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**Reviewer's report:**

1. This is an interesting report that seeks to add to the data on an important issue; the relative performance of graduate entry programmes in medicine.

2. I am not qualified to comment on the statistics; however, the authors themselves make the point that the numbers may not be large enough.

3. The most important findings are the overall comparable performance between the 2 routes of entry and the higher completion rate.

4. The data would seem to give apparently contradictory findings, and it is difficult to know what to make of them. Could the authors look in more depth at the nature of the assessments to look for patterns. For example, do the assessments perhaps favour a PBL or non-PBL approach.

5. Following on from 4, do the authors have any ideas why the community follow-up project and OSLER should have had lower marks?

6. To what extent do the authors think the age difference between the 2 groups was an issue?

7. I'm afraid I didn't fully understand the section explaining previous educational attainment, although I take the overall point. Further explanation here would be beneficial.

8. As the authors comment, the variance in structures of graduate entry programmes makes it hard to generalise these findings. However, it is important for studies like this to continue to add to the overall picture, in order for the future of graduate entry programmes to become clearer.
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