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Reviewer’s report:

This study aims to investigate whether medical students admitted to medical school by different selection criteria differ in the occurrence of perfectionism. I believe this is an interesting issue, but the manuscript still needs some revisions. See below my comments:

- It would be interesting to clarify the selection process to the international audience. For instance, who is eligible for the waiting period? What is the waiting period? We can see that age seems to be very different from this method and other methods of selection. Why?

- The Faculty of the University of Hamburg individual process needs also clarification. "Students are invited by grade point average to participate in a natural sciences test (HAM-Nat) " - students are invited by the medical school or do they register in a selection process? I believe further explanation for the selection process is needed.

- It would be interesting to describe the characteristics of the Faculty of the University of Hamburg. How many students do you have? How many are enrolled each year? 358? All incoming students were invited to participate in this study?

- How were students approached? Were they invited and fill the questionnaires in the same moment/activity? In-person? Who performed this approach?

- It seems that you have a long questionnaire. How many minutes did it take to students in order to complete the questionnaire?

- "The Ethics Committee of the Hamburg Chamber of Physicians confirmed the innocuousness of this study and its congruence with the Declaration of Helsinki (WF-047/16)" - It would be better to describe if the study was approved by the Ethics Committee, to provide the approval number and to clarify if students signed a consent term.

- Authors report that they used a series of instruments. However, the references are from the English literature. Were these instruments validated into the German language? They should report the validation studies and the internal consistency for the sample.

- In order to standardize the description of the instruments, I will suggest authors to provide examples of the BFI-10 items.
- It would be appropriate to briefly report how many missing items were found in each instrument.

- The term GPA appears first in the Results section. You should add the meaning of this abbreviation when it is first cited.

- Why did you use a stepwise linear regression instead of a hierarchical linear regression?

- "2.7% of our sample showed a moderate and 0.7% a major level of depression" - in the methods authors do not mention the cutoff for depression and anxiety.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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