When we analyze data that people submit anonymously, there are several limitations. Since the information is self-reported, there is no way to check if it is completely accurate or truthful. Some users may accidentally enter wrong details, leave out important information, or even submit the same data more than once. Anonymous data also usually does not include background information such as demographics or other context that helps explain trends. Another major issue is sampling bias. People who choose to submit their results are often not a true representation of all applicants. For example, students with strong academic scores may be more willing to share their results, while students with lower scores or rejections may avoid posting. Because of this, the overall results can become biased and less reliable.

The results of the analysis were not very surprising to me, especially when I saw that the average GRE quantitative score from grad school submissions was around 165, which is much higher than the official average of about 157. This difference likely happens because students who report their scores online usually have stronger academic profiles. There is also something called survivorship bias, where students who get admitted or feel confident about their chances are more likely to share their results. In addition, differences in how people enter data, missing information, and lack of proper verification can affect the final analysis. Compared to official testing data, anonymous submissions do not follow strict rules or standardized methods. Therefore, while this data can still provide useful general insights, it should not be treated as a fully accurate representation of all applicants.