

- **JHE Manuscript Checklist**

Authors and reviewers are encouraged to refer to the below checklist in preparing or assessing manuscripts for the Journal of Health Equity.

1	Title	
	1.1	Does the title accurately capture the essence of the article?
	1.2	Is the originality of the article obvious from the title?
	1.3	Is the type of article evident from the title? (e.g. a discussion paper, a systematic review, a case report)
	1.4	If a research article, is the study design/method included or implied?
2	Abstract	
	2.1	Does the abstract provide a concise summary of the paper?
	2.2	Is the originality and importance of the paper obvious?
	2.3	Does it include the aim or purpose of the article?
	2.4	If a review or empirical paper, are key research elements noted? (e.g. design, sample size, data collection, analysis)
	2.5	Are key findings summarised coherently? (e.g. themes or statistical results)
	2.6	Is there a comprehensive conclusion?
	2.7	Have the authors noted explicit recommendations or implications from their work for health equity research, education or practice?
3	Introduction	
	3.1	Does the beginning paragraph signify the importance of the paper?
	3.2	Is the aim or purpose of the paper noted?
	3.3	Is the international relevance of the paper apparent?
4	Background	
	4.1	Is the paper adequately situated in the wider literature?
	4.2	Are appropriate sources used to support the authors' argument?
	4.3	Do the authors draw from both national and international literature?
	4.4	Where research literature is cited, do the authors provide a sense of the research methods and comment on the methodological quality?
	4.5	Does the overall quality level of the evidence base on the topic come through in the discussion?
	4.6	Are gaps in knowledge identified, which the paper seeks to address?
	4.7	Where applicable, is the educational or practice initiative or intervention described in sufficient detail (either in the text or in a supplementary file) to allow replication?
	4.8	Is the significance of the paper/ study obvious?

5	Method (where applicable)	
	5.1	Is the overall research design identified? Where this is unconventional or innovative, has a rationale been provided?
	5.2	Is the research setting and sampling approach explicit? Where applicable, have sample size considerations been noted? Is the recruitment process described?
	5.3	Is the approach to data collection described in sufficient detail? (e.g. are interview topic guides or questionnaires explained)
	5.4	Is the process of data analysis transparent and justified? (i.e. who did what, when, how, and why)
	5.5	Are ethical considerations included? (if applicable, is research ethics committee or institutional review board decision number included)
	5.6	Overall, is there sufficient evidence of a rigorous research approach?
6	Results/ Findings	
	6.1	Are results (for quantitative papers) or findings (for qualitative papers) presented in a structured and logical manner?
	6.2	Is there good use of tables, charts, diagrams, or conceptual models to present the results or findings?
	6.3	Are details of the sample or participants summarised coherently?
	6.4	For quantitative research, are statistical tests reported? Are point estimates, measures of dispersion, confidence intervals, effect sizes and significance tests included as appropriate?
	6.5	For qualitative research, are themes presented and self-explanatory? Are these supported by data excerpts, such as interview quotes or fieldnotes? Do the data support the authors' interpretation?
	6.6	Does the paper need to be reviewed by a statistician or an expert in the particular methodology (if unusual)?
7	Discussion	
	7.1	Is there a concise summary of the main or most important results or findings?
	7.2	Are the results or findings discussed in the context of prior research?
	7.3	Is it explained how the results or findings advance prior knowledge?
	7.4	Is there evidence of critical examination of the current study's results or findings with those of prior research, indicating areas of convergence or divergence? Do the authors offer possible explanations for these?
	7.5	Are recommendations and/or implications for health equity education/ practice/ policy/ and/or research made explicit?
	7.6	Do the authors moderate their arguments depending on the strength of their evidence?
	7.7	Are study limitations included?

8	Conclusion	
	8.1	Is an overall message from the study expressed concisely?
	8.2	Are there evidence-informed and forward-looking recommendations for scholars in the field that help advance health equity education, practice, research, or policy?
9	Other notes	
	9.1	Where appropriate, have the authors followed applicable reporting guidelines? (available from: https://www.equator-network.org) E.g. - for qualitative research see COREQ; for qualitative reviews see ENTREQ - for systematic reviews see PRISMA; for scoping reviews see PRISMA-ScR - for quality improvement studies see SQUIRE
	9.2	Is there consistent use of health equity concepts? See https://nccdh.ca/learn/glossary/
	9.3	Is there a focussed line of argument throughout? Is there evidence of the authors contradicting themselves?
	9.4	Is the paper written in academic language and at a good level of English? Would the paper benefit from an English language editor?
	9.5	Is language inclusive and non-stigmatizing? See https://www.cdc.gov/healthcommunication/Resources.html https://www.cdc.gov/healthcommunication/Preferred_Terms.html
	9.6	Additional resources from Taylor & Francis: Writing your paper: https://authorservices.taylorandfrancis.com/publishing-your-research/writing-your-paper/ Becoming a peer reviewer: https://editorresources.taylorandfrancis.com/reviewer-guidelines/