inaccuracy rate.

4) "inaccuracies" vs "error" - As Dr. Paice points out, we have tried to avoid questions of intent, as this can only be assumed. It is our feeling that both terms can be used for both inadvertent and intentional misrepresentations.

6) Prospectively defining "benign" errors proved to be difficult. In general, we listed an abstract or letter that was not identified as such to be a non-clerical error under a separate category. This removed all questions
of overstating page numbers that I am aware of.

7) A paper with multiple inaccuracies would be referenced in table 1 in multiple places. This is the significance of the referenced statement.

Thank you again to both reviewers for their comments and time!
Eric Katz, MD, FACEP