

1 **Two-year interview and match outcomes of otolaryngology preference signaling**

2 C.W. David Chang, M.D.: Conception, design, and drafting of the work; critically revising
3 the work for important intellectual content; approval of the final submission; agreement
4 to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

5 Professor and Vice Chair

6 Department of Otolaryngology–Head and Neck Surgery

7 University of Missouri, Columbia, MO

8 ORCID:0000-0002-0141-7583

9

10 Marc C. Thorne, M.D. M.P.H.: Conception, design, and drafting of the work; critically
11 revising the work for important intellectual content; approval of the final submission;
12 agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

13 Professor and Associate Chair for Education and Quality

14 Department of Otolaryngology – Head and Neck Surgery

15 University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI

16

17 Sonya Malekzadeh, M.D.: Conception, design, and drafting of the work; critically
18 revising the work for important intellectual content; approval of the final submission;
19 agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

20 Professor and Residency Program Director

21 Department of Otolaryngology–Head and Neck Surgery

22 MedStar Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

23

24 Steven D. Pletcher, M.D.: Conception, design, and drafting of the work; critically revising
25 the work for important intellectual content; approval of the final submission; agreement
26 to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

27 Professor and Residency Program Director

28 Department of Otolaryngology – Head and Neck Surgery

29 University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA

30

31 Keywords: graduate medical education, preference signaling, match, interview,
32 residency

33 2254 words

34 Conflicts of interests: No relevant conflicts for all authors

35 Sponsorships: None.

36 Funding source: None.

37 Corresponding author: C.W. David Chang, One Hospital Dr., MA 314, Columbia, MO

38 65212. changda@health.missouri.edu.

39 Submitted for presentation at AAO-HNSF 2022 Annual Meeting

40

41 **Two-year interview and match outcomes of otolaryngology preference signaling**

42 **Objective:** To present the first year-over-year data comparison of preference signaling
43 for residency interviews in the otolaryngology application marketplace.

44 **Study Design:** Cross-sectional study conducted over 2 application cycles

45 **Setting:** Otolaryngology training programs in the United States.

46 **Methods:** Otolaryngology residency applicants were invited to participate in preference
47 signaling during the 2021 and 2022 application cycles. Submissions were collected
48 using a web-based interface. The distribution of signals among programs was evaluated
49 descriptively and in relationship to program rankings. Surveys were sent to applicants to
50 assess general attitudes and the number of interview invitations received from signaled
51 and non-signaled programs. Surveys were sent to programs to evaluate use of signals
52 and the impact on Match results.

53 **Results:** Programs received a range of signals from 0-66, with 50% of signals going to
54 24% of programs, which was similarly found in 2021. Programs of higher rank tended to
55 receive more signals. Overall, greater than 87% of surveyed applicants received an
56 interview offer from at least one program they signaled. In 2021 and 2022, applicants
57 were 2.6 times more likely to get an interview from a signaled program than from a
58 comparator non-signaled program. A greater positive impact on interview offer rate was
59 seen for less competitive applicants. Signaling was viewed favorably by the vast
60 majority surveyed applicants and programs.

61 **Conclusions:** Preference signaling for otolaryngology residency interviews
62 demonstrates a promising mechanism to improve applicant visibility to programs during
63 the application cycle. This impact is consistent over 2 application cycles.

64

65

PREPRINT

66 **INTRODUCTION**

67 The 2022 application cycle, saw a record number (643) of otolaryngology applicants
68 vying for 361 residency positions. Within this competitive environment, programs
69 received a record number of applications (427 on average) and allopathic applicants
70 applied to a record number of programs: 84 on average.¹

71 In response to rising application numbers and limitations imposed by the COVID
72 pandemic on medical student away rotations, Otolaryngology Program Director
73 Organization (OPDO) implemented an interview preference signaling system for both
74 the 2021 and 2022 application cycles.^{2,3} Preference signaling is a mechanism that
75 allows applicants to credibly signal their interests in an otherwise congested market,
76 with the aim of facilitating mutually suitable matches between employer and applicant
77 during the interview offer phase of the application process.^{4,5} While preference signaling
78 has been utilized in the economics job market for prospective graduate students since
79 2006, the use in graduate medical education was pioneered by OPDO in the 2021
80 application cycle. Over the past two years, adoption of preference signaling has rapidly
81 expanded within the GME community. We present the first year-over-year data
82 comparison for signaling in this marketplace. As this concept remains relatively new to
83 the medical education community, continued data sharing is required to enable both
84 programs and prospective residents to understand its utility.

85

86 **METHODS**

87 For the 2022 application cycle, applicants identified 4 programs they wished to send a
88 signal. For the 2021 application cycle, 5 signals were provided. During both cycles,
89 applicants were counselled not to send signals to visiting sub-internship and home
90 programs. Likewise, these programs were informed not to expect signals from their
91 home applicants or those that rotated with them. Additionally, applicants were asked to
92 submit the name of another program that they would have signaled had they been given
93 an additional signal to send. This additional program, designated the “comparator non-
94 signaled” program, was used for quality evaluation purposes only. The comparator non-
95 signaled program is assumed to resemble the characteristics of the officially signaled
96 programs most closely.

97 Submissions were collected using a web-based interface at www.entsignaling.org. Each
98 year, the signals were distributed to participating programs the same day Electronic
99 Residency Application System (ERAS) released applications for viewing by programs.

100 The distribution of signals among programs was evaluated descriptively and in
101 relationship to Doximity rankings.⁶ Mean number of signals were calculated for
102 programs in ranking groups of 10. For programs that received separate signaling for
103 their research track versus their non-research track, Doximity analysis was conducted
104 using only signals from the non-research track to avoid potential for duplicate signaling
105 by applicants to that program. Military programs were not included in the signaling
106 initiative as their applicant population and their matching system has limited utility for
107 preference signals. Military programs were thus removed from the calculation of the
108 mean.

109 To assess the signaling process, a survey was sent the week before Match to
110 applicants who participated in signaling. Along with inquiring about general attitudes
111 towards the signaling process, applicants were asked the number of interview
112 invitations received, how many invitations were garnered from signaled programs, non-
113 signaled programs, and from the comparator non-sigaled program.

114 Surveys were sent to otolaryngology training programs (program directors and program
115 coordinators) after the Match to evaluate the impact of signaling on final Match results.
116 Programs reported the number of matched applicants that came from their home
117 medical school, completed a visiting in-person rotation within the current Match cycle, or
118 sent a signal. Program directors were queried how they utilized the signals. Duplicate
119 program survey responses were managed by eliminating responses that did not provide
120 numerically correct data or provided responses that were not internally congruent.
121 Students and program directors were also asked whether the signaling process should
122 continue, and they were given space for unstructured comments. Respondents were not
123 forced to answer all questions.

124 COVID pandemic circumstances made the two application cycles slightly different.
125 However, in both the 2021 and 2022 application cycles, applicants had six “special”
126 programs for analysis (Table 1). In 2021, applicants with home programs were afforded
127 5 signals plus their home program for analysis. Applicants without home programs
128 received 5 signals plus a possible visiting sub-internship (visiting sub-internships were
129 permitted only to those without home programs due to the COVID pandemic). In 2022,
130 allowance for visiting sub-internship increased incrementally by one. Applicants were
131 afforded 4 signals plus home plus one visiting sub-internship (or two visiting sub-

132 internships permitted for applicants without a home otolaryngology program) for
133 analysis. As this data was collected for quality assurance/ quality improvement
134 purposes, the post hoc analysis of de-identified survey data was categorized as not
135 human subjects research by the University of California, San Francisco Institutional
136 Review Board and thus exempt from review.

137 **Table 1.** “Six Program” Preference Signaling Design

Application cycle	2021		2022	
Applicant type	A	B	A	B
# Preference signals	5	5	4	4
Home program	1	0	1	0
Visiting Sub-I	0	1	1	2
Total “signals”	6	6	6	6


138

139 RESULTS


140 Signaling Data

141 In the 2021 and 2022 application cycle, there were 558 and 559 unique applicants
142 respectively who signaled. There were 117 and 120 programs that participated in Match
143 in 2021 and 2022 respectively (programs with more than one residency track were
144 counted only once). Programs received a range of signals from 0-66, with 50% of
145 signals going to 24% of programs (Figure 1), which was similarly found in 2021 (not

146 shown). Programs of higher Doximity rank tended to receive more signals per program
147 (Figure 2).



148
149 **Figure 1.** Histogram of number of programs and the number of signals received,
150 2022.



151

152 **Figure 2.** Average number of signals received by programs per Doximity rank
153 group, 2022. Programs are grouped in bins of 10 to preserve anonymity.

154


155 **Applicant Survey Results**

156 Survey response rate for applicants who participated in signaling in 2021 and 2022 was
157 42% (233/558) and 47% (263/559) respectively.


158 *Interviews received*

159 In 2022, among surveyed applicants, median and mean number of interview offers
160 received was 11 and 12.8 respectively, with the spread between the 25th percentile and
161 75th percentile ranging from 7 to 18 invitations. Overall, 87% of surveyed applicants

162 received an interview offer from at least one program they signaled (Figure 3). This
163 compares to 93% in 2021, a year where signaling may have helped mitigate the severe
164 restriction of visiting sub-internships. Applicants who received more interview offers
165 from signaled programs also received more interview offers overall (Figure 4).



166
167 **Figure 3.** Pie chart of applicant-reported number of interviews received from
168 signaled programs




169
170 **Figure 4.** Total number of interviews received, 2022. Data is stratified by
171 applicants who received 0, 1, 2, 3, or 4 interviews from signaled programs. Box
172 plots represent 25-75%ile with horizontal line denoting median, X denotes mean,
173 whiskers represent 95%tile.

174
175 *Impact of signaling*

176 The rate of receiving an interview offer was significantly higher for signaled programs
177 (rate 50%) compared with both non-sigaled programs (rate 13%; OR 6.7, 95% CI 5.9-
178 7.7) and the comparator non-sigaled program (rate 19%, OR 4.3, 95% CI 3.1-6.0; see
179 Figure 5). While the overall offer rate was lower in Match 2022 than Match 2021, the
180 multiplier effect of signaling remained similar: In both 2021 and 2022, applicants were

181 2.6 times more likely to get an interview from a signaled program than from the
182 comparator non-signaled program. During the 2022 recruitment cycle, the survey also
183 inquired specifically about interview rates among visiting sub-internship programs and
184 home programs. Predictably, both options provided applicants with a high interview offer
185 rate.



186
187 **Figure 5.** Interview offer rates, 2022. Rates are shown grouped by program
188 attribute. Sub-I = sub-internship

189 To assess the impact of signaling across the spectrum of applicant competitiveness, we
190 divided applicants into quartiles based on their overall likelihood of receiving an
191 interview offer (# interview offers / #applications). Signals had a significant impact ($P <$
192 $.001$) on the interview offer rate across all quartiles (Figure 6). A larger multiplier effect
193 was seen among lower quartile applicants, suggesting that signaling had a greater

194 positive impact on interview offer rate for the less competitive applicants. These findings
195 are similar to last year's results with the exception of the 4th quartile where the multiplier
196 effect was markedly increased in 2022. This is likely due to an overall decrease in
197 interview offer rate from non-sigaled programs within this quartile.

Interview offer rate by quartiles



198

199

200

201

202 Program survey results

203

204

205

206

207


Figure 6. Interview offer rate by quartiles, 2021 and 2022. Comp non-signal = comparator non-sigaled program.

Survey response rate for programs was 52% (62/117) and 53% (64/120) for 2021 and 2022 respectively.

Use of signals in residency application review

In 2022, program directors were queried as to how the signals were utilized in the applicant recruitment process. Programs were permitted to provide multiple answers

208 (Figure 7). Most programs incorporated signals into the initial review or used signals as
209 a tie breaker for interview invitations. Four programs responded they did not use
210 signaling (two cited a communication error and two programs merely cited they did not
211 use the signals they were provided). Five programs incorporated signaling information
212 into the development of their rank lists.




213

214 **Figure 7.** Venn diagram of how programs used signals received, 2022.

215

216 *Positions filled by signals*

217 Programs reported that 60% and 70% of their matches in 2021 and 2022 respectively
218 were from applicants that either signaled, completed a visiting sub-internship, or were
219 from their own program (Figure 8).



220

221

222

223

224

225

226

227

228


229

Figure 8. Signaling characteristics of applicants who filled positions, as reported by programs. *entries from programs excluded if data were omitted or if reported match data were discrepant. Sub-I = sub-internship

Applicant and Program Opinions on Preference Signaling.

Signaling was viewed favorably by most surveyed applicants and programs. Nearly 90% of both constituents wished to continue with the signaling initiative. More than 60% of applicants and more than 70% of programs agreed or strongly agreed with being satisfied with signaling (Figure 9).

230



231

232 **Figure 9.** Applicant and program opinions of preference signaling, 2022.

233

234 DISCUSSION

235 Preference signaling is a mechanism intended to allow applicants the ability to
236 demonstrate credible interest in receiving an interview from selected programs. With the
237 large rise of applications submitted by each applicant, an individual application to a
238 program is diluted by the large number of applications each program receives. In the
239 2021 application cycle, otolaryngology was the first specialty in graduate medical
240 education to implement a preference signaling system for residency interviews.¹
241 Survey results from this initial experience demonstrated that signals markedly increased
242 the likelihood of receiving an interview offer. The impact of signals was greatest for
243 applicants who struggled most to obtain interview offers. This finding continued to hold
244 true for the 2022 application cycle.

245 For the applicant, receiving an interview from a specific program is virtually assured if
246 such program is the applicant's home program or if the applicant completed a visiting
247 sub-internship at that program. This advantages applicants from medical schools with
248 otolaryngology programs as well as those applicants able to secure coveted visiting
249 sub-internship rotations. This translates to match outcomes that strongly favor
250 applicant-program pairings with home program or visiting sub-internship relationships.
251 Such biases may perpetuate equity challenges inherent in medical school matriculation
252 as well as the process involved in obtaining visiting otolaryngology sub-internships.
253 Preference signaling helps applicants garner interviews with programs in the absence of
254 any pre-existing relationship, with a 260% interview invitation rate boost. This impact is
255 robust and present across the demographic categories of gender and self-identified
256 URIM status (pre-published data).

257 With this early success, preference signaling was incorporated into the 2022 Match
258 through a collaboration with the Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC) and
259 ERAS pilot program involving internal medicine, general surgery, and dermatology.
260 Urology also adopted preference signaling, independent of AAMC and ERAS. After
261 favorable initial impressions, this pilot has been expanded to include 15 specialties for
262 the 2023 application cycle.⁷

263 Signaling may provide a pathway for additional modifications to the residency
264 application process. One solution proposed to address the progressive increase in the
265 number of applications submitted per applicant is to implement an application cap.
266 Models to evaluate the impact of a cap are limited by the ability to predict applicant
267 behavior. However, applicant strategies used to choose programs to signal are similar

268 to strategies that would be employed with an application cap. Evaluation of match
269 positions filled with a limited “6-program” system models a very low application cap.
270 The finding that >70% of programs filled in this scenario suggests that in a specialty like
271 otolaryngology, an application cap of 5 times the number would very likely result in
272 matching of all residency slots and reduce the surplus of 40+ applications per applicant.
273 Furthermore, programs could devote more time to apply the principles of holistic review
274 with a decreased application load. In the 2023 application cycle, orthopedic surgery
275 and obstetrics-gynecology are piloting higher number of preference signals (30 and 18
276 respectively)⁶ that, if all programs fill with signaled and home applicants, may validate
277 an application cap approach.

278 Even in the absence of an application cap, given the appropriate number of signals,
279 candidates could feel less compelled to over-apply. More competitive candidates would
280 realize cost savings, confident that their applications would be suitably noticed with
281 signaling. Less competitive applicants could continue to pursue an unrestrained
282 application strategy if they so wish. Thus far, a reduction in application submissions has
283 not been realized, however this was not the original intent of the preference signaling
284 process. If downward pressure on over application is desired, transparency of signaling
285 data outcomes is required to feedback to applicants the effects of signaling. Upward
286 adjustment of the number signals provided to each applicant may be needed to provide
287 the reasonably competitive applicants the statistical and psychological reassurance of
288 match success.

289 Continued messaging regarding the intent of the signaling process is needed to combat
290 misperceptions. Preference signaling is intended to be used to facilitate selection of

291 candidates to interview. A signal is not intended to guarantee an interview. Programs
292 will use signals variably depending upon their recruitment strategy. This is not unlike the
293 variable use of any application metric. Match rank lists created by both the applicant
294 and the program should match their professional and departmental goals respectively to
295 achieve optimal outcomes, regardless of interview preference signaling. During the first
296 2 years of preference signaling, applicants were instructed not to signal their home
297 program or visiting sub-internship program to avoid coercion of a forced “loyalty pledge.”
298 Signaling was an appropriate equity strategy in years where opportunities for visiting
299 sub-internships were constrained. However, if in-person visiting sub-internship
300 scheduling returns to pre-pandemic levels, this guidance may need modification.

301 Limitations of this study include an incomplete survey response rate and potential for
302 biased sample of respondents. Generalizability of otolaryngology preference signaling
303 results to other specialties may vary due to differences in the size of other programs,
304 number of signals provided to each applicant, applicant characteristics, and differing
305 recruitment climate.

306

307 **CONCLUSIONS**

308 Preference signaling for otolaryngology residency interviews demonstrates a promising
309 mechanism for applicants to better influence visibility to programs during the application
310 cycle. This impact is consistent over 2 application cycles. Continued iterations may help
311 reduce the application burden for applicants.

312

313 **Acknowledgments:** The authors thank Emily Maurer, senior administrator at the
314 American College of Surgeons, for her invaluable contributions to the execution of the
315 otolaryngology signaling program. They also thank the Otolaryngology Program
316 Directors Organization and the councils of the Society of University Otolaryngologists
317 and the Association of Academic Departments of Otolaryngology for their support of the
318 signaling program.

319

PREPRINT

- 320 1. Association of American Medical Colleges. Preliminary data (ERAS 2022).
321 <https://www.aamc.org/media/41241/download>. Accessed Jan 27, 2022.
- 322 2. Chang CWD, Pletcher SD, Thorne MC, Malekzadeh S. Preference Signaling for
323 the Otolaryngology Interview Market. *Laryngoscope*. 2021;131(3):E744-E745.
324 doi:10.1002/lary.29151
- 325 3. Pletcher SD, Chang CWD, Thorne MC, Malekzadeh S. The Otolaryngology
326 Residency Program Preference Signaling Experience. *Acad Med*.
327 2022;97(5):664-668. doi:10.1097/ACM.0000000000004441
- 328 4. Coles P, Cawley J, Levine PB, Niederle M, Roth AE, Siegfried JJ. The job market
329 for new economists: A market design perspective. *J Econ Perspect*.
330 2010;24(4):187-206. doi:10.1257/jep.24.4.187
- 331 5. Coles P, Kushnir A, Niederle M. Preference signaling in matching markets. *Am*
332 *Econ J Microeconomics*. 2013;5(2):99-134. doi:10.1257/mic.5.2.99
- 333 6. Residency Navigator. Doximity. Accessed May 13, 2022.
334 [https://www.doximity.com/residency/programs?specialtyKey=4667266b-9685-
335 49c5-8a72-33940db2c9d6-
336 otolaryngology&sortByKey=reputation&trainingEnvironmentKey=all&intendedFell
337 owshipKey=](https://www.doximity.com/residency/programs?specialtyKey=4667266b-9685-49c5-8a72-33940db2c9d6-otolaryngology&sortByKey=reputation&trainingEnvironmentKey=all&intendedFellowshipKey=)
- 338 7. Supplemental ERAS®Application Guide. Association of American Medical
339 Colleges. Accessed June 20, 2022. [https://students-
340 residents.aamc.org/media/12326/download](https://students-residents.aamc.org/media/12326/download).

341

342

343 **Figure 1.** Histogram of number of programs and the number of signals received,
344 2022.

345 **Figure 2.** Average number of signals received by programs per Doximity rank
346 group, 2022. Programs are grouped in bins of 10 to preserve anonymity.

347 **Figure 3.** Pie chart of applicant-reported number of interviews received from
348 signaled programs

349 **Figure 4.** Total number of interviews received, 2022. Data is stratified by
350 applicants who received 0, 1, 2, 3, or 4 interviews from signaled programs. Box
351 plots represent 25-75%ile with horizontal line denoting median, X denotes mean,
352 whiskers represent 95%tile.

353 **Figure 5.** Interview offer rates, 2022. Rates are shown grouped by program
354 attribute. Sub-I = sub-internship

355 **Figure 6.** Interview offer rate by quartiles, 2021 and 2022. Comp non-signal =
356 comparator non-signal program.

357 **Figure 7.** Venn diagram of how programs used signals received, 2022.

358 **Figure 8.** Signaling characteristics of applicants who filled positions, as reported
359 by programs. *entries from programs excluded if data were omitted or if reported
360 match data were discrepant. Sub-I = sub-internship

361 **Figure 9.** Applicant and program opinions of preference signaling, 2022.

362

363

364 **Table 1.** “Six Program” Preference Signaling Design

Application cycle	2021		2022	
Applicant type	A	B	A	B
# Preference signals	5	5	4	4
Home program	1	0	1	0
Visiting Sub-I	0	1	1	2
Total “signals”	6	6	6	6

365

366 Applicant type A = applicant with home otolaryngology program. Applicant type B

367 = applicant without home otolaryngology program.

368