One limitation of conducting analytics on anonymously submitted data is the lack of verification and standardization across entries. Since submissions are self-reported, there is no way to confirm the accuracy of the values such as GPA, GRE scores, acceptance status, or even the specific programs applied to. Participants may interpret questions differently or selectively omit information. Also, anonymous datasets often contain inconsistent/incomplete fields which can lead to filtering assumptions during the analysis. These issues can reduce the reliability of aggregate statistics and introduce inconsistencies that would not usually be present in formally collected institutional datasets.

Another significant limitation is self-selection bias which can skew analytic results. Individuals who choose to post on platforms like Grad School Cafe are not a random sample of all applicants. These applicants usually have strong emotions attached such as anxiety or an eagerness to share outcomes. This helps explain why some metrics, such as average GRE scores, appear significantly higher in the dataset compared to official standards. For example, while the average GRE quantitative score for test takers in recent years is approximately 157, the analyzed Grad School Cafe submissions show averages closer to 165. This discrepancy likely occurs because of higher performing applicants being more motivated to report their results while average or lower-scoring applicants may be underrepresented. As a result, analytics based on anonymous, voluntary submissions can appear surprising or overly optimistic when compared to standardized, population-level data collected by testing agencies or universities.