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Reviewer’s report:

General
Dr Katz and colleagues present a well thought out and implemented study. The prospective design and contributions of multiple centers are strengths. This represents a major addition to the available literature on misrepresentations by applicants (or inaccuracy of applications, depending on your perspective and degree of cynicism).

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
None

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
* Please check all percentages reported. I calculate 56/493 as 11.4 not 11.6 (there are a couple more minor calculation differences that I noted).
* Consider changing language in abstract that "attempts ... to diminish the frequency of inaccuracies ... have not been made". It is probably more accurate to say that they have not been reported or not been published.
* The claim in the abstract that 28.6% of all applicants who applied to at least one EM program were reviewed is a little confusing. It is clarified later in the manuscript that this is of all applicants NATIONALLY and not just of the participating institutions.
* There are multiple times when the authors’ reference prior work only by the lead author’s last name. Please include a superscripted reference number as well.
* The initial time an organization’s name is used, please write it out and then provide the abbreviation that you will be using. This was done correctly with emergency medicine (EM) but not done with NRMP, ACGME, etc.
* My understanding that the accreditation body of allopathic medical schools is the LCME not the USLME (which provides standardized testing for candidates for medical licensure).
* The last two sentences in last paragraph of the Background section are redundant and nearly identical.
* Page 6- first line- these folks were applicants, not residents

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
None noted

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No
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