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# Article summary:

1. Physical performance is the most predictive factor of successful selection in the U.S. Army Special Forces Assessment and Selection course.

2. Demographics, psychological measures, and physiological markers are also predictive of success in the course.

3. Lower C-reactive protein, higher cortisol and sex-hormone binding globulin, higher intelligence quotient, grade level equivalents, resilience score, military aptitude score, and grit are all associated with successful selection in the course.

# Article rating:

May be slightly imbalanced: The article presents the information in a generally reliable way, but there are minor points of consideration that could be explored further or claims that are not fully backed by appropriate evidence. Some perspectives may also be omitted, and you are encouraged to use the research topics section to explore the topic further.

# Article analysis:

The article is generally reliable and trustworthy as it provides a comprehensive overview of the predictors of success in the U.S. Army Special Forces Assessment and Selection (SFAS) course among 800 Soldiers. The authors provide evidence for their claims by citing relevant studies that have been conducted on this topic previously as well as providing data from their own study to support their findings. Furthermore, they provide detailed explanations for each predictor they discuss which makes it easier to understand how each factor contributes to successful selection in SFAS.

However, there are some potential biases that should be noted when reading this article such as its focus on physical performance being the most predictive factor of success in SFAS which could lead to an overemphasis on physical strength over other important factors such as mental resilience or intelligence which may be equally important for successful selection in SFAS. Additionally, there is a lack of discussion regarding possible risks associated with participating in SFAS such as physical injury or psychological distress which could be important considerations when assessing whether or not someone should participate in this type of training program. Finally, while the authors do mention some counterarguments to their findings such as lower C-reactive protein being associated with better performance on physical events but higher C-reactive protein being associated with lower fitness test scores and slower road march times they do not explore these counterarguments further which could provide more insight into why these contradictory results occur.

# Topics for further research:

* Mental resilience in SFAS
* Intelligence and SFAS selection
* Risks associated with SFAS
* Physical injury in SFAS
* Psychological distress in SFAS
* C-reactive protein and SFAS performance
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