

C1, C2 Equity Checklist for Systematic Review Authors

"The term 'inequity' has a moral and ethical dimension. It refers to differences which are unnecessary and avoidable but, in addition, are also considered unfair and unjust."

- Whitehead, 1991

TITLE REGISTRATION

Objectives:

- Eq-1. Is there potential for differences in relative effects between advantaged and disadvantaged populations? E.g. Are children from lower income families less likely to use bicycle helmets? (Royal, 2005) Yes No
- Eq-2. Are interventions likely to be aimed at the disadvantaged? E.g. School meals aimed at children in poor cities. (Kristjansson, 2007) Yes No

PROTOCOL

Search Strategy:

- Eq-3. Will your search include databases relevant for health equity? Yes No
- Eq-4. Will your search strategy include terms or concepts relevant for health equity? Yes No
- Eq-5. Will your search strategy avoid using limits (such as language, age) that could miss relevant literature for health equity? Yes No

Methods:

- Eq-6. Will inclusion/exclusion criteria and data extraction use structured methods to access dimensions of disadvantage (e.g. socioeconomic status, gender, race, etc.)? Yes No
- Eq-7. Will you conduct a process evaluation that considers the disadvantaged? Yes No
- Eq-8. Will you conduct subgroup analyses across dimensions of disadvantage where appropriate? Yes No

REVIEW

Description of Studies; Characteristics of Included Studies/Characteristics of Excluded Studies:

- Eq-9. Could the included studies bias the generalizability to disadvantaged populations (e.g. restrictive exclusion criteria)? Yes No
- Eq-10. Did you appropriately describe sociodemographics (e.g. socioeconomic status, gender, race, etc.), given the details in the included studies? Yes No
- Eq-11. Did you describe the social context in each study? Yes No

C1, C2 Equity Checklist for Systematic Review Authors

Methodological Quality of Included Studies:

Eq-12. Did you describe the sociodemographic characteristics of withdrawals and dropouts? Yes No

The Results:

Eq-13. Did you conduct subgroup analyses across categories of disadvantage, where appropriate (e.g. socioeconomic status, gender, race, etc.)? Yes No

Eq-14. If subgroups were analyzed, did you interpret the results appropriately, given statistical power? Yes No

Reviewer's Conclusions

Implications for Practice:

Eq-15. Did you consider potential implications for health equity? Yes No

Implications for Research:

Eq-16. Did you identify whether there are research needs specific to promoting health equity? Yes No

References:

Kristjansson EA, Robinson V, Petticrew M, MacDonald B, Krasevec J, Janzen L, Greenhalgh T, Wells G, MacGowan J, Farmer A, Shea BJ, Mayhew A, Tugwell P. School feeding for improving the physical and psychosocial health of disadvantaged elementary school children. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2007, Issue 1.

Royal ST, Kendrick D, Coleman T. Non-legislative interventions for the promotion of cycle helmet wearing by children. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2005, Issue 2.

Whitehead M. The concepts and principles of equity and health. Health Promotion International 1991;6(3):217-28.

This checklist may be used and distributed. We would appreciate the following citation:

Ueffing E, Tugwell P, Welch V for the Cochrane Health Equity Field. 2008. C1, C2 Equity Checklist for Systematic Review Authors. Version 2008-11-06. Accessed at www.equity.cochrane.org/files/equitychecklist.pdf on [please insert the date of access].

Also, we would be very interested to hear how it is being used and welcome feedback. Please send any comments to Erin Ueffing at erin.ueffing@uottawa.ca. Thank you.