

## PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

### ARTICLE DETAILS

<b>TITLE (PROVISIONAL)</b>	Examining the predictors of academic outcomes for indigenous Māori, Pacific and rural students admitted into medicine via two equity pathways: a retrospective observational study at the University of Auckland, Aotearoa New Zealand.
<b>AUTHORS</b>	Curtis, Elana; Wikaire, Erena; Jiang, Yannan; McMillan, Louise; Loto, Robert; Poole, Phillippa; Barrow, Mark; Bagg, Warwick; Reid, Papaarangi

### VERSION 1 - REVIEW

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Loreto Lancia University of L'Aquila, Italy
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	25-Apr-2017

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>The manuscript contains interesting data, it is well written and easy to read. Statistical analysis, that is crucial in this work, it is appropriate for the aim of the study. I think that these results really may help decision makers in order to ensure equity admission pathways in the specific contest like the one where the study was carry out.</p> <p>I would just ask the authors to discuss why they have not considered the final degree grade as a possible measure of academic success as many other studies about this topic did (e.g. Lancia L, Petrucci C, Giorgi F, Dante A, Cifone MG. Academic success or failure in nursing students: results of a retrospective observational study. Nurse Educ Today. 2013 Dec;33(12):1501-5. doi: 10.1016/j.nedt.2013.05.001. Epub 2013 May 22).</p>
-------------------------	--

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Professor Sandra Nicholson QMUL UK
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	13-May-2017

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>This is a well written paper and the findings are of importance to the medical selection, widening participation and general medical and educational literature. Medical education research in selection is criticised for a lack of longitudinal large scale studies and your contribution attenuates these in part.</p> <p>There are a couple of comments and corrections.</p> <p>You have acknowledged the limitations of using the school decile as a proxy of socio-economic status. It may be worthwhile noting that other measures used by other authors are also limited eg POLAR data in the UK. You comment that the "Bridging programme" adds value and is associated to some of the students from the MAPAS cohort's success. It would be useful for details of the programme to</p>
-------------------------	---

	be appended. Reference 3 and 61 are duplicated.
--	--

### VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

In response to Reviewer 1:

1. "I would just ask the authors to discuss why they have not considered the final degree grade as a possible measure of academic success as many other studies about this topic did (e.g. Lancia L, Petrucci C, Giorgi F, Dante A, Cifone MG. Academic success or failure in nursing students: results of a retrospective observational study. Nurse Educ Today. 2013 Dec;33(12):1501-5. doi: 10.1016/j.nedt.2013.05.001. Epub 2013 May 22)".

Please see page 6 where a footnote has been added to the Outcome Variables section: "A final grade has not been included as a possible measure of academic success as the UoA medical programme only awards pass/fail in the final year of medical study"

In response to Reviewer 2:

1. "You have acknowledged the limitations of using the school decile as a proxy of socio-economic status. It may be worthwhile noting that other measures used by other authors are also limited eg POLAR data in the UK".

Please see page 11, Line 12. The following text has been added: "Like similar measures elsewhere (e.g. participation of local areas (POLAR) classification in England),..."

2. "You comment that the "Bridging programme" adds value and is associated to some of the students from the MAPAS cohort's success. It would be useful for details of the programme to be appended".

Please see page 12, Line 3. I have added a weblink reference rather than an appendix: "for more information please see <https://www.fmhs.auckland.ac.nz/en/faculty/for/future-undergraduates/undergraduate-study-options/certhsc.html>".

3. Reference 3 and 61 are duplicated.

The reference list has been amended by deleting reference 61 and the in-text numbering has been adjusted.

Thank-you for the opportunity to be published in your journal. Please let us know if any further amendments are required.

### VERSION 2 – REVIEW

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Loreto Lancia University of L'Aquila
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	01-Jun-2017

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	The author(s) have addressed the issue I raised satisfactorily.
-------------------------	---

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Sandra Nicholson QMUL
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	23-Jun-2017

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

I think the authors have responded appropriately to my minor comments.  
Thank you