Abstract

A recent paper in Sci. Adv. by Miller et al. concludes that GREs do not help predict whether physics grad students will get Ph.D.s. The paper makes numerous elementary statistics errors, including introduction of unnecessary collider-like stratification bias, variance inflation by collinearity and range restriction, omission of needed data (some subsequently provided), a peculiar choice of null hypothesis on subgroups, blurring the distinction between failure to reject a null and accepting a null, and an extraordinary procedure for radically inflating confidence intervals in a figure. The paper exhibits exactly the sort of research techniques which we should be teaching students to avoid.

“The aim of science is not to open the door to infinite wisdom, but to set a limit to infinite error.” — Bertolt Brecht
Introduction

A recent paper by Miller et al. (1, 2) argues, primarily with regard to the use of GRE scores, that “Typical Ph.D. admissions criteria limit access to underrepresented groups but fail to predict doctoral completion.” They claim “The weight of evidence in this paper...indicates that lower than average scores on admissions exams do not imply a lower than average probability of earning a physics Ph.D.” so that GREs are “metrics that do not predict Ph.D. completion.” These are surprising conclusions to reach for a paper whose results are framed in terms of null-hypothesis p-value cutoffs (3) that shows (see Table 2 of (1)) only one predictor for doctoral completion that can be used by admissions committees to select students and has p-value <0.01 in the overall sample studied: the GRE quantitative test (GRE-Q).

In this response I describe several improper statistical methods used in the article. My response is not intended to take a position on the complicated issue of desirable admissions criteria but only to defend minimal standards of research competence and transparency. I will not explore here whether other papers in the field make similar errors but will include some pedagogical material on elementary statistics.

Before evaluating the validity of the paper, we need to clarify what question it is trying to answer. The statement “Our goal here was not to identify the best predictive model with the minimum number of parameters but rather to understand how all four commonly used admissions metrics (UGPA, GRE-Q, GRE-V, and GRE-P) and the most salient demographic information would contribute to a discussion of metrics and diversity by admissions committees” (1) does not help much. More succinctly, the main goal appears to be to estimate how much predictive power for degree completion would be lost by de-emphasizing or dropping the GRE components of the admissions criteria. More formally, one wishes to evaluate what effect a treatment (inclusion of GREs in admissions criteria) has on an outcome (Ph.D. rate).

Directly evaluating how well students admitted by different criteria would have done requires either a randomized trial in which similar programs would be randomly assigned to do GRE-
aware or GRE-blind admissions (not feasible at the time of the study) or a comparison of non-randomly assigned programs using modern causal inference methods (4) to attempt to reduce systematic errors. There seem not to have been enough GRE-blind programs to allow such an observational study. (1) Instead, the strategy is to create an implicit model of what causes program completion, from which one can try to back out what the effect of dropping GREs would have been. Although that reasoning is not spelled out clearly, this plan would be reasonable if implemented properly.

The authors model Ph.D. attainment, a crude but convenient dichotomous proxy for broader ultimate goals such as scientific productivity, by a standard logistic regression, with the logit given by a multivariate linear regression on several predictors. Although use of this dichotomous outcome no doubt loses some important dynamic range compared to the outcomes of interest, it has the advantage of being easy to quantify without too much time delay. The multivariate form is justified as a way to give a better “basis for policy decisions” by avoiding “confounding” (1). Since confounding is a purely causal concept, these claims confirm that the results are intended to tell us what the causal effects of policy choices would be. Specifically, the model coefficients for the predictors, combined with the ranges of the predictors, are intended to tell us how much incremental predictive power would be lost by dropping each predictor, i.e. what the causal effects of that policy change would be on graduation rate. The predictors include percentile ranks of GRE scores (quantitative GRE-Q, verbal GRE-V, and physics GRE-P), undergraduate GPA, gender, ethnicity/race, U.S. vs. non-U.S. citizenship, year of matriculation, and one predictor that an admissions committee constrained by causality cannot use as an attribute to distinguish between applicants - the rank stratum of the program in which the student ultimately enrolled. (1) Setting aside for now the rank stratum, some such procedure, with the usual major caveats, would provide a conventional start to estimating which effects could be excluded from admissions decisions without causing major reductions in degree completion rates.
Several features of their analysis, however, contribute to major over-estimation of the statistical uncertainty in estimates of the predictive value of GREs, i.e. to the well-known “variance inflation” problem in estimating such parameters.(5) Inclusion of the rank stratum can also exacerbate *systematic* underestimation of the predictive power, already a problem due to lack of data on the students who were not admitted. (6) (7) (8) (9) The net result is to obscure the statistical reliability of the conclusion that those tests help predict which students are likely to get a PhD.

**Variance Inflation from Collinearity**

The main issue being addressed by the paper is not how well one can distinguish the separate predictive coefficients of GRE-Q and GRE-P but rather, since they show similar disparities among demographic groups (1, 10), what weight if any should be placed on such tests altogether. (1) The model shown includes both GRE-P and GRE-Q as separate variables. The scores on these exams are highly correlated(2), i.e. “collinear”, which both inflates the uncertainties on the predictive coefficients of each variable (since the model fit is rather insensitive to their relative weights) (11) and divides up their net predictive power into two smaller pieces. This can convert a highly significant net predictor into two that appear “insignificant”. If, for example, one were to predict people’s height from a model including right and left shoe sizes, the two shoe coefficients would be almost completely uncertain since the prediction doesn’t care which variable is used. Either shoe could be dropped from the model. A very naive reading of the statistical confidence ranges might suggest that neither shoe size was “significant” and therefore *both* shoes should be dropped from the model. Nevertheless the predictive coefficient for their average would be well-defined, and dropping both shoes from the predictive model would weaken predictive power substantially unless there were good substitutes. (11) The predictive coefficient for their sum would show relatively little statistical uncertainty.

To avoid the collinearity, one need only take the obvious step of combining GRE-P and GRE-Q into a single score, first scaling by the inverses of their ranges to make their contributions of
equal weight, since unlike the shoes they have different ranges. (Their predictive powers are similar enough that almost nothing is gained by adding a parameter to give them unequal weights.) Although the follow-up paper(1, 2) contains some general discussion of collinearity, the simple step of calculating the net GRE effect and its uncertainty for this obvious combination is omitted. The 10th to 90th percentile ranges for the U.S. group can be seen in Fig. 2 (1), with GRE-P having ~1.5 times as large a range as GRE-Q in this cohort, so the equal-weighted sum is close to P+1.5Q, i.e. 1.5Q has about the same range as P. Using data from Table 2 its coefficient (GRE-P coefficient +(1/1.5)*GRE-Q coefficient) is virtually identical (0.0116 per percentile, within 1%) in the entire sample (“All Students”) and the three subgroups described (U.S., U.S. female, and U.S. male).

The paper(1) relies heavily on p-value significance cutoffs(3) to claim that the GREs are not predictors. The follow-up paper now gives the correlation coefficient between the estimated predictive coefficients for these two tests, -0.42. (2) Due to this large negative correlation the standard error in the estimated coefficient of the weighted sum,

\[ SE_{\text{SUM}} = (SE_P^2 + (SE_Q/1.5)^2 - 2*0.42*SE_P*SE_Q/1.5)^{1/2} \]

is much less than it would be if the tests were independent. (Here I use the approximation that the other coefficients, e.g. for GPA, change little when the GREs are combined, although this combination has slightly different weighting than the one found with separately adjusted coefficients.) Using \( SE_P \) and \( SE_Q \) from Table 2 gives a standard error for the coefficient in the All Students group of 0.0026, less than ¼ of the coefficient’s point estimate. In other words, based on the data of the paper and the follow-up, the GRE predictive effect is a 4.5-sigma effect overall, far more statistically significant than any conventional cutoff value for such problems. In the U.S. subgroup, it’s a 3.4-sigma effect. Among U.S. males it’s a 3.0-sigma effect. Even in the smallest subgroup, U.S. females, for which the point estimate of the net GRE predictive coefficient is virtually identical to the other groups, it’s a 1.5-sigma effect. (Each of these is approximate due to limited precision of the reported standard errors.) Each of these effect/sigma ratios would increase further if the irrelevant GRE-V were dropped from the model. (Even simpler, just dropping either GRE-P or GRE-Q would
leave the other as clearly significant except in the small U.S. female subgroup, although not as strong as the simple equal-weight sum. Think of the shoes.)

To convert this robust coefficient to a net effect size for the combined GRE-P and GRE-Q we must allow for standard deviation (i.e. range) of the test combination being slightly less than the sum of the two separate standard deviations, which are equal for the range-weighted sum, by a factor of \((1+r_{PQ}/2)^{1/2}\) where \(r_{PQ}\) is their correlation coefficient. Although no correlation data were included in the original paper, the subsequent note(2) gives \(r_{PQ}=0.55\) for their sample, allowing us now to calculate the effect size for the sum. The 10th to 90th percentile effects for each test within the U.S. group are \(\sim0.48\) and \(\sim0.35\), respectively, reading the ranges and logit changes from Fig. 2, with slopes checked via Table 2 (1). Using the approximation that the 10th to 90th percentile range for the sum scales like the standard deviation, the effect size from the 10th to 90th percentile is then a logit of \((1.55/2)^{1/2}(0.48+0.35) = \sim0.73\) in the U.S. subgroup. Most of this predictive power could be obtained from the GRE-Q alone if GRE-P were dropped, but that would have little effect on the demographic disparities in the net criterion.

The GRE effect is thus not only very statistically significant but also slightly larger than the effect size of GPA in the U.S. subgroup, \(\sim0.6\) from Fig. 2. In the total sample, All Students, for which the predictive power of GPA apparently collapses by a factor of 2, (1) the GREs provide much greater predictive power than GPA. Thus, even before we get to the more interesting and serious systematic problems, we see that based on the data of Miller et al. (1, 2) the obvious weighted sum of GREs provides the best general predictor in their model in the group of all students and is approximately tied with GPA in the U.S. subgroup, although none of the predictors are very powerful.

Stratification and Variance Inflation, Confounding, and Collider-Like Bias

The model chosen includes the rank of the graduate program in which the student enrolled, via an adjustable extra term for three rank strata. (1) Clearly this variable is not one that an admissions committee lacking pre-cognition could use to decide among competing applicants.
Interaction terms between rank and other predictors could be used to help different programs choose different criteria, but no such terms are included in the model reported (1) or in the later addition. (2) Does rank nevertheless belong in a model estimating the predictive value of other metrics?

Before we get to the big problem from stratification, systematic bias in coefficient estimates, it is important first to recognize that it creates another variance inflation. The rank of the student’s program is no doubt positively correlated with the standard predictors in the model (GREs and GPA), so including it as a quantitative variable would create variance inflation in estimates of their coefficients. Stratification has essentially the same variance-inflating effect because of the restricted range of those predictors within each rank stratum. This problem of restricted range in predictive modeling is very well known, especially in the context of educational and employment decisions (e.g. (6) (12)), and has even been described vividly in the specific context of physics GREs. (7) Although the variation in outcomes within each narrow stratum may correlate only weakly with the predictor variable of interest, that says little about how well the outcomes would correlate with the predictor if the predictor were discarded in admissions decisions.

In one especially relevant study (6), the GRE validity in predicting performance of psychology students in classes on statistics, assessments, and research methods was found to be high (0.55 to 0.70) in a program with little range restriction, in contrast to much lower validity in a range-restricted subset or to typical low validity values for predicting grades in more range-restricted programs. In one actual experimental comparison involving two components of a Swedish driving test, their correlation in a restricted group (those who passed the first test) was less than half their correlation in an unrestricted group (in which everyone was allowed to take the second test). (12)

Reducing the range of a predictive variable by about a factor of three while keeping the same total number of data points (corresponding to division into three strata) would increase the
standard error in its coefficient estimates by about a factor of three. Restricting the range of outcome-linked variables (e.g. program rank) produces much less inflation of the standard errors for the predictive slopes because the range of any one predictor is less restricted, but at the expense of introducing systematic bias (6) (7) (8) (9) in the slope estimate due to range restriction of the net predictor, as I discuss below. Although we’ve seen that simply combining the GRE-P and GRE-Q scores is already sufficient to give a statistically robust effect estimate except in the smallest subgroup described, in the published paper the extra range-restriction variance inflation helped give the impression of the effect being insignificant. According to the follow-up version (2) the covariances between the predictive coefficients for strata and for the other variables have been calculated, but are not reported. Therefore one cannot tell by how much removing the stratum variable would increase the statistical significance of the GRE coefficient or whether that significance would cross the conventional threshold even in the smallest subgroup, U.S. females.

What is unusual about the Miller et al. analysis is not that there was a restricted range problem, since a school or employer typically does not have performance data on the those who either were not offered a position in their institution or did not choose to take it. What’s peculiar is that the restricted range here was largely a self-inflicted problem created by stratifying the students by program rank. (1) Miller et al. state that one of the strengths of their study is that it includes a wide range for the predictive variables because it includes schools of very different ranks, (1) but they do not use that range to narrow the statistical uncertainties in the parameter estimates.

Is that major loss of precision justified by the need to avoid systematic errors? Although Miller et al. say they “...include covariates to render more precise [sic] estimates“ it is well known that including covariates can make estimates either more or less systematically biased, depending on which covariates are included and, of course, on what one wishes to estimate.(4) (8) (9)
Miller et al. find that even after taking into account GPA, GREs, etc. students in the higher-ranked programs have a higher likelihood of completion. (1) Using their stratified model to evaluate the incremental predictive power of GREs implicitly assumes that this boost is caused entirely by factors that would not change if students with lower scores were admitted to those programs. They emphasize the possibility that highly ranked programs might directly make it easier for any students they accept to succeed, in which case the boost would be maintained regardless of changes in selection procedure. Program rank would be a simple confounder of the estimate of the potential effects of changing selection methods and therefore should be removed via stratification. The actual sign of any such direct effects of the program rank on graduation likelihood is not known, however. Anecdotal stories suggest that it might be negative.

A more obvious reason for the boost in graduation rate in high-ranked programs in the model is that almost all admissions committees take into account many out-of-model predictors (research experience, recommendations, etc.) as has been thoroughly documented by a group including one of the Miller et al. authors. (13) Unless that ubiquitous effort is pointless, these predictors will have some positive predictive value, which will be reflected in the coefficient of the rank variable, as Miller et al. also acknowledge. (1) The model itself does not know how much of the association between an in-model predictor (e.g. GPA) and the outcome comes from correlation with these out-of-model predictors. If the out-of-model predictors are positively correlated with an in-model predictor such as GPA, they will increase the coefficient that the model assigns to that predictor beyond what would actually be lost by dropping the predictor, but if they are negatively correlated they will decrease that coefficient.

In the overall population of applicants, it is reasonable to assume that the out-of-model predictors are positively correlated with GREs and GPA. Once the population is stratified, however, even by mere restriction to those who enrolled in some program, the correlation between in-model and out-of-model predictors tends to turn negative within each stratum, as Alex Small has nicely illustrated. (7) The reason is not hard to understand: a student with low in-
model predictors enrolled in a mid-rank program probably got in there because of good out-of-model predictors. A student having high in-model predictors in that mid-rank program probably didn’t get in somewhere with higher rank because of weak out-of-model predictors. In an analogous case, although performances on long-jumps and 110 meter races are likely to be positively correlated in the general population, within the narrow stratum of Olympic decathletes these have a strongly negative correlation. (14)

Since the group of all enrolled students has already been stratified by omitting those who were not accepted, a negative contribution to the correlation between in-model and out-of-model predictors is unavoidable. (7) The effect is not small. For example, if both in and out contributions are independent normally distributed and given equal weight, mere selection of applicants with an overall above-average score gives a correlation coefficient of 

\[-1/(\pi-1) = -0.47,\]

obtained from simply integrating over the remaining stratum to find the covariance matrix of the two predictors. Similar results are found in simulations for a variety of selection procedures, e.g. selection of the top 23% in the above model gives a correlation of -0.62. (7) The more finely rank is stratified, the more negative these correlations become. (7) In the ideal limit of narrow rank stratification and admissions criteria successfully aimed to maximize a particular goal, all power for predicting that goal using any variables other than rank becomes zero regardless of how predictive they are in the unstratified population, since no variation is left within each stratum. That remains true regardless of how much range remains for any individual predictor. That program rank should be a relatively good predictor in the highly stratified Miller et al. model thus tells us very little other than that admissions committees are actually making use of the out-of-model predictors that they say they use. (13)

This problem with stratification should not have been hard to foresee. By 1993, one empirical study already concluded “These results support the conventional argument that uncorrected GRE validity estimates based on range-restricted samples are strongly biased toward zero.” (6) Warnings of similar problems specifically for physics graduate programs were available in 2017. (7) More generally, the systematic errors introduced in causal inference studies by
conditioning on stratified groups downstream of the suspected cause are well-known under the names “collider-stratification” selection bias or “compensatory effect” bias(4, 8, 9). In one famous case, inadvertent conditioning gives the paradoxical effect that maternal smoking appears to protect low birth weight newborns from mortality, because within the low birth weight stratum smoking is negatively correlated with even more ominous predictors.(15) The problem is not merely statistical, in that it does not go away in the large-sample limit. *The systematic underestimation of predictive coefficients due to stratification selection bias is a problem for any coefficients derived from individual programs or other narrow strata, even after averaging coefficients over all individual programs or strata.*

The follow-up paper (2) gives some more range data, but entirely ignores the stratification bias issue and does not give the ranges of scores in the different strata. The arguments presented assume that mere inclusion of the different strata would get rid of problems, rather than recognizing that the collider stratification itself creates systematically biased estimates of predictive coefficients.

Given the large effect of the unavoidable restriction to enrollees, even a model without any deliberate stratification may well underestimate the incremental predictive power of in-model predictors. For example, in the model described above for equal-weight in-model and out-of-model predictors, even if they are positively correlated (coefficient $r_{OI}$) in the entire applicant population, their correlation in the enrolled upper half is $((\pi - 1)r_{OI} - 1)/(\pi - 1 - r_{OI})$, again obtained by integrating over half the bivariate Gaussian distribution to find the terms in the covariance matrix. The model would underestimate the in-model coefficients if $r_{OI} < 1/(\pi - 1) = 0.47$. The standard errors given for the logit differences between each of the top two rank tiers and the bottom one (Table 2 of (1)) in different groups are inflated by less than a factor of 1.3 from the values they would have in a model without covariates, easily calculated just by using binomial distributions for outcomes in each stratum: $(6/Np(1-p))^{1/2}$ where $N$ is the total number of students in the group and $p$ is the graduation probability. The admission criteria in actual use thus must contain significant components orthogonal to the GRE+GPA prediction of the model, since otherwise the inflation due to collinearity would be larger. Such orthogonal components
are presumably mainly in the out-of-model predictors used, which would not then be very highly correlated with the in-model GRE+GPA predictors, i.e. \( r_{oi} \) is not very large. (Obviously it would be far easier to reason briefly and accurately about this if the covariances between program tier and other variables were given, but they are not included either in the paper(1) or the follow-up(2).) Thus to the extent that the positive logits for high-ranked programs are caused by their selection of students, even a model omitting rank strata would be likely to underestimate the incremental predictive power of including GREs, or at any rate not overestimate it by very much. The model including three rank strata is almost certain to underestimate these coefficients unless the positive logit for higher ranks is mainly due to those programs directly making graduation easier rather than to their effective use of out-of-model selection criteria.

The reported data include indications that the odds boost for students in high-ranked programs is likely to be due primarily to the out-of-model predictors used in admissions rather than to direct student-independent effects of the programs. If some randomly chosen students were boosted in enrolled program rank, their graduation probability would increase from the hypothetical direct effect but not change for the out-of-model selection effect. In the selection case, but not the direct effect case, the stratified model would then assign this random group a negative logit equal to the positive logit assigned to the rank boost. Something approximately similar to that randomized trial would happen if the boosted students were picked non-randomly, but based on traits with little direct relevance to graduation probability. Given the almost universal attempt to boost representation of under-represented minorities, we may see such artifacts in the logits the model assigns to them. In a causal diagram, effects of demographic traits would collide with effects of out-of-model selection traits on program rank. As seen in Table 2, the Miller et al. (1) model does in fact assign the under-represented minorities large negative logits, statistically significant in the overall sample, close in magnitude to the positive logit assigned to the difference between the first and third rank tier. That pattern is more consistent with collider bias in the model than with the more selective
programs being easier to complete, although without further information on other possible factors, one cannot precisely sort out these systematic effects.

It is ironic that the same stratification collider bias that helps minimize the model’s estimate of the predictive value of GREs, nominally for the sake of under-represented minorities, produces as collateral damage negative predictive logits for those groups, even after controlling for the effects of GREs and GPA. I predict that these negative demographic logits will shrink substantially in a less-stratified (and probably more accurate) model omitting program rank, and could easily fall to zero or turn positive if a fully unstratified model were possible. I would be surprised if the simple analysis without rank strata did not already exist, since Miller et al. say they have looked at a variety of models, but it is not given in the paper (1) or the follow-up (2). Information on how GRE and GPA vary between the tiers is also omitted, making it hard to estimate the results for the simple tier-free model. I cannot think of any legitimate reason for not releasing the results of a tier-free model to show how inclusion of the three tiers changed the results from those that would be found in a model based on predictors rather than outcomes of admissions decisions.

**Null Hypotheses for Subgroups, Confidence Intervals, and Other Presentation Issues**

As an example of the unusual way in which the data are described, although the point estimate given in Table 2 for the coefficient of the logit for GRE-Q in “all” (0.013 per percentile rank) is statistically significant, and the point estimate among U.S. females (0.017) is somewhat larger, the latter fact is described as “we see no differences in Ph.D. completion probability...” in females. (1) In typical medical trials, when a treatment appears to work better in a subgroup than in the overall group, but with larger uncertainty due to the smaller sample, one does not jump to the conclusion that the treatment doesn’t work in the subgroup. In the absence of strong prior arguments or strong data, the conventional null assumption is that effects in each subgroup approximately equal the overall effect, not that no effect is present in each subgroup. The treatment of the null used by Miller et al. (1) would routinely lead to conclusions such as
that although a treatment worked well overall it would not work at all in any particular group of people, since the uncertainties in any small group are large.

Figure 2 shows very large “95% confidence intervals associated with Ph.D. completion probability”, but the meaning of these confidence intervals is not explained. The intervals shown are of nearly the same size for the points representing low-scorers, median scorers, and high-scorers. Although I do not know with certainty what these “confidence intervals” represent, that near-equality at the middle and edges of the distribution tells us that they cannot primarily reflect the uncertainty of interest, i.e. uncertainty in the slopes of the logit dependence on the model variables, because that would not show up in the middle points. The logit intervals extracted from Fig. 2 appear to be the same for U.S. males and females, ±1.1 around the central point. If those intervals are intended to represent some sort of ordinary statistical uncertainty, one would expect them to be smaller by a factor of about 2.2 for the U.S. male group than for the U.S. female group, because there are four to five times as many males as females both in the enrolled students and in the larger test-taking group whose scores are represented in Fig. 2. The large intervals seem to represent something irrelevant to the slopes and independent of the particular population being described.

For large N it’s not hard to calculate that in the middle of the parameter range the 95% confidence intervals for the logit should be ±1.96*/(Np(1-p))^{1/2} just from using the binomial variance Np(1-p) and the large-N derivative of the logit with respect to the number of graduates, 1/(Np(1-p)), together with a normal distribution. For the full U.S. sample with N=2315 and p =~0.7, that would be ±0.09, not ±1.1.

How did these confidence intervals expand by a factor of ~12? One particular algorithm that would generate the confidence intervals shown (within my ability to judge from a blown-up printout of Figure 2) would be to calculate the confidence interval for the expected graduation rate for e.g. the 10th percentile of the U.S. group as if it were based on only the 23 enrolled U.S. students in precisely that integer percentile, i.e. not using any information from the other 99%
of the students in the group, and then convert the probability range to a logit range. The latter step is slightly non-linear due to the small $N$, inflating the confidence intervals in the middle of the distribution by a bit more than the obvious factor of $100^{1/2}=10$. Toward the edges of the distribution where the model’s confidence intervals on the slopes contribute to the actual uncertainty, the inflation factor is roughly half that size. It may strain credulity to claim that anyone would use such an integer-percentile procedure to estimate confidence intervals in the context of a linear logit model for which the point estimates are based on all the data, but something like that seems to have been done. The visual effect of these radically inflated confidence intervals is to de-emphasize the predictive power of the admissions criteria even beyond the substantial variance inflation introduced by the model itself.

Rather than directly use the GRE scores themselves in the linear model, the paper uses percentile rankings. This is a convenient way to stitch together scores from before and after the GRE scale changed. It is not, however, required, since score conversion tables are easily available. The percentile method has the effect of greatly compressing the dynamic range in the higher scores in the tail of the distribution and magnifying small differences in the meat of the distribution, where most accepted applicants are found. Thus it is quite possible that this non-linear map from raw scores to the predictors used in the linear model reduces the predictive power, although perhaps the strong non-linearity happens to approximate an actual non-linear dependence. It would be useful to see results of a model using the scores rather than the percentiles.

Some smaller features of the presentation style are also problematic. For predictors whose power the authors wish to emphasize (e.g. program rank) the results are often presented in terms of odds ratios. For those whose predictive power the authors wish to deemphasize (GREs) the results are always presented in terms of percentage differences in completion rates. A comparison of completion rates of 75% and 60% gives a rather small-sounding 15% rate difference, a medium-sounding logit of 0.69, and an odds ratio of 2, which sounds rather large.
Key data (the results of a model without rank stratum, information on covariance of stratum with other predictors, ranges of variables on the overall group, predictive coefficients for the large non-U.S. group, etc.) remain missing even in the belated follow-up release.\(^{(1, 2)}\) Since this missing information does not appear in the arXiv follow-up\(^{(1, 2)}\), it cannot have been omitted simply due to space limitations of the original paper. A small anomaly appears in Table 2 for the “non-U.S.” group, whose group logit is given as positive 0.09 but whose group odds ratio is given as 0.9, i.e. \(e^{-0.09}\) rather than \(e^{+0.09}\). \(^{(1)}\)

The Bottom Line
Based even on the incomplete data presented, the statistical uncertainty in estimating how much predictive strength would be lost by dropping or de-emphasizing GREs is clearly not particularly important, despite the claims of the paper. \(^{(1)}\) Nevertheless, a statistically significant result from a large sample is not necessarily of much practical significance, as is often noted in the distinction between statistical and clinical significance. So how much are the GREs actually helping in finding which students are likely to get a degree? We’ve seen that in the U.S. group the combined GRE-P and GRE-Q provides a logit difference of \(~0.7\) (a factor of 2 in odds) between the 10\(^{th}\) and 90\(^{th}\) percentile of U.S. GRE-P test-takers, even before we attempt to make any correction for the strong bias toward zero caused by the highly stratified model, or check to see if the scores themselves are better predictors than the percentiles.

A little guesswork is needed to compare the 10\(^{th}\)-90\(^{th}\) percentile logit increments of GRE-Q and GPA in the “all” group (including non-U.S.) since the ranges are missing. One strong hint, in Table 2 but not commented on in the paper, is that GRE-Q has substantially more statistical significance than GPA in this group, i.e. the whole sample in the study. \(^{(1)}\) The logit slope vs. GRE-Q is about the same overall as in the U.S., according to Table 2. Since logit GPA slope (0.31) is much smaller in the All Students group than in the U.S. group (0.60), GRE-Q appears to be providing much more predictive power than GPA overall. That conclusion is confirmed by data included in Appendix III of the follow-up\(^{(2)}\), which shows that in the All group even a simple GRE-Q model is substantially superior to a GPA model by either of the model-selection criteria.
given. Although the follow-up table of model-quality criteria (2)2 (these are based on predictive power with a penalty for adding parameters) does not include the obvious model (including GPA and the equal-weight sum of GRE-P and GRE-Q) it is not hard to extrapolate from the models given to see that by the standard Akaike Information Criterion it is superior to any of them by very substantial margins in the All and U.S. groups, significantly in the U.S. male subgroup, and approximately tied with GPA alone in the U.S. female subgroup.

Due to the collider bias from stratification of the model on admissions and post-admissions program rank all these logit differences, both for GREs and for GPA, probably substantially underestimate the predictive power that would be lost to admissions committees by dropping the predictors in the model. Use of percentiles rather than scores may have also led to underestimation for the GREs. There is no reason to believe that the slope of logit vs. GRE percentile would become weaker if the range of GREs accepted were extended downward. (6)

One caveat is in order. These data give no compelling reason to think that fields other than physics, or even various subfields in physics, will find similar predictive effects. It’s quite possible that, e.g., GRE-Q is more predictive for physics and for quantitative social science methods (6) than for many other fields.

Discussion
The problem of “p-hacking” or “data-dredging” is well-known. (16) Motivated researchers can search among many hypotheses to find ones that happen by accident to meet the arbitrary conventional p-value criterion for “significance” (3). For approved medical treatment trials, since experimenters (e.g. drug companies) typically have intense motivation to find some positive results, they are required to file protocols ahead of time specifying which outcomes will be tested by which statistical techniques. A similar “registered report” system is now spreading to social sciences. (17)
The Miller et al. (1) paper appears to be an instance of reverse p-hacking. (18) Some “insignificant” p-values are sought and found to confirm the lead author’s often-repeated claim (e.g. (10) (19)) that "the US Ph.D. completion rate in STEM fields is only 50%.... So the standard admissions procedure is no better a predictor of success than a coin flip." (19) The logic of that claim is identical to that of a claim “Since the 5-year survival rate is only 50% the treatment is no better than a placebo”, as if the expected outcomes for the untreated condition, e.g. pancreatic cancer or acne, were irrelevant. Of the athletes admitted to the U.S. Olympic track trials, less than 10% graduate to the Olympic team. Is the selection procedure for Olympic trial athletes a worse predictor of success than pure chance would be?

Finding spurious negative results is even easier than finding spurious positive results, especially when one is free to search through a variety of models before choosing one for “parsimony”. (1) One need only combine a few variance-inflators and some stratification on downstream variables with a willingness to misinterpret failure to reject the null on some subsamples as confirmation of the null. (3) The claimed null value of the GREs as predictors is an artifact of these improper procedures.

The question of what use should be made of the actual predictive power of the GREs remains, but that involves non-technical considerations rather than p-values. The issue of how our profession should choose its new members faces a variety of not always parallel social goals and is fraught with uncertainties, so interesting arguments over ways different institutions should improve their selection methods will continue. The effects of changing criteria may not even be dominated by the individual-level effects discussed here, but by much harder to predict changes in institutional traits. For example, if GRE-P were not used in many graduate admissions decisions, many institutions would be likely to change undergraduate physics curricula and even grading standards, for better or worse or both.

Despite these difficulties, finding the best selection method is trivial in one limiting case. If we do not try to maintain minimal standards of competence and transparency or even basic logic in
our treatment of data, then the optimum group of students whom we should be educating is the empty set.
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