

# Response to Editors and Reviewers

ozan

2023-04-18

## Editor

### Major recommendations/concerns

1. College admissions priorities or student list products

*First, Reviewer 1 and 2 note that several of the arguments made in the paper are not necessarily about college lists, but instead about the admissions priorities of each institution. We believe it would be useful to tease this out more in the paper. We also believe it would be helpful to provide some (masked) information about the 14 institutions. This could be rounded enrollment numbers (in bands) or Carnegie Classification or something else. But it feels like as the argument is strengthened on why this might be about the admissions priorities of institutions, the reader would benefit from better understanding the contexts of the 14 institutions.*

**Author response:** la la la

2. Empirical analyses do not make a contribution
3. Requesting overview of college admissions and recruitment
4. Justify assertions with citations
5. Reduce scope and length of conceptual framework
6. Strengthen ties to policy
7. representativeness of sample for geographic analyses

text

Minor recommendations/concerns

## Reviewer 1

Major recommendations/concerns

Minor recommendations/concerns

## Reviewer 2

Major recommendations/concerns

Minor recommendations/concerns

## Reviewer 3

Major recommendations/concerns

Minor recommendations/concerns

Hoxby (2009) credits the standardized college entrance exam for transforming U.S. higher education from a system of local autarkies to an efficient, national market by causing a

Hoxby, C. M. (2009). The changing selectivity of american colleges. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 23(4), 95–118. Retrieved from <Go to ISI>://000272677100005