

This is a repository copy of *UK nationals who received their medical degrees abroad: selection into, and subsequent performance in postgraduate training- a national data linkage study*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/132022/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

Tiffin, Paul Alexander [orcid.org/0000-0003-1770-5034](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1770-5034), Orr, James, Paton, Lewis William [orcid.org/0000-0002-3328-5634](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3328-5634) et al. (2 more authors) (2018) UK nationals who received their medical degrees abroad: selection into, and subsequent performance in postgraduate training- a national data linkage study. *BMJ Open*. e023060. ISSN 2044-6055

<https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2018-023060>

---

**Reuse**

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence. This licence allows you to distribute, remix, tweak, and build upon the work, even commercially, as long as you credit the authors for the original work. More information and the full terms of the licence here:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

# BMJ Open

## UK nationals who received their medical degrees abroad: selection into, and subsequent performance in postgraduate training- a national data linkage study

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-023060.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	08-May-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Tiffin, Paul; University of York, Health Sciences Orr, James; Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust, Emergency Department Paton, Lewis; University of York, Health Sciences Smith, Daniel; General Medical Council, Education and Standards Norcini, John; FAIMER
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Medical education and training
Secondary Subject Heading:	Health policy, Health services research, Medical education and training
Keywords:	international medical graduates, medical regulation, medical selection

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3  
4 **UK nationals who received their medical degrees abroad:**  
5 **selection into, and subsequent performance in**  
6 **postgraduate training- a national data linkage study**  
7  
8  
9

10 Paul A Tiffin, James Orr, Lewis W. Paton, Daniel Smith, & John J. Norcini

11  
12 [short title: "UK nationals who are overseas medical graduates: postgraduate selection and  
13 performance"]  
14  
15

16  
17  
18  
19 **Author Details**  
20

21 PAT (corresponding author): Reader in Psychometric Epidemiology and NIHR Career  
22 Development Fellow, Health Sciences, University of York, YO10 5DD, UK. Tel 0044 +1904  
23 321117, email; [paul.tiffin@york.ac.uk](mailto:paul.tiffin@york.ac.uk)  
24  
25

26 JO: Trust Grade Doctor, Emergency Department, Wythenshawe Hospital, Manchester  
27 University NHS Foundation Trust, Southmoor Road, Manchester, UK, M23 9LT, email;  
28 [jo670@york.ac.uk](mailto:jo670@york.ac.uk)  
29  
30

31  
32 LWP: Research Fellow, Health Sciences, University of York, YO10 5DD, UK. Email;  
33 [lewis.paton@york.ac.uk](mailto:lewis.paton@york.ac.uk)  
34  
35

36 DS: Education Data Development Manager, the General Medical Council, 350 Euston Road,  
37 London, NW1 3JN, UK. Email; [daniel.smith@gmc-uk.org](mailto:daniel.smith@gmc-uk.org)  
38  
39

40 JJN: President and Chief Executive Officer, Foundation for the Advancement of International  
41 Medical Education Research, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104, USA.  
42 Tel: 00 1215 823 2170, email; [JNorcini@FAIMER.org](mailto:JNorcini@FAIMER.org)  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Abstract

### Objectives

To compare the likelihood of success at selection into specialty training for doctors who were UK nationals but obtained their primary medical qualification (PMQ) from outside the UK ('UK overseas graduates') with other graduate groups based on their nationality and where they gain their PMQ. We also compared subsequent educational performance during postgraduate training between the graduate groups.

### Design

Observational study linking UK medical specialty recruitment data with postgraduate educational performance (Annual Review of Competence Progression (ARCP) ratings).

### Setting

Doctors recruited into national programmes of postgraduate specialist training in the UK from 2012 to 2016.

### Participants

34,755 UK based trainee doctors recruited into national specialty training programmes with at least one subsequent ARCP outcome reported during the study period, including 1,108 UK overseas graduates.

### Main outcome measures

Odds of being deemed appointable at specialty selection and subsequent odds of obtaining a less versus more satisfactory category of ARCP outcome.

### Results

UK overseas graduates were more likely to be deemed appointable compared to non-EU medical graduates who were not UK citizens (OR 1.29, 1.16 to 1.42), though less so than UK (OR 0.25, 0.23 to 0.27) or European graduates (OR 0.66, 0.58 to 0.75). However, UK overseas graduates were subsequently more likely to receive a less satisfactory outcome at ARCP than other graduate groups. Adjusting for age, sex, experience and the economic disparity between country of nationality and place of qualification reduced intergroup differences.

## Conclusions

The failure of recruitment patterns to mirror the ARCP data raises issues regarding consistency in selection and the deaneries' subsequent annual reviews. Excessive weight is possibly given to interview performance at specialty recruitment. Regulators and selectors should continue to develop robust processes for selection and assessment of doctors in training. Further support could be considered for UK overseas graduates returning to practice in the UK.

**Keywords:** International medical graduates, medical regulation, medical selection

## Strengths and limitations of this study

- The quantity, representativeness and completeness of the data available, consisting of 34,755 UK based trainee doctors.
- The observational nature of the study meant we could not control for the effects of unmeasured variables not captured in the dataset.
- The use of Annual Review of Competence Progression (ARCP) as an outcome allowed comparisons to be made both across and within specialties.
- Some restriction of range may be present, since ARCP outcomes were only observed for those who entered specialty training.

## Introduction

The medical workforce is globalised, with international movement of doctors.(1) The UK is one of the largest net importers of doctors with around 33% of doctors registered with the medical regulator, the General Medical Council (GMC) having graduated from outside of the UK.(2) The situation is different for doctors in training, where in 2015 85% have a UK Primary Medical Qualification.(3) Some specialties in the UK are particularly dependent on doctors who obtained their primary medical qualification abroad in order to fill training posts. Such specialties include general practice and the psychiatric specialties.(4) The reliance on overseas doctors in the UK is likely to continue. Indeed, the recent pledge by the Health Secretary for England, Jeremy Hunt, to provide 1,500 extra medical school places per year, starting in 2018 will not provide additional applicants for basic speciality ('ST1 level') training programmes until 2025. This is based on a five year undergraduate medical degree and two subsequent postgraduate years of 'foundation' clinical training.(5) The effect of 'Brexit' (the

1  
2  
3 UK leaving the EU) is also likely to have an impact on the number of non-UK European  
4 doctors working in the British National Health Service (NHS).  
5

6 Previous research in the UK regarding international medical graduates has focussed on  
7 identifying differences in performance on postgraduate exams and ARCPs when compared  
8 to doctors with UK primary medical qualifications.(6-8) Such studies have identified a  
9 number of demographic and educational factors associated with later postgraduate  
10 academic performance. For example, international medical graduates who obtained higher  
11 scores on the Professional and Linguistic Assessments Board (PLAB) exams and the  
12 English fluency test (IELTS), used to obtain registration with the GMC, have educational  
13 outcomes closer to UK medical graduates.(7, 9, 10)Differential attainment has also been  
14 observed in postgraduate medical examinations in North America.(11) There are a variety of  
15 views about the underlying reasons for these differences.(12)  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 Approximately 3-4% of all UK doctors in training (see results section) are UK citizens who  
23 obtained their primary medical qualification outside of the UK - referred to here as 'UK  
24 overseas graduates'. This includes those who obtained their medical degrees from both  
25 countries within and without the European Economic Area (EEA). At present virtually nothing  
26 is known about this group of doctors. However, a previous study reported some interesting  
27 differences in performance on the PLAB exams between UK overseas graduates and non-  
28 UK citizens who qualified outside of the EU (referred to here as 'international medical  
29 graduates'). Compared to the international medical graduates, the UK overseas graduates  
30 were observed, on average, to have more attempts and lower scores on part 1 of the PLAB  
31 exam (the written component). In addition they had reduced performance on the knowledge-  
32 based component of the Membership of the Royal College of General Practitioners exam  
33 (MRCGP) relative to the international medical graduates. Interestingly no significant  
34 difference in scores on the clinical component on the MRCGP was observed between the  
35 two groups.(7) A North-American study reported that US citizens with non-US primary  
36 medical qualifications perform less well in US medical licensing exams (USMLE) and are  
37 less likely to be board certified specialists compared to other groups of doctors.(13) Of more  
38 concern was the observation that the patients of doctors who are American citizens with  
39 non-US primary medical qualifications had poorer clinical outcomes than those treated both  
40 by non-US international and US medical graduates.(14) Thus, it is possible that differential  
41 educational attainment may translate, in some cases, to poorer clinical care.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

52 For a doctor to practise in the UK they must fulfil the requirements of the 1983 Medical Act.  
53 (15) For international medical graduates this often involves evidencing their clinical  
54 competence by passing both parts of the PLAB test, though other routes to registration are  
55  
56  
57

1  
2  
3 available, especially for more experienced practitioners. The first part of the PLAB evaluates  
4 medical knowledge using multiple choice questions. Part 2 of the PLAB is an evaluation of  
5 practical clinical skills using a series of objective structured clinical examination stations. To  
6 be eligible to sit the PLAB test doctors must have an acceptable medical degree. (15) Until  
7 2014 for those from countries outside of the EEA, where English was not an official  
8 language, evidence of English proficiency must have been provided. Since 2014 this applies  
9 to all countries, including EEA countries too, that are not on the GMC's 'first and native'  
10 English language list. (16) However, UK citizens who obtained their primary medical  
11 qualification outside of the EEA would generally have to pass the PLAB test in order to  
12 demonstrate clinical competency prior to obtaining a license to practice. Paradoxically this is  
13 not the case with citizens of other EEA countries who qualified from a non-European  
14 institution, as long as they have practiced medicine within the EEA for at least three years. In  
15 this latter case an exemption from sitting the PLAB test may be granted to the doctor via  
16 their "enforceable Community right" which is conferred via their European Union (EU)  
17 citizenship. Nevertheless those seeking to register must provide robust evidence of their  
18 competence, and as no entitlement to registration exists under this route, failure to do so will  
19 result in refusal. This situation may change following the UK's exit from the EU.(17)  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

29 Obtaining a licence to practise does not guarantee employment. In particular doctors  
30 registering to practise via the PLAB route will often be seeking to obtain a place on a  
31 specialty training programme, which is the most usual pathway to both general practice and  
32 senior hospital medical positions. In the UK these are usually divided into core training and  
33 higher specialist training. It is usual for doctors to complete their core specialist training  
34 before applying for a higher specialist training post, though some training programmes, such  
35 as General Practice, Paediatrics and Obstetrics and Gynaecology are 'run through' and do  
36 not have such a break. The time spent at each stage will vary depending on the specialism.  
37 Postgraduate examinations, linked to the relevant Royal College, must be passed at varying  
38 stages in order to progress and eventually obtain a certificate of completion of training  
39 (CCT). This CCT permits a doctor to be placed on the GMC Specialist or GP Register. In the  
40 UK recruitment into specialty training programmes is now largely organised around a  
41 nationalised system, though some local 'standalone' posts may still exist, particularly if they  
42 are short-term posts intended to cover unplanned vacancies (e.g. 'Locum Appointed for  
43 Training Posts'- LAT). Applications to specialist training programmes use the online Oriel  
44 system. Online application forms and evidence of qualifications are submitted and selectors  
45 then generate short-listing scores based on the job criteria. Applicants to some core-training  
46 posts and for general practice, may also have to complete additional tests such as those  
47 found in the Multi-Specialty Recruitment Assessment (MSRA)(18). Applicants successful at  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58

1  
2  
3 any initial stages will be invited to attend further face-to-face assessments and interviews at  
4 national selection centres.(19) It is currently unknown, other than for GP selection (20),  
5 whether the probability of a doctor's success at specialty recruitment predicts, as ideally it  
6 should, subsequent educational performance in postgraduate medical training.  
7  
8  
9

10 Previous research has identified a number of demographic factors that are associated with  
11 performance in postgraduate medical training.(8, 21, 22) From a patient perspective the  
12 causes of any disparities in performance between medical graduate groups are not likely to  
13 be as important as the very fact they exist. However, attempting to control for the influence  
14 of such variables in studies of inter-group differences may be useful in clarifying the  
15 underlying relationships with the outcomes of interest. For instance, gender has been  
16 associated with performance in postgraduate medical examinations.(21) Increasing age  
17 tends to be associated inversely with performance both in postgraduate education (6, 22)  
18 and practice.(23, 24) In contrast clinical experience tends to improve performance in both.(6,  
19 25) However, there is something of an interaction between age and experience in that,  
20 increasing age tends to offset the benefits of experience when determining clinical  
21 outcomes.(23, 26)  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

29 Qualitative research findings have suggested that linguistic and cultural factors may, at least  
30 partly, mediate these differential attainment rates between home and overseas medical  
31 graduates.(27, 28) In UK citizens who graduate from abroad these language and cultural  
32 factors may be assumed to be less prominent than in non-UK overseas graduates. However,  
33 preparedness for practice has been highlighted as an issue even with UK medical  
34 graduates.(29) It may be that those who experience their undergraduate training in another  
35 country may be less well prepared to work in the UK Health Services.(30) This may be  
36 reflected in educational performance. In particular it is possible that those training in a very  
37 different socioeconomic context may be the most disadvantaged in this respect. Specifically  
38 the nature of clinical practice may be shaped by the healthcare resources in a country.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 The reasons for UK citizens applying to study medicine outside their home country are likely  
46 to be varied but at present unknown. However, in the US roughly half of all Americans who  
47 study medicine outside of the States previously or concurrently applied to US medical  
48 schools.(31) Similarly a major motivation for UK citizens applying abroad may be that they  
49 consider themselves unlikely to obtain a place to study medicine at a British university. It is  
50 possible that family links, tuition costs and other sociocultural influences may encourage  
51 study outside of the UK.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 Data are routinely collated by the GMC on demographics and educational performance of  
4 doctors registered to practise in the UK. Thus, the aims of our study were:  
5

- 6 • To compare the likelihood of being deemed appointable to a national medical  
7 postgraduate training programme for UK citizens who obtain their medical degrees  
8 overseas, compared to other graduate groups.  
9
- 10 • To evaluate whether subsequent differential attainment in postgraduate training was  
11 observed for such UK citizens who graduated abroad, compared to other groups of  
12 medical graduates.  
13
- 14 • To compare any patterns observed, as above, in order to assess the effectiveness of  
15 selection into postgraduate training, in relation to a doctor's nationality and place of  
16 qualification.  
17  
18  
19

20  
21 Thus, our findings would have implications for both international medical regulators and  
22 employers.  
23

## 24 **Methods**

25  
26  
27 Our aim was to compare the chances of success at specialty training selection between UK  
28 overseas graduates and the other graduate groups, both before and after controlling for the  
29 effects of potential confounding factors, such as age, sex, and duration of UK based  
30 experience. We then compared the subsequent Annual Review of Competence Progression  
31 (ARCP) outcomes across groups. We then evaluated the extent to which the probability of  
32 success, in relation to other medical graduate groups, at selection was mirrored by  
33 subsequent ratings of performance in postgraduate training. The ARCP process involves a  
34 regular review of the progress of a UK doctor in training by an educational panel. This panel  
35 considers the evidence presented in the doctor's portfolio, which includes anonymised  
36 cases, reflections and feedback from a supervisor, colleagues and workplace based  
37 assessments. It does not usually involve a face-to-face meeting unless issues arise that  
38 require clarification or a less than satisfactory outcome is likely to result.(32)  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

## 46 **Data sources and preparation**

47  
48  
49 Data on the outcomes of recruitment to specialty training for the UK between 2012 and 2016  
50 were obtained via an extract from the Oriol database (33) supplied to the GMC. The  
51 recruitment process was concerned with appointing doctors to training programmes at Core-  
52 training (CT) and up to and including Specialty Training (ST) level 4 (i.e. to the earlier years  
53 a training programme, the length of which is determined by the specialty). The flow of data  
54  
55  
56  
57

1  
2  
3 through the study is depicted in Figure 1. Oriel recruitment data were potentially available for  
4 52, 894 doctors of whom 34, 755 were linked to the subsequent ARCP dataset (see below).  
5 The two potential outcome variables available from the Oriel recruitment database were  
6 '*deemed appointable*' and '*post offered*'. In order to reduce the impact of local competition on  
7 the results the '*deemed appointable*' variable was used as the outcome measure for the  
8 recruitment data modelling. Data were also available on interview performance and  
9 shortlisting ratings, which were standardised as z scores (mean 0, sd of 1) within each year  
10 and specialty. Note that in GP recruitment, an applicant can receive an offer without  
11 interview if they score above a certain threshold on the Multi-Specialty Recruitment  
12 Assessment.(18) In these cases, the interview score was treated as missing. In this sample,  
13 interview score was missing for 5,198 applications for GP specialty training (17.63%).  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 Data relating to performance in training were potentially available for 90, 240 doctors in  
29 specialist training with 344, 492 competency-based ARCP outcomes recorded (see below  
30 and Figure 1), who were in national postgraduate training schemes between August 2009  
31 and August 2016. We also noted that there were 838 doctors (2.4%) who only had ARCP  
32 outcomes that were awarded in relation to short term 'Locum appointment for training' (LAT)  
33 or 'Fixed term specialty training appointment' (FTSTA) posts. The data were analysed within  
34 a 'Safe Haven' environment.(34) The ARCP data are collected annually by the GMC, the  
35 collection notices are published on the GMC website.(35)  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 Record of in-training assessment scores were recoded to the equivalent ARCP outcome  
42 codes. Only ARCP 'competency-based' outcomes indicating training progress were included  
43 (e.g. 'out of programme' experience was excluded). The remaining outcomes were then  
44 collapsed onto a four point ordinal scale:  
45  
46  
47

- 48 • 1='satisfactory progression'/'training programme completed' (ARCP outcomes '1' or  
49 '6', respectively)
- 50 • 2='additional evidence requested' (ARCP outcome '5')
- 51 • 3='targeted training required [no extended time]' (ARCP outcome '2')
- 52 • 4='extended training time required/left programme' (ARCP outcomes '3' or '4',  
53 respectively)
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57

1  
2  
3 This was an approach previously shown to be valid.<sup>(6)</sup> The dataset also contained a  
4 variable, recorded by the deaneries, to indicate whether a specific ARCP outcome was  
5 associated with a failure to pass a postgraduate examination (i.e. those required by the UK  
6 Royal Colleges as part of specialist training). When ARCP outcomes were treated as  
7 dichotomous we classified any outcome other than a '1' ('satisfactory progress') or a '6'  
8 ('training programme completed') as "less than satisfactory". Note that this included outcome  
9 '5' which the ARCP 'Gold Guide' does not classify as 'unsatisfactory'.<sup>(32)</sup> Training deanery,  
10 specialty and medical training grade, all matched to individual ARCP records, were obtained  
11 from deaneries via the GMC.  
12  
13  
14  
15

16  
17 For the sample the nationality and the name and country of the medical school where the  
18 primary medical qualification was obtained were derived from the GMC List of Registered  
19 Medical Practitioners (LRMP). According to the GMC dual nationality was recorded in 2115  
20 (2.4%) of the sample. Where dual nationality occurred only the first nationality provided by  
21 the GMC was used. The country of origin was deleted by the GMC only in four instances  
22 prior to release as a safeguard against identifying the individual doctors.  
23  
24  
25

26 Graduate status was categorised predominantly, though not exclusively, according to GMC  
27 regulatory policy; i.e. whether the doctor would have been expected to have passed the  
28 PLAB test in order to provide evidence of clinical competence and obtain a licence to  
29 practise. Thus, for analytic purposes the sample was grouped as follows:  
30  
31  
32

- 33 1. *UK medical graduates (UKGs)* - irrespective of country of nationality.
- 34 2. *Graduates who were nationals of countries from the EEA* (with the exception of the UK),  
35 irrespective of country of qualification.
- 36 3. *International medical graduates (IMGs)* who were non-EEA nationals, irrespective of  
37 place of graduation (excepting the UK)
- 38 4. *UK overseas graduates (UK OGs)* - UK nationals who graduated from an institution  
39 outside of the UK (either EEA or non-EEA).  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 The graduate group classification is further described in Table 1.  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE  
50  
51  
52

53 Note that in the above classification that within the group of UK overseas graduates there  
54 were those that would have been likely to sit the PLAB exams (i.e. those who graduated  
55  
56  
57

1  
2  
3 outside of the EEA) and those that were not (i.e. those graduating from universities within  
4 the EEA). For this reason a sub-analysis of this group was conducted (see Results). It  
5 should also be noted that group 2 (EEAGs) was defined by nationality rather than place of  
6 qualification. This was because citizens of the EEA do not tend to obtain a license via the  
7 PLAB route if they have worked clinically in a European country for three years or more. In  
8 our sample 155 out of 1225 EEA nationals (12.65%) had obtained their primary medical  
9 qualification from outwith the EEA.  
10  
11  
12

13  
14 Dichotomised ethnicity data (White/Non-white) was available from the GMC annual national  
15 training survey.<sup>(36)</sup> However, ethnicity was used for descriptive purposes only and not  
16 utilised in the modelling. This was because ethnic status served as a proxy for graduate  
17 group membership (e.g. only 15% of the UK overseas graduates reported themselves as of  
18 White ethnicity). Thus, ethnicity was, in effect, confounded by graduate group allocation.  
19  
20 Sex, year of birth and date of first UK medical registration was also obtained from the list of  
21 registered medical practitioners. For the recruitment data analyses the duration of  
22 experience in UK medical practice was calculated from the years of birth and application. For  
23 analyses relating to ARCP, the duration of experience in UK medical practice was calculated  
24 from the year of birth and date of ARCP.  
25  
26  
27  
28

29  
30 Specialties were classified predominantly according to the Royal College they were affiliated  
31 to, as in our previous study.<sup>(6)</sup> We wished to understand whether training in a relatively less  
32 well-resourced undergraduate medical environment mattered or whether the degree of  
33 dissonance between the country of nationality and country of qualification was relevant.  
34  
35 Consequently we derived a metric of the economic status of the country of nationality and  
36 qualification, and the difference between these two for each doctor. This was done by linking  
37 the gross domestic product (GDP) per capita in US dollars, according to the 2008 World  
38 Bank data <sup>(37)</sup> to the name of the associated countries in the sample. The discrepancy  
39 between these values was also calculated as both a relative and absolute difference.  
40  
41  
42  
43

#### 44 **Patient and public involvement**

45  
46 Patients were not involved in this study.  
47

#### 48 **Analyses**

49  
50 For the recruitment outcomes multi-level logistic regressions were used to estimate  
51 predictive models for the binary outcomes. Application events were treated as repeat  
52 measurements nested within doctors, with the intercept of the model allowed to vary  
53 randomly across each applicant.  
54  
55  
56  
57

1  
2  
3 Likewise ARCPs were treated as repeat measurements nested within doctors. Thus,  
4 multilevel ordinal logistic regression analyses were used to estimate the odds of obtaining a  
5 less versus a more satisfactory ARCP outcome. The intercept of the model was allowed to  
6 vary randomly across each doctor in training. No clustering effects (as indicated by the  
7 intraclass correlation) for deanery were observed and thus no control for this was required.  
8  
9 For the prediction of subsequent training performance analyses were conducted both with  
10 and without ARCP outcomes associated with postgraduate exam failure. This was in order to  
11 evaluate the impact of the examination performance on the ARCP outcomes in each  
12 graduate group and across the main medical specialties.  
13  
14  
15

16  
17 For both sets of analyses the baseline category of graduate group was swapped to evaluate  
18 all combinations of comparison. As part of the modelling process all combinations of  
19 interactions between the predictor variables were evaluated. Only interaction terms that were  
20 statistically significant (at the  $p < 0.05$  level) and substantively meaningful were included in  
21 the final models. Multivariable model building proceeded in a forward stepwise manner with  
22 a  $p$  value of  $< 0.05$  from univariable analysis being the criterion for entry. The predictor  
23 variables used in the multivariable model building, including the available potentially  
24 confounding variables, were: age, UK experience, ethnicity, sex, selection standardised  
25 shortlisting scores and standardised interview scores.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 Analyses by specialty group were conducted and the results from three of these reported as  
32 exemplars: *general practice*, *psychiatry* and *surgery*. General practice and psychiatry were  
33 selected as they had relatively high proportions of UK overseas graduates working in them.  
34 Moreover, relatively high differential performance at both ARCP and postgraduate  
35 membership exams between UK and international graduates have been reported.<sup>(6-8)</sup> The  
36 results for the surgical specialties are also presented as, traditionally, entry to the training  
37 schemes are more competitive than most other medical fields.<sup>(38)</sup>  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 Missing data were relatively uncommon (see Figure 1), other than for shortlisting score and  
43 interview score. As such, we repeated the above analyses using multiply imputed data  
44 using chained equations, creating 20 imputed dataset, as implemented in STATA 14. This  
45 portion of the analysis can be thought of as a sensitivity analyses for these two selection  
46 variables. Specifically, if the results between the imputed and non-imputed datasets vary  
47 then this would be evidence that the absent values are 'missing not at random' (i.e. the  
48 missing values are neither associated with the observed data nor due to chance). Thus, the  
49 results in relation to any affected variables must be interpreted more cautiously.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Results

### Descriptive statistics

As can be seen from Figure 1, there were relatively few missing data in the final sample of doctors. For example, country of nationality and/or qualification was unavailable in only 301 (0.8%) of the doctors in this final sample. The exceptions to this are the shortlisting score, which was missing in 45.9% of cases, and interview score, unavailable for 30.2% of the final sample.

Table 2 shows the demographic characteristics of the doctors in the final sample (where both recruitment and ARCP outcomes were available) in relation to the recruitment outcomes. As can be seen from Table 2, UK overseas graduates were more likely than UK graduates to be male and report non-White ethnicity. It can also be seen that, on average, UK overseas graduates had slightly lower standardised short-listing scores but somewhat higher mean interview scores than non-UK international medical graduates. UK overseas graduates were, on average, approximately five years older than UK graduates at specialty application with around a year of extra UK clinical experience at the time of the first recorded ARCP. It can also be seen from Table 2 that, on average, international medical graduates applied for more specialty posts than UK overseas graduates during the study period, though were less often deemed appointable by the selection panel. The background characteristics and overall ARCP outcomes for the four groups of medical graduates are shown in Table 3. As can be seen, compared to other graduate groups, UK overseas graduates were more likely to receive a 'less than satisfactory' outcome at ARCP which was more likely to be associated with a failure to pass a postgraduate exam.

INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

Table 4 depicts a breakdown of the composition of doctors in training in each specialty according to graduate group. Overall 1108 (3.19%) of the doctors in our sample were UK overseas graduates. As can be seen, those disciplines where competition for training places

1  
2  
3 is less competitive (38) tend to have the highest proportion of UK overseas graduates, such  
4 as psychiatry (145/2183, 6.6%).  
5  
6  
7

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE

### Modelling outcomes from specialty selection

The results from the univariable analyses are depicted in Table 5 and Figure 2. In order to further reduce the impact of competition effects (i.e. less highly achieving candidates applying for the least competitive specialties) we also repeated the specialty-based analyses with the three exemplars (*psychiatry, surgery and general practice*). Results by specialty are shown in Figure 3. As can be seen from the results in the left hand column of Table 5 and also Figure 2, UK overseas graduates were less likely than UK graduates or EEA nationals to be deemed appointable at specialty selection. However, they were more likely than international medical graduates who were not UK nationals to be deemed appointable (OR 1.29, 1.16 to 1.42). Also apparent in Table 5 is that females, younger and more experienced doctors were more likely to be successful at recruitment. Those who were nationals or qualified from wealthier countries were more also more likely to be deemed appointable. Disparities between a country of qualification and nationality's income, in either direction, were associated with a reduced odds of being deemed appointable, with the odds being roughly reduced by 25% for every difference of \$10,000 per capita.

INSERT TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE

INSERT FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE

INSERT FIGURE 3 ABOUT HERE

The results from the multivariable analyses, predicting outcome at specialty recruitment are also contained in Table 5, in the right-hand column. Results adjusted for various predictor variables are also shown in Figure 2. One interaction term that was statistically significant at



1  
2  
3 the  $p < 0.05$  level and conceptually justifiable was included in the modelling. This was the  
4 term representing the interaction between age and experience. This term, when  
5 exponentiated as an odds ratio, was less than one. This highlights that the advantage of  
6 increasing experience at interview was offset by more advanced age. The pattern in the  
7 multivariable results observed was generally similar to the univariable results. As can also be  
8 seen from Figure 2, as expected, progressively controlling for background variables,  
9 shortlisting scores and interview performance reduces the disparities in odds of being  
10 deemed appointable between the UK medical graduates and non-UK graduate groups.  
11 However, it is notable from the results shown in Table 4 that the difference in the odds  
12 between a UK overseas graduate and a non-UK international medical graduate increased  
13 after controlling for other predictor variables. Another noteworthy observation is that once the  
14 odds are conditioned on the relative interview scores the shortlisting scores become non-  
15 significant to the probability of being deemed appointable.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

### 23 **Modelling ARCP outcomes**

24  
25  
26 In total there were data relating to 99,293 ARCP outcomes relating to 34,755 doctors in  
27 specialist training in the final dataset. As can be seen from the flow of data depicted in  
28 Figure 1 there were relatively few missing data. Statistical significance, in the present case,  
29 should be assumed to be at the  $p < 0.001$  level, unless otherwise stated.  
30  
31  
32

33 In terms of univariable analyses, graduate group was associated with an increased odds of  
34 receiving a less satisfactory ARCP outcome at review, with UK overseas graduates showing  
35 the largest difference with UK medical graduates as the comparison category (Figure 4).  
36 This pattern was replicated across the three specialties selected as exemplars (Figure 5).  
37 We also noted no significant difference in the odds of a less satisfactory ARCP outcome  
38 between UK overseas graduates who are generally expected to sit the PLAB test ( $n=812$ )  
39 and those who had qualified from a medical school within the EEA ( $n=793$ , OR 1.16, 0.91 to  
40 1.47,  $p=0.24$ ); the latter sub-group ( $n=294$ ) being exempt from the test.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 Both increasing age and UK experience at ARCP were associated with higher odds of a less  
47 satisfactory outcome, as was male sex. In the case of age and experience, the odds of a  
48 poorer versus better outcome increased by approximately 5% per year. Likewise, the odds  
49 of males having a less, rather than more, satisfactory outcomes, were about 43% higher  
50 than those for females doctors (Table 6).  
51  
52  
53

54 Both the GDP of the country of nationality and that of the place of qualification had roughly  
55 equal influences on ARCP outcomes: for every \$10 000 extra per capita the GDP of the  
56  
57



1  
2  
3 country the odds of a less satisfactory (versus more satisfactory) outcome dropped by  
4 approximately 20%. However, the most potent predictor in this regard was the absolute  
5 difference in GDP between country of nationality and place of qualification. This indicated  
6 that the odds of a less satisfactory (versus more satisfactory) outcome increased by  
7 approximately 22% for every \$10 000 per capita difference between the two countries,  
8 regardless of the direction of the disparity.  
9

10  
11  
12 Once ARCP outcomes associated with postgraduate exam failure were excluded from the  
13 analyses the effect sizes of the predictors diminished to varying degrees though remained  
14 statistically significant in all cases (Table 6 - right hand column and Figure 4). This indicated  
15 that some of the association between ARCP outcomes and graduate status and the other  
16 predictors were mediated by differential Royal College exam pass rates.  
17  
18  
19

20  
21 The influence of background variables was controlled for in the multivariable analyses. We  
22 observed that the differences in ARCP outcomes between the UK medical graduates and  
23 those who held non-UK primary medical qualifications diminished to some extent (Figure 4).  
24 Moreover when the impact of differential postgraduate exam pass rates were also adjusted  
25 for (by excluding the relevant ARCP outcomes) the inter-group differences further reduced,  
26 disappearing entirely for UK overseas graduates versus home medical graduates. We also  
27 noted that (in contrast to the univariable results), once the influence of age was controlled  
28 for, UK-based experience predicted the probability of more, rather than less, satisfactory  
29 ARCP outcomes. The results are also depicted in Table 7.  
30  
31  
32  
33

34  
35 The picture when analyses were conducted for each specialty group was similar (Figure 5).  
36 As can be seen, even after adjusting only for the influence of background variables there  
37 were no differences remaining in the odds of a more satisfactory ARCP outcome between  
38 UK overseas and home graduates in the surgical trainees. Likewise, no statistically  
39 significant differences remained after excluding ARCPs associated with exam failure in  
40 psychiatry and general practice (Figure 5). It is worth noting that all the other predictors in  
41 the model, including an interaction term for age and experience remained statistically  
42 significant and independent predictors of ARCP outcome (Table 7).  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 INSERT FIGURE 4 ABOUT HERE

51  
52  
53  
54 INSERT FIGURE 5 ABOUT HERE  
55  
56  
57

1  
2  
3 INSERT TABLE 6 ABOUT HERE  
4  
5  
6

7 INSERT TABLE 7 ABOUT HERE  
8  
9  
10

### 11 **Results from the imputed datasets**

12  
13 When re-running the multivariable analysis predicting 'appointability' at specialty recruitment  
14 on the imputed data, unlike the analysis on the non-imputed dataset (Table 5), both  
15 shortlisting score (OR 1.05, 1.03 to 1.08) and interview score (OR 3.13, 3.03 to 3.23) are  
16 significant independent predictors.  
17  
18

19  
20 In contrast, the analyses for ARCP outcome show negligible difference whether being  
21 performed on the non-imputed data or the imputed data.  
22  
23  
24  
25

### 26 **Discussion**

27  
28 In this study, the first to focus on UK overseas graduates, we observed that this group of  
29 doctors were more likely to be deemed appointable at specialty training recruitment than  
30 non-UK international medical graduates, though less so than other graduate groups. Marked  
31 disparities in ARCP outcomes between this group of doctors and other graduate types were  
32 also noted. The patterns observed in the selection data were not precisely replicated, with a  
33 're-ordering' of UK and non-UK overseas medical graduates. In the present case the  
34 dissonance between the selection and ARCP results could be largely, if not wholly,  
35 explained by the differential interview performances between UK and non-UK international  
36 medical graduates. This finding is consistent with a previous report into selection and  
37 subsequent educational achievement in those recruited to UK general practice training-  
38 performance on selection measures were noted to be less strongly predictive of subsequent  
39 scores at the MRCGP exam in international, compared to home graduates.(20)  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46  
47 The magnitude of intergroup differences in ARCP outcomes reduced after controlling for the  
48 influence of age, UK experience and absolute economic differences between the country of  
49 nationality and qualification. We also observed a significant interaction between age and  
50 (UK-based) clinical experience, in line with previous findings.(23) In addition the inter-group  
51 differences further diminished after excluding ARCP outcomes associated with exam failure,  
52 and indeed vanished for UK overseas graduates versus home graduates following these  
53 adjustments. This pattern was generally seen across the medical specialties.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### Comparison with other studies and possible interpretations

Our observation that the disparities in the odds of entering specialist training in the UK recruitment data were not precisely mirrored by ARCP outcomes was consistent with data from North America on selection to medical specialties. US international medical graduates tend to have higher odds of being placed in a residency programme than their non-US counterpart (39) despite subsequent reduced specialty certification rates for North American citizens who trained outside of the country.(40)

Likewise our findings in relation to postgraduate educational performance were in keeping with those from previous studies of postgraduate education performance in international medical graduates training in the UK.(10) Specifically our observations concurred with those reported by McManus and Wakeford who reported lower scores on the PLAB part 1 (written component) and Applied Knowledge Test (AKT) of the MRCGP exam.(7) However, in the latter study only a subset of UK international medical graduates (i.e. those who registered via the PLAB system) were included. We noted that the magnitude of inter-group differences was less marked in the more competitive disciplines. Over time, increasing competition ratios may drive up educational performance and so reduce any disparities between medical graduate groups.

By comparing the raw and adjusted odds ratios we obtain some indications of factors that may underlie the observed differences in ARCP outcomes. Certainly age, UK experience and the interaction between these two variables play a role. Moreover, it appeared that it was the absolute, rather than relative difference, between the economic status of country of nationality and qualification which had the larger influence on ARCP outcomes. This observation leads to the inference that there was something different about those individuals who studied medicine in a setting economically, and probably culturally different to their home country. It is also interesting to observe that controlling for the influence of the background predictors and postgraduate exam pass rates reduced the difference in ARCP outcomes between UK overseas and home graduates to a somewhat greater degree than those between the latter group and non-UK international medical graduates (see Fig. 4). It is thus likely that some of the remaining, unexplained gap in ARCP performance between these latter two groups is accounted for by, perhaps subtle, linguistic and sociocultural factors, previously referred to as the 'dark variance' of differential attainment.(41)

1  
2  
3 It also seemed that many of the 'less than satisfactory' ARCP outcomes (as defined by the  
4 authors) were disproportionately associated with exam failure in UK international medical  
5 graduates. Thus, removing these reviews from the analyses diminished the observed inter-  
6 group differences. This raises questions about both the reliability of each assessment, as  
7 well as the constructs that they purport to measure. At present the reliability of the ARCP is  
8 unknown, though the process has recently been subject to a qualitative review.(42) In  
9 contrast there is some existing evidence of acceptable reliability for the Royal College  
10 postgraduate examinations.(43, 44) Moreover, where psychometrically investigated, no  
11 evidence of racial bias was detected (45) though, at least for the MRCGP CSA, more subtle  
12 sociocultural forms of bias cannot be ruled out.(8, 27) It could also be assumed that ARCP  
13 panels consider a range of factors in addition to clinical knowledge and skills, though do not  
14 usually involve a face-to-face interview.(32) These attributes may include perceived  
15 professionalism, ability to team work and administrative efficiency. Regarding the contrast  
16 between ARCP and the recruitment into specialty training results- it could be argued that the  
17 latter process gives some additional scope for bias (both conscious and unconscious). For  
18 example, there is evidence that face-to-face interviewers sometimes base decisions on  
19 misleading cues.(46) Although there are structured elements to the selection process it can  
20 be assumed that 'softer' abilities, such as presentational skills will partly determine the  
21 outcome.(47) Thus, non-UK candidates, and especially those for whom English is not their  
22 first language, may be disproportionately disadvantaged, compared to the ARCP process.  
23 This possibility is supported by our observation that UK overseas graduates received, on  
24 average, higher interview scores at selection than non-UK international medical graduates. It  
25 was noteworthy that once performance at interview was controlled for in the modelling the  
26 graduate groups restacked into an order that was more consistent with that observed for  
27 ARCP performance. This raises the issue about whether excessive weight is given to  
28 interview performance within the specialty selection process. Such 'overweighting' might  
29 lead to situations where a candidate destined for satisfactory performance in postgraduate  
30 training is passed over in favour of one who outperforms them at interview but is less likely  
31 to make satisfactory future progress. It should be recognised that both in the UK and  
32 elsewhere postgraduate medical selectors are working to increase the standardisation and  
33 structure of their processes.(48) In particular, the introduction of Situational Judgement Tests  
34 (SJTs) as a component of selection into UK general practice training may effectively  
35 evaluate some of the non-academic qualities of candidates.(49) Such assessments are  
36 usually used at an early stage screening processes which leaves scope for candidates to  
37 diverge in performance at later stages of selection. Thus these observations raise the  
38 question of whether ARCP and selection processes should become more like the  
39 postgraduate exams or vice versa? Perhaps ideally postgraduate examinations should test a

1  
2  
3 wider range of qualities important to real world practice, including the ability to demonstrate  
4 culturally-appropriate professionalism and team-working. Likewise the ARCP process has  
5 been recently qualitatively reviewed <sup>41</sup> and at the time of writing there are plans to review it in  
6 order to improve its reliability, acceptability and validity.(50)  
7  
8

### 9 **Strengths and potential limitations**

10  
11 The primary strength of this study is the quantity, representativeness and completeness of  
12 the data available. This leads to the power to detect inter-group differences, even in sub-  
13 group analyses. The use of ARCP as an outcome allowed comparisons to be made both  
14 across and within specialties. We were also able to adjust for the impact of differential pass  
15 rates at postgraduate exams. Unlike in some previous studies, country of both nationality  
16 and place of qualification were available, allowing a more granular analysis, including by  
17 GDP. However, it should be noted that we only had access to the nationality of the doctor at  
18 the point of registration with the GMC. Thus, we were unable to differentiate between  
19 doctors who were designated UK citizens at birth and those who obtained this status  
20 subsequently.  
21  
22

23  
24 The major limitation in this case was the observational nature of the study. Thus, we could  
25 not control for the effects of unmeasured variables not captured in the dataset. Nevertheless,  
26 by controlling for the effects of the predictor variables we had access to, as well as by  
27 excluding ARCPs associated with postgraduate exam failure, we were able to obliterate the  
28 observed differences in overall performance between the UK overseas and home graduates.  
29 Naturally these results do not give rise to causal explanations for the differences. However,  
30 they do guide the focus of further investigation into the factors underlying these disparities,  
31 for example, differential pass rates at the Royal College membership examinations. We also  
32 noted a small percentage (2.4%) of doctors who only had ARCP outcomes recorded in  
33 relation to short-term training posts (e.g. LATs). The posts held by this small group of  
34 doctors may have not been typical of training posts in general. However, when we excluded  
35 these medical trainees from the analyses no meaningful impact on the results was noted.  
36 Moreover, in practice, such short-term training appointments are sometimes awarded to  
37 doctors who then subsequently obtain a place on a substantive training programme. Thus, it  
38 did not appear practicable to differentiate between such temporary posts and longer term  
39 training programmes in the analyses.  
40  
41

42  
43 It should be noted that, in this study, ARCP outcome '5' ('further information required') was  
44 used as an intermediate outcome category when conducting our modelling. In practice a  
45 request for further information may, occasionally, be due to the failure of a supervisor, or  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

1  
2  
3 other third-party, to supply documentation and may be due to the actions of the trainee  
4 themselves. However, in line with our previous findings and exploration of the use of ARCP's  
5 as an educational outcome, it was felt that use of the 'outcome 5' in this way was justified.  
6  
7 (6)  
8

9  
10 When comparing the results from the analysis of ARCP outcomes to the recruitment  
11 processes it must be borne in mind that some level of 'filtration' has already occurred by the  
12 time doctors enter postgraduate training. That is to say that the range of the data has been  
13 restricted in that ARCP outcomes were only observed for those doctors successfully entering  
14 specialty training. Thus, the degree of disparity between the different graduate groups may  
15 have been underestimated. In particular those who obtained their primary medical  
16 qualification outside of the UK may be especially likely to be in non-training medical posts  
17 and not included in the present sample. Moreover, at least for the more competitive  
18 specialties, in accordance with EU employment law, those who were not nationals from the  
19 European Economic Area may not have been shortlisted if there were deemed sufficient  
20 numbers of applicants from Europe. In addition we only had access to date of registration  
21 with the GMC and could not estimate years of practice outside of the UK. However, it may  
22 be that practice in a comparable healthcare setting may be more important in predicting  
23 educational and clinical performance than experience *per se*. A further limitation was that  
24 ARCP were not directly linked to the programmes interviewed for. This was because the  
25 structure of the data were complicated and the doctors sometimes changed speciality, or  
26 were undergoing 'dual' training in more than one speciality.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35  
36 Some caution must be exercised when interpreting the interview scores as predictors of  
37 recruitment outcomes. The decision to deem a candidate 'appointable' is almost wholly  
38 based, at that stage of selection, on the interview ratings, and thus there is a tautological  
39 element to this aspect of the analysis Nevertheless it was informative to compare the  
40 standardised interview scores between the graduate groups. This permitted us to identify the  
41 source of the advantage that the UK overseas graduates had over the non-UK citizens who  
42 had graduated from outside of the EEA at selection.  
43  
44  
45

46  
47 Both shortlisting score and interview score displayed extensive missingness, and the analysis  
48 relating to selection into specialty training on the imputed dataset produced somewhat  
49 differing results than those for the non-imputed data. The reduction in odds ratio observed  
50 for the interview score in the imputed data set is not an unexpected result – only an  
51 application which proceeded to interview will have an associated interview score. Thus,  
52 there is likely to be some 'restriction of range' present. The shortlisting score was missing in  
53 nearly half of all cases, and the change in significance for shortlisting score in the  
54  
55  
56  
57



1  
2  
3 multivariable model suggest that these data were not missing at random. It is possible that  
4 the missing data was at least partly due to differences in deanery returning practices. As the  
5 imputed analysis displayed somewhat different results, some caution must be exercised  
6 when interpreting the results specifically relating to appointability at specialty recruitment and  
7 the shortlisting scores.  
8  
9

10  
11 These findings raise important questions that could be answered by both further quantitative  
12 and qualitative studies. If the data could be made available further research could be  
13 conducted to understand the differences in royal college examination performance across  
14 the four graduate groups that the ARCP results presented here suggest exist. The reasons  
15 why UK citizens study abroad may be varied; ideally one could identify whether the such  
16 individuals had applied to medical school in the UK unsuccessfully or attended a UK medical  
17 school but left at some point. For these cases, it may be possible to obtain data from their  
18 application to UK medical school in the UK, for example aptitude test scores, as a measure  
19 of their educational performance prior to completing their degree.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

## 25 **Conclusions**

26  
27 We observed a significant effect for NHS experience. This implies that in order to enhance  
28 the postgraduate educational performance of doctors who graduate from overseas additional  
29 training opportunities could be effective. In particular, previous research has highlighted the  
30 challenges that overseas doctors experience when transitioning to the UK NHS. It may be  
31 that UK citizens who have undergone their undergraduate training in other settings are not  
32 readily identified as potentially benefitting from additional support. This would be because  
33 culturally and linguistically they would not be expected to stand out from home medical  
34 graduates and less likely to experience cultural dissonance. As such policy could highlight  
35 this group as one that could be targeted for addition support with transitioning. Additionally,  
36 not all doctors entering UK training from overseas have completed their foundation training,  
37 these doctors require a supervisor (sometimes from abroad) to verify that they have  
38 achieved foundation competencies (the Alternative Certificate of Foundation Competence).  
39 At present it is unclear what proportion of non-UK graduates this relates to and whether they  
40 are disadvantaged in any way.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 While conducting this study we noted some inconsistencies in the current UK regulatory  
50 policy. For example, European citizens who study outside of the EEA are not expected to sit  
51 the PLAB (if having practised in the EEA for at least three years) whilst UK citizens in a  
52 similar situation generally would undergo the assessments. In addition, those UK overseas  
53 graduates who would usually be expected to demonstrate their competency via the PLAB  
54  
55  
56  
57

1  
2  
3 system did not have significantly better ARCP outcomes than those who did not. Most PLAB  
4 candidates eventually pass both parts so the impact of the exam on future ARCP  
5 performance in this subgroup may not be substantial.(51) However, previous research has  
6 shown that PLAB scores do predict both ARCP and postgraduate exam performance in  
7 international medical graduates.(6, 7) Once the UK leaves the EU there is a potential  
8 opportunity for changes to medical regulation. For example, 'Brexit' could potentially allow  
9 for the introduction of a national licensing exam that will be taken by all doctors wishing to  
10 practice in the UK regardless of nationality or place of qualification, subject to any  
11 exemptions that are agreed. The GMC has been consulting on plans to introduce such a test  
12 in the form of the UK 'Medical Licensing Assessment'.(52) It is important to point out that in  
13 other parts of the world the introduction of such licensing exams do not, in themselves,  
14 ensure equivalence in subsequent performance between differing medical graduate groups.  
15 (11) Nevertheless it would hopefully help ensure minimum standards of competence and a  
16 greater degree of fairness in the regulatory system.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 Those UK nationals who choose to study medicine abroad before returning to the NHS are  
25 unlikely to be a homogenous group. Thus further research should focus on understanding  
26 the qualitative characteristics of this category of doctor. Importantly we do not know whether,  
27 as in the US, this group of nationals who qualified overseas have inferior patient outcomes  
28 compared to other categories of medical practitioner.(14) Certainly the observations alluded  
29 to by McManus and Wakeford (7), that UK overseas graduates performed more poorly on  
30 the knowledge but not the clinical component of the MRCGP, are intriguing. Indeed they may  
31 imply, at least for UK overseas graduates who sit the PLAB, that it may be mainly  
32 performance on knowledge, rather than skills-based assessments that are at least driving  
33 the differential attainment between this latter and other medical graduate groups. Thus, for  
34 these reasons research examining actual UK-based clinical practice into differing graduate  
35 groups is urgently required.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 The present study, in the context of previous work in this area, suggests that the regulations  
44 governing the right to practise medicine in a particular country should not be determined by  
45 either nationality or place of qualification. Rather they should be based on a reliable and  
46 equitable evaluation of clinical ability and other personal qualities essential to the practice of  
47 medicine in that specific national context. The introduction of a licensing exam into the UK  
48 would provide an opportunity to implement such policy. The impact of such a licensing exam  
49 should be carefully evaluated as at present it is unclear whether such a universal  
50 assessment is likely to translate into improved safety and quality of patient care.(53)  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

## 56 **Abbreviations**

57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 ARCP; Annual Review of Competence Progression: CSA; Clinical Skills Assessment: EEA;  
4 European Economic Area: EU; European Union: GDP; Gross Domestic Product (in US  
5 Dollars): GMC; General Medical Council: LAT; Locum appointment for training: MRCGP;  
6 Membership of the Royal College of General Practitioners: MSRA; Multi-Specialty  
7 Recruitment Assessment: PLAB; Professional and Linguistic Assessment Board: SJT;  
8 Situational Judgement Test.  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

## 15 **Declarations**

16  
17 **Ethical approval:** Not required. The study relied on the analysis of de-identified routinely  
18 collected data analysed within a 'safe haven' environment. This was confirmed in writing by  
19 the chair of the University of York Department of Health Sciences Ethics Committee.  
20  
21

22  
23 **Consent for publication:** Not applicable.  
24  
25

26 **Data sharing statement:** The data and associated STATA syntax used to manage and  
27 analyse the data are archived and may be made available from the GMC on request within a  
28 safe haven environment on an individual basis should a sufficient justification be provided.  
29 No additional individual data available.  
30  
31

32 **Competing interests:** The time that DS spent working on this project was funded as part of  
33 his role at the General Medical Council (GMC). However, the views expressed in this article  
34 do not necessarily reflect those of the GMC. PAT has previously received research funding,  
35 via a competitive tendering processes, as lead and co-applicant from the GMC, Health  
36 Education England and the Department of Health for England.  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 **Funding:** PAT is supported in his research by the National Institute for Healthcare Research  
42 (NIHR) via a Career Development Fellowship. This paper represents independent research  
43 part-funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR). The views expressed are  
44 those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR or the Department of  
45 Health. The time that DS spent working on this project was funded as part of his role at the  
46 General Medical Council (GMC). However, the views expressed in this article do not  
47 necessarily reflect those of the GMC.  
48  
49  
50  
51

52 **Authors' contributions:** PAT led on conception, design, statistical analysis and  
53 interpretation of data and is the guarantor of the paper. JO contributed to the cleaning,  
54 management and analysis of the data and drafting the article. LWP conducted analyses and  
55  
56  
57

1  
2  
3 produced the data visualisations of the results as well as contributing to drafting and critically  
4 appraising the article. DS was involved in cleaning and managing the data as well as  
5 drafting, revising the article and critically appraising the content. JJN was involved in  
6 providing supervision and advice in relation to the analyses as well as contributing to drafting  
7 and critically appraising the article. All authors (PAT, JO, LWP, DS and JJN) have approved  
8 the final version of the article submitted.  
9  
10  
11

12 **Acknowledgements:** The authors are grateful to GMC colleagues who commented on the  
13 paper: Richard Amison, Ben Griffith, Neil Jinks, Andy Knapton, Nicola While and Kirsty  
14 White. The views expressed are those of the authors and not the GMC.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

## 20 21 **References**

- 22 1. Clark PF, Stewart JB, Clark DA. The globalization of the labour market for health-  
23 care professionals. *International Labour Review*. 2006;145(1-1):37-64.  
24
- 25 2. General Medical Council. The state of medical education and practice in the UK 2016  
26 [Electronic]. London: General Medical Council. 2016. [cited 17 November 2017] Available  
27 from: [http://www.gmc-uk.org/SOMEPEP\\_2016\\_Full\\_Report\\_Lo\\_Res.pdf\\_68139324.pdf](http://www.gmc-uk.org/SOMEPEP_2016_Full_Report_Lo_Res.pdf_68139324.pdf).  
28
- 29 3. General Medical Council. Chapter two: Our data on medical students and doctors in  
30 training in the UK [Internet]. 2016 [cited 23 November 2017]. Available from:  
31 [https://www.gmc-uk.org/SoMEPEP\\_2016\\_Chapter\\_two.pdf\\_68136455.pdf](https://www.gmc-uk.org/SoMEPEP_2016_Chapter_two.pdf_68136455.pdf).  
32
- 33 4. General Medical Council. The state of medical education and practice in the UK 2015  
34 [Electronic]. London: General Medical Council. 2015. [cited 17 November 2017] Available  
35 from: [http://www.gmc-uk.org/SOMEPEP\\_2015.pdf\\_63501874.pdf](http://www.gmc-uk.org/SOMEPEP_2015.pdf_63501874.pdf).  
36
- 37 5. McManus C. Hunt promises 25% more medical students in 2018. *BMJ*.  
38 2016;355:i5480.  
39
- 40 6. Tiffin PA, Illing J, Kasim AS, McLachlan JC. Annual Review of Competence  
41 Progression (ARCP) performance of doctors who passed Professional and Linguistic  
42 Assessments Board (PLAB) tests compared with UK medical graduates: national data  
43 linkage study. *BMJ*. 2014;348:g2622.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

- 1  
2  
3 7. McManus IC, Wakeford R. PLAB and UK graduates' performance on MRCP(UK) and  
4 MRCGP examinations: data linkage study. *BMJ*. 2014;348:g2621.
- 5  
6  
7 8. Esmail A, Roberts C. Academic performance of ethnic minority candidates and  
8 discrimination in the MRCGP examinations between 2010 and 2012: analysis of data. *BMJ*.  
9  
10 2013;347:f5662.
- 11  
12 9. Tiffin PA, Illing J, Webster LAD, McLachlan JC. The validity of the Professional and  
13 Linguistic Assessments Board (PLAB) exam: Research report. London: General Medical  
14 Council; 2013. [cited 18 November 2017] Available from [https://www.gmc-](https://www.gmc-uk.org/Report_on_PLAB_Validity_FINAL_2014_.pdf_57909935.pdf)  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000
10. Regan De Bere S, Nunn S, Nasser M. Understanding differential attainment across  
21 medical training pathways: A rapid review of the literature. Plymouth University: Plymouth  
22 University; 2015. [cited 18 November 2017] Available from [https://www.gmc-](https://www.gmc-uk.org/GMC_Understanding_Differential_Attainment.pdf_63533431.pdf)  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100
11. MacLellan AM, Brailovsky C, Rainsberry P, Bowmer I, Desrochers M. Examination  
30 outcomes for international medical graduates pursuing or completing family medicine  
31 residency training in Quebec. *Canadian Family Physician Medecin de Famille Canadien*.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
12. Woolf K, Rich A, Viney R, Needleman S, Griffin A. Perceived causes of differential  
36 attainment in UK postgraduate medical training: a national qualitative study. *BMJ Open*.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
13. Norcini JJ, Boulet JR, Opalek A, Dauphinee WD. The relationship between licensing  
42 examination performance and the outcomes of care by international medical school  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
14. Norcini JJ, Boulet JR, Dauphinee WD, Opalek A, Krantz ID, Anderson ST. Evaluating  
50 the quality of care provided by graduates of international medical schools. *Health Affairs*.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 15. Medical Act 1983 [cited 23 November 2017] Available from: [http://www.gmc-uk.org/about/legislation/medical\\_act.asp](http://www.gmc-uk.org/about/legislation/medical_act.asp).
- 4  
5  
6  
7 16. General Medical Council. Our required IELTS scores are changing on 18 June 2014  
8 [Internet]. 2014 [cited 23 November 2017] Available from: [http://www.gmc-](http://www.gmc-uk.org/doctors/registration_news/23882.asp)  
9  
10  
11 [uk.org/doctors/registration\\_news/23882.asp](http://www.gmc-uk.org/doctors/registration_news/23882.asp).
- 12  
13 17. General Medical Council. Applying for registration as an International Medical  
14 Graduate [Internet]. 2017 [cited 23 November 2017] Available from: [http://www.gmc-](http://www.gmc-uk.org/doctors/before_you_apply/imgs.asp)  
15  
16  
17 [uk.org/doctors/before\\_you\\_apply/imgs.asp](http://www.gmc-uk.org/doctors/before_you_apply/imgs.asp).
- 18  
19 18. The Multi-Specialty Recruitment Assessment- Applicant Guidance [Internet]. [cited 23  
20 November 2017] Available from: [https://gprecruitment.hee.nhs.uk/Recruitment/Applicant-](https://gprecruitment.hee.nhs.uk/Recruitment/Applicant-Guidance/MSRA)  
21  
22  
23 [Guidance/MSRA](https://gprecruitment.hee.nhs.uk/Recruitment/Applicant-Guidance/MSRA).
- 24  
25 19. Recruitment to Speciality Training- Applicant Guide 2017 [Internet]. [cited 13  
26 September 2017]. Available from: <https://specialtytraining.hee.nhs.uk/>.
- 27  
28 20. General Medical Council. Exploring the Relationship between General Practice  
29 Selection Scores and MRCGP Examination Performance [Electronic]. 2015 [cited 23  
30 November 2017] Available from: <https://www.gmc-uk.org/about/research/28334.asp>.
- 31  
32  
33 21. Cuddy MM, Swanson DB, Clauser BE. A multilevel analysis of examinee gender and  
34 USMLE step 1 performance. *Academic Medicine : Journal of the Association of American*  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000
22. Pyne Y, Ben-Shlomo Y. Older doctors and progression through specialty training in the UK: a cohort analysis of General Medical Council data. *BMJ Open*. 2015;5(2).
23. Norcini JJ, Boulet JR, Opalek A, Dauphinee WD. Patients of doctors further from medical school graduation have poorer outcomes. *Medical Education*. 2017;51(5):480-9.
24. Tsugawa Y, Newhouse JP, Zaslavsky AM, Blumenthal DM, Jena AB. Physician age and outcomes in elderly patients in hospital in the US: observational study. *BMJ*. 2017;357.
25. Birkmeyer JD, Stukel TA, Siewers AE, Goodney PP, Wennberg DE, Lucas FL. Surgeon volume and operative mortality in the United States. *The New England Journal of Medicine*. 2003;349(22):2117-27.

- 1  
2  
3 26. Duclos A, Peix J-L, Colin C, Kraimps J-L, Menegaux F, Pattou F, et al. Influence of  
4 experience on performance of individual surgeons in thyroid surgery: prospective cross  
5 sectional multicentre study. *BMJ*. 2012;344.  
6  
7  
8 27. Roberts C, Atkins S, Hawthorne K. Performance features in clinical skills  
9 assessment: Linguistic and cultural factors in the Membership of the Royal College of  
10 General Practitioners examination. London: King's College London; 2014.  
11  
12  
13 28. Johannessen KA, Hagen TP. Individual and hospital-specific factors influencing  
14 medical graduates' time to medical specialization. *Social Science & Medicine* (1982).  
15 2013;97:170-5.  
16  
17  
18 29. Monrouxe LV, Grundy L, Mann M, John Z, Panagoulas E, Bullock A, et al. How  
19 prepared are UK medical graduates for practice? A rapid review of the literature 2009–2014.  
20 *BMJ Open*. 2017;7(1).  
21  
22  
23 30. Slowther A, Lewando Hundt GA, Purkis J, Taylor R. Experiences of non-UK-qualified  
24 doctors working within the UK regulatory framework: a qualitative study. *Journal of the Royal*  
25 *Society of Medicine*. 2012;105(4):157-65.  
26  
27  
28 31. Jolly P, Garrison G, Boulet JR, Levitan T, Cooper RA. Three pathways to a physician  
29 career: applicants to U.S. MD and DO schools and U.S. Citizen applicants to international  
30 medical schools. *Academic Medicine : Journal of the Association of American Medical*  
31 *Colleges*. 2008;83(12):1125-31.  
32  
33  
34 32. COPMed. The Gold Guide [Electronic]. London: The Conference of Postgraduate  
35 Medical Deans of the United Kingdom; 2016. [cited 18 November 2017] Available from:  
36 <https://www.copmed.org.uk/publications/the-gold-guide>.  
37  
38  
39 33. Oriel: the UK wide portal for recruitment to postgraduate medical, dental, public  
40 health, healthcare science and pharmacy training programmes. 2017 [cited 30th October  
41 2017]. Available from: <https://www.oriel.nhs.uk/web>.  
42  
43  
44 34. The Health Informatics Centre at Dundee [cited 23 November 2017]. Available from:  
45 <https://www.dundee.ac.uk/hic/>.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 35. General Medical Council. Collection of ARCP and RITA outcomes awarded in  
4 2015/2016 – Briefing Note 1. London: General Medical Council; 2016.  
5  
6 36. General Medical Council. National Training Surveys [Electronic]. 2016 [cited 23  
7 November 2017]. Available from: <http://www.gmc-uk.org/education/surveys.asp>.  
8  
9 37. The World Bank. National Gross Domestic Products (GDPs) [Electronic]. 2017 [cited  
10 23 November 2017] Available from: <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD>.  
11  
12 38. Health Education England. Competition ratios [Electronic]. 2017 [cited 30th October  
13 2017]. Available from: <https://specialtytraining.hee.nhs.uk/Competition-Ratios>.  
14  
15 39. The Match National Resident Matching Program. Charting Outcomes in the Match for  
16 International Medical Graduates [Electronic]. 2016 [cited 23 November 2017]. Available from  
17 <http://www.nrmp.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/Charting-Outcomes-IMGs-2016.pdf>.  
18  
19 40. Norcini JJ, Boulet JR, Whelan GP, McKinley DW. Specialty board certification among  
20 U.S. citizen and non-U.S. citizen graduates of international medical schools. *Academic*  
21 *Medicine : Journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges*. 2005;80(10 Suppl):S42-  
22 5.  
23  
24 41. McManus I, Dewberry C, Nicholson S, Dowell JS, Woolf K, Potts HW. Construct-level  
25 predictive validity of educational attainment and intellectual aptitude tests in medical student  
26 selection: meta-regression of six UK longitudinal studies. *BMC Medicine*. 2013;11(1):243.  
27  
28 42. Viney R, Rich A, Needleman S, Griffin A, Woolf K. The validity of the Annual Review  
29 of Competence Progression: a qualitative interview study of the perceptions of junior doctors  
30 and their trainers. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*. 2017;110(3):110-7.  
31  
32 43. McManus IC, Mooney-Somers J, Dacre JE, Vale JA, on behalf of the MPIEB, the  
33 FoRCoPMCO. Reliability of the MRCP(UK) Part I Examination, 1984–2001. *Medical*  
34 *Education*. 2003;37(7):609-11.  
35  
36 44. Oyeboode F, Furlong E. MRCPsych examinations: cumulative results 1997–2002.  
37 *Psychiatric Bulletin*. 2007;31(2):61-4.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 45. McManus IC, Elder AT, Dacre J. Investigating possible ethnicity and sex bias in  
4 clinical examiners: an analysis of data from the MRCP(UK) PACES and nPACES  
5  
6 examinations. BMC Medical Education. 2013;13(1):103.  
7  
8 46. McDaniel MA, Whetzel DL, Schmidt FL, Maurer SD. The validity of employment  
9 interviews: A comprehensive review and meta-analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology.  
10 1994;79(4):599-616.  
11  
12 47. Green M. Shining through at a specialty training interview. 2011. Available from:  
13 [http://careers.bmj.com/careers/advice/Shining\\_through\\_at\\_a\\_specialty\\_training\\_interview](http://careers.bmj.com/careers/advice/Shining_through_at_a_specialty_training_interview).  
14  
15 48. Roberts C, Togno JM. Selection into specialist training programs: an approach from  
16 general practice. The Medical Journal of Australia. 2011;194(2):93-5.  
17  
18 49. Patterson F, Baron H, Carr V, Plint S, Lane P. Evaluation of three short-listing  
19 methodologies for selection into postgraduate training in general practice. Medical  
20 Education. 2009;43(1):50-7.  
21  
22 50. Rimmer A. Making junior doctors' lives easier. 2017 Available from:  
23 [http://careers.bmj.com/careers/advice/Making\\_junior\\_doctors%E2%80%99\\_lives\\_easier](http://careers.bmj.com/careers/advice/Making_junior_doctors%E2%80%99_lives_easier).  
24  
25 51. Tiffin PA, Paton LW, Mwandigha LM, McLachlan JC, Illing J. Predicting fitness to  
26 practise events in international medical graduates who registered as UK doctors via the  
27 Professional and Linguistic Assessments Board (PLAB) system: a national cohort study.  
28 BMC Medicine. 2017;15(1):66.  
29  
30 52. General Medical Council. Medical Licensing Assessment [Electronic]. [cited 23  
31 November 2017]. Available from: <http://www.gmc-uk.org/education/29000.asp>.  
32  
33 53. Archer J, Lynn N, Coombes L, Roberts M, Gale T, Price T, et al. The impact of large  
34 scale licensing examinations in highly developed countries: a systematic review. BMC  
35 Medical Education. 2016;16:212.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Tables

Group name	Region where PMQ obtained	Nationality
UK medical graduates (UKGs)	UK	All
EEA graduates (EEAGs)	EEA	All – except for UK nationals
International Medical Graduates (IMGs)	Outside of EEA and UK	All – except for UK nationals
UK overseas graduates (UK OGs)	Outside of UK (EEA or non-EEA country)	UK national

Table 1. Classification of medical graduate groups for purposes of study.



Group	Male (%)	Non-white ethnicity (%)	Mean shortlisting z score (sd)	Mean interview z score (sd)	Mean no. of jobs applied to during the study period (SD)	Mean no. deemed appointable (sd)	Mean no. offered (sd)
1. UKGs	12008/28293 (42%)	9235/28249 (33%)	0.31 (0.84)	0.27 (0.91)	1.97 (1.41)	1.36 (0.87)	1.25 (0.74)
2. EEAGs	535/1225 (44%)	191/1209 (16%)	-0.17 (1.06)	-0.24 (0.93)	2.49 (2.13)	1.17 (1.00)	0.96 (0.80)
3. IMGs	2120/3828 (55%)	3597/3766 (96%)	-0.46 (0.91)	-0.45 (0.90)	3.08 (2.66)	1.01 (0.98)	0.80 (0.73)
4. UK OGs	652/1108 (59%)	925/1093 (85%)	-0.45 (0.90)	-0.42 (0.92)	2.94 (2.49)	1.11 (0.91)	0.92 (0.71)

Table 2. Background and specialty recruitment characteristics of the doctors in the sample by graduate group. Recruitment data values for the study period August 2009-2016.

Group	Mean age at 1 <sup>st</sup> ARCP (SD)	Mean UK experience at 1 <sup>st</sup> ARCP (SD)	Mean number of ARCPs (SD)	Proportion 'unsatisfactory' (i.e. not outcome 1 or 6)	Proportion of ARCPs associated with postgraduate exam failure (%)
1. UKGs	29.00 (3.31)	2.62 (1.30)	3.29 (2.04)	19511/80361 (24.28%)	3213/80361 (4.00%)
2. EEAGs	31.85 (4.55)	3.54 (2.06)	3.22 (2.04)	1093/3341 (32.71%)	347/3341 (10.39%)
3. IMGs	34.68 (4.66)	4.14 (2.08)	3.70 (2.38)	3902/11404 (34.22%)	1086/11404 (9.52%)
4. UK OGs	34.38 (5.60)	3.82 (2.10)	3.49 (2.15)	1167/3174 (36.77%)	348/3174 (10.96%)

Table 3. Summary of the background and Annual Review of Competence Progression (ARCP) descriptive statistics for the doctors in the study sample.

Specialty group	UK medical graduates (%)	EEA nationals (%)	IMGs (%)	UK overseas graduates (%)
Anaesthetics	2918 (91.53%)	61 (1.91%)	149 (4.67%)	37 (1.16%)
Medicine	6329 (79.18%)	336 (4.20%)	1040 (13.01%)	233 (2.92%)
Psychiatry	1289 (61.82%)	143 (6.86%)	489 (23.45%)	136 (6.52%)
Surgery	3394 (82.82%)	173 (4.22%)	357 (8.71%)	131 (3.20%)
EM and ACCS	1070 (80.21%)	47 (3.52%)	162 (12.14%)	46 (3.45%)
GP	9353 (83.45%)	219 (1.95%)	1126 (10.05%)	409 (3.65%)
Obs & Gynae	822 (78.36%)	51 (4.86%)	132 (12.58%)	36 (3.43%)
Occ Medicine	6 (50.00%)	1 (8.33%)	3 (25.00%)	0 (0.00%)
Ophthalmology	341 (82.37%)	26 (6.28%)	29 (7.00%)	10 (2.42%)
Paediatrics	1557 (81.82%)	105 (5.52%)	192 (10.09%)	37 (1.94%)
Lab based	309 (75.55%)	23 (5.62%)	64 (15.65%)	11 (2.69%)
Public Health	123 (91.79%)	3 (2.24%)	1 (0.75%)	1 (0.75%)
Radiology	688 (83.29%)	36 (4.36%)	78 (9.44%)	20 (2.42%)
All specialties	28199(81.41%)	1224 (3.52%)	3822 (11.01%)	1108 (3.19%)

Table 4. Number of doctors in the sample (percentage of total) in specialty training by graduate group and specialty

Predictor	Univariable Models	Multivariable Model
	Odds Ratio (95% CI)	Odds Ratio (95% CI)
UK overseas graduates vs UKG	0.25 (0.23 to 0.27)	0.65 (0.56 to 0.77)
UK overseas graduates vs EEAG	0.66 (0.58 to 0.75)	0.65 (0.53 to 0.81)
UK overseas graduates vs IMG	1.29 (1.16 to 1.42)	1.05 (0.89 to 1.23)*
Male sex	0.70 (0.68 to 0.73)	-
Shortlisting score (z score)	1.74 (1.69 to 1.80)	-
Interview score (z score)	8.41 (8.10 to 8.73)	6.78 (6.47 to 7.10)
Age at selection	0.93 (0.93 to 0.94)	-
UK experience (years) at selection	1.50 (1.47 to 1.52)	1.17 (1.08 to 1.27)
Experience/age interaction	-	0.99 (0.99 to <1.00)†
GDP of Country of nationality (\$10k per person)	1.52 (1.50 to 1.55)	-
GDP of Country of qualification (\$10k per person)	1.63 (1.60 to 1.65)	-
Difference in GDP countries (\$10k per person)	0.87 (0.85 to 0.89)	-
Absolute difference in GDP (\$10k per person)	0.74 (0.73 to 0.76)	-

Table 5. Results from univariable and multivariable multi-level logistic regressions predicting the odds of being deemed appointable at specialty training recruitment.

\* p>0.5

† p=0.01

Predictor	Including exam failures	Excluding exam failures
	Odds Ratio (95% CI)	Odds Ratio (95% CI)
UK overseas graduates vs UKG	2.36 (2.12 to 2.62)	1.77 (1.59 to 1.96)
UK overseas graduates vs EEAG	1.29 (1.12 to 1.48)	1.30 (1.13 to 1.50)
UK overseas graduates vs IMG	1.20 (1.07 to 1.35)	1.14 (1.02 to 1.28) <sup>‡</sup>
Male sex	1.43 (1.38 to 1.49)	1.37 (1.32 to 1.43)
Age at ARCP	1.05 (1.05 to 1.05)	1.03 (1.03 to 1.04)
UK experience (years) at ARCP	1.04 (1.03 to 1.05)	1.02 (1.02 to 1.03)
GDP of Country of nationality (\$10k per person)	0.83 (0.82 to 0.84)	0.88 (0.87 to 0.90)
GDP of Country of qualification (\$10k per person)	0.80 (0.79 to 0.82)	0.87 (0.85 to 0.88)
Difference in GDP countries (\$10k per person)	1.06 (1.03 to 1.09)	1.03 (>1.00 to 1.05) <sup>§</sup>
Absolute difference in GDP (\$10k per person)	1.22 (1.19 to 1.25)	1.15 (1.12 to 1.18)
Mean shortlisting score (z score)	0.63 (0.61 to 0.64)	0.76 (0.74 to 0.78)
Mean interview score (z score)	0.61 (0.59 to 0.62)	0.71 (0.69 to 0.72)

Table 6. Results from a series of univariable multilevel ordinal logistic regression analyses predicting the odds of 'less' vs 'more' satisfactory ARCP outcomes for the sample of doctors (N=34,755). In the right hand column the results from analyses where ARCP outcomes associated with postgraduate exam failure were excluded are shown.


<sup>‡</sup> p=0.02  
<sup>§</sup> p=0.04

Predictor	Including exam failures	Excluding exam failures
	Odds Ratio (95% CI)	Odds Ratio (95% CI)
UK overseas graduates vs UKG	1.08 (0.92 to 1.26)**	1.05 (0.90 to 1.22) <sup>!</sup>
UK overseas graduates vs EEAG	0.96 (0.79 to 1.16) <sup>!</sup>	1.04 (0.86 to 1.26) <sup>!</sup>
UK overseas graduates vs IMG	1.03 (0.88 to 1.21) <sup>!</sup>	1.03 (0.88 to 1.21) <sup>!</sup>
Male sex	1.28 (1.22 to 1.34)	1.29 (1.23 to 1.35)
Age at ARCP	1.02 (1.01 to 1.03) <sup>††</sup>	>1.00 (0.99 to 1.01) <sup>!</sup>
UK experience (years) at ARCP	0.84 (0.79 to 0.90)	0.83 (0.78 to 0.88)
Age/Experience interaction	>1.00 (>1.00 to 1.01)	>1.00 (>1.00 to >1.00)
Absolute difference in GDP (\$10k per person)	1.06 (1.02 to 1.10) <sup>‡‡</sup>	1.05 (1.01 to 1.09)
Mean shortlisting score (z score)	0.72 (0.69 to 0.74)	0.84 (0.81 to 0.86)
Mean interview score (z score)	0.67 (0.65 to 0.69)	0.74 (0.72 to 0.77)

Table 7. Results from two multivariable multilevel ordinal logistic regression analyses predicting the odds of 'less' vs 'more' satisfactory ARCP outcomes for the sample of doctors (N=34,755). In the right hand column the results from analyses where ARCP outcomes associated with postgraduate exam failure were excluded are shown.


\*\* p=0.3  
†† p=0.002  
‡‡ p=0.001  
<sup>!</sup> p>0.5

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



Flow of data through the study.






Results from univariable and multivariable analyses for an individual being deemed 'appointable' for each graduate group in comparison to UK graduates.


101x73mm (300 x 300 DPI)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




Results by specialty for UK overseas graduates being deemed 'appointable' vs. UK graduates.

101x73mm (300 x 300 DPI)



Univariable and multivariable ARCP results for all specialties for each graduate group in comparison to UK graduates.

101x73mm (300 x 300 DPI)



30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Univariable and multivariable odds ratios for receiving a less satisfactory vs. a more satisfactory ARCP outcome. The results are shown only for UK overseas graduates vs. UK graduates, by specialty.

101x73mm (300 x 300 DPI)

**STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies***

Section/Topic	Item #	Recommendation	Reported on page #
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	Page 1
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	Pages 2-3
<b>Introduction</b>			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	Pages 3-7
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	Page 7
<b>Methods</b>			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	Page 7
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	Pages 7-8
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	Pages 7-10
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	Pages 7-10
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	Pages 7-10
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	Page 10
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	Pages 7-8 and Figure 1
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	Pages 8-10 and Table 1
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	Pages 10-11
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	Pages 10-11
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	Page 11
		(d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	N/A
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	N/A

<b>Results</b>			
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	Figure 1
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	Figure 1
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	Figure 1
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	Tables 2-4
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	Figure 1
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	Tables 2-3
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	Tables 5-7 and Figures 2-5
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	N/A
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	N/A
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	Page 13
<b>Discussion</b>			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	Pages 15-16
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	Pages 18-19
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	Pages 19-21
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	Pages 17-18, pages 20-21
<b>Other information</b>			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	Page 22

\*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

**Note:** An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at [www.strobe-statement.org](http://www.strobe-statement.org).