

JINS AUTHOR CHECKLIST Authors of all papers should submit this checklist together with their manuscript. The checklist will be made available during the submission process online to all authors and full step-by-step guidance given.

Part 1 identifies basic requirements for the manuscript submission (*mandatory for all submissions*)

Part 2 identifies recognized guidelines for scientific reporting, which you should use to prepare your manuscript (*required for systematic reviews and original research*)

Part 3 is a self assessment checklist that is designed to help to ensure that your research or review manuscript meets basic standards and the journal's Guide for Authors. (*optional only*)

PART 1 Basic requirements	Author response or further detail	Tick
Word count		
Was ethical approval given and by whom? (give any reference number)		
Please state any conflicts of interest		
Please state sources of funding and the role of funders in the conduct of the research		
Please state any study registry number (e.g. ISRCTN)		
Title	The title is in the format 'Topic / question: design/type of paper' and identifies the population / care setting studied. (e.g. <i>The effectiveness of telephone support for adolescents with insulin dependant diabetes: controlled before and after study: the structure is optional for discussion papers, editorials and commentaries</i>)	
Abstract	A structured abstract appropriate to the design (see <i>guidelines for authors</i>). Reports of controlled trials should follow the CONSORT format (does not apply to editorials or commentaries, Abstracts for discussion papers need not be structured)	
Key words	Between four and six key words have been provided in alphabetical order, which accurately identify the paper's subject, purpose, method and focus. Use the Medical Subject Headings (MeSH®) thesaurus or Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health (CINAHL) headings where possible (see http://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/meshhome.html).	
What the paper adds	Bullet points have been included that identify existing research knowledge relating to the specific research question / topic (what is already known) and a summary of the new knowledge added by this study (see <i>Guide for Authors</i> , does not apply to editorials or commentaries)	
References	Citations accord to the journal's format (Author, date) and reference list includes full details of all cited references in the proper format and alphabetical order (see <i>Guide for Authors</i>)	
Other Published accounts	All published and in press accounts of the study from which data in this paper originate are referred to in the paper and the relationship between this and other publications from the same study is made clear (see <i>Guide for Authors</i>)	
	The study is referred to by a distinctive name which will be used in any future publications to identify that it as the same study.	
	Please upload copies of all previous, current and under review publications from this study and / or give full details below	

PART 2 Standards of reporting	<p>The editors require that manuscripts adhere to recognized reporting guidelines relevant to the research design used. These identify matters that should be addressed in your paper. Please indicate which guidelines you have referred to.</p> <p>These are not quality assessment frameworks and your study need not meet all the criteria implied in the reporting guideline to be worthy of publication in the IJNS. The checklists do identify essential matters that should be considered and reported upon. For example, a controlled trial may or may not be blinded but it is important that the paper identifies whether or not participants, clinicians and outcome assessors were aware of treatment assignments.</p> <p>**You are encouraged (although not required) to submit a checklist from the appropriate reporting guideline together with your paper as a guide to the editors and reviewers of your paper.</p> <p><i>Reporting guidelines endorsed by the IJNS are listed below:</i></p>	Guideline referred to	Checklist submitted**
Observational cohort, case control and cross sectional studies	STROBE Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology http://www.equator-network.org/index.aspx?o=1032		
Quasi experimental / non-randomized evaluations	TREND - Transparent Reporting of Evaluations with Non-randomized Designs http://www.equator-network.org/index.aspx?o=1032		
Randomised (and quasi-randomised) controlled trial	CONSORT – Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials http://www.equator-network.org/index.aspx?o=1032		
Study of Diagnostic accuracy / assessment scale	STARD Standards for the Reporting of Diagnostic Accuracy studies http://www.equator-network.org/index.aspx?o=1032		
Systematic Review of Controlled Trials	PRISMA - Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses http://www.equator-network.org/index.aspx?o=1032		
Systematic Review of Observational Studies	MOOSE Meta-analysis of Observational Studies in Epidemiology http://www.equator-network.org/index.aspx?o=1032		
	<i>Qualitative researchers might wish to consult the guideline listed below</i>		
Qualitative studies	COREQ : Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research Tong, A., Sainsbury, P., Craig, J., 2007. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. <i>International Journal for Quality in Health Care</i> 19 (6), 349-357. (http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/intqhc/mzm042)		
Other (please give source)			
Not applicable (please elaborate)			

PART 3	Part 3 Self-assessment checklist for research and reviews (optional)	
	You might like to review the content of your paper before submission to ensure that the essential elements are present. We do not intend that this checklist should dictate sub headings that you must use (although you might find it useful) but rather give a guide to content and issues that should (in general) always be considered. You might find it helpful to note the page number where some of the key issues are dealt with to assist reviewers	

Section	Descriptor	TICK
a) Primary research only		
Background	A statement of the problem / phenomena of interest, a brief summary of existing research which addresses the topic and an explanation of the purpose of the current study / review in relation to this.	
METHODS	Clear statement of the aims, objectives (hypothesis) and research design	
Settings	The settings and locations where the study took place	
Inclusion Criteria	Eligibility criteria for participants – inclusion and exclusion criteria	
Sampling	Method of sampling and if relevant allocation to groups (e.g. convenience, random) and <i>description</i> of sampling, recruitment and allocation procedures .	
Sample size	How sample size was determined.	
Outcomes and data collection procedures	Clearly defined primary and secondary outcome measures (when applicable), Setting and methods of data collection and methods used to enhance the quality of data collection (e.g., multiple observations, training of assessors).	
Analysis Methods	Statistical methods used / approaches to qualitative analysis including procedures to ensure accuracy / validity / truthfulness of accounts.	
Ethical review*	Details of ethical scrutiny / approvals obtained.	
RESULTS Participant flow	Flow of participants through each stage of selection, allocation, follow up / inclusion in analysis (a diagram is strongly recommended). Describe protocol deviations from study as planned, together with reasons.	
Recruitment	Dates defining the periods of recruitment and follow-up.	
Baseline data	Baseline demographic and clinical characteristics of each group.	
Results	Point estimates, exact p-values and confidence intervals for quantitative studies. Qualitative analyses are supported by appropriate quotations which support the derived themes / categories and which are anonymously attributed to participants (using pseudonyms, numbers or equivalent)	
DISCUSSION	Brief recapitulation / summary of the results taking into account study hypotheses / aims	
Interpretation	Interpretation of the results, taking into account study limitations	
Overall evidence	Assessment of the current state of knowledge in the context of study results and other evidence.	
Implications	Consideration of the implications of the current state of knowledge for further research and or practice	

PART 3	Self-assessment checklist for research and reviews*	
Section	Descriptor	TICK
b) Reviews only		
Background	A statement of the problem / phenomena of interest, a brief summary of existing research which addresses the topic and an explanation of the purpose of the current study / review in relation to this.	
METHODS	Explicit statement of the scope of the review and its aims and objectives	
Search strategy	Description of search strategy, including time period and limits applied, keywords and index terms, citation searching, databases and registries searched. Search software used, including special features used (eg, explosion) <input type="checkbox"/> Use of hand searching (eg, reference lists of obtained articles) <input type="checkbox"/> Description of search results justification for exclusions <input type="checkbox"/> Method of addressing articles published in languages other than English <input type="checkbox"/> Method of handling abstracts and unpublished studies <input type="checkbox"/> Description of any contact with authors <input type="checkbox"/> Effort to include all available studies, including contact with author	
Study Selection	Types of study designs / papers considered Selection criteria Assessment of study quality Documentation of how data were classified and coded (eg, multiple raters, blinding, and inter-rater reliability)	
Synthesis	Approach to synthesising evidence	
Results	Flow chart of studies from search to inclusion (number identified from search, selected for scrutiny, included in review, included in meta-analysis)	
*	Descriptive information for each included study (eg, setting, participant characteristics, sample size, methods, interventions / procedures, follow-up period) – a table is encouraged	
*	A summary of individual study results (including point estimates, confidence intervals and p values where relevant / available) and if relevant an overall estimate	
	Results of sensitivity testing (eg, subgroup analysis)	
DISCUSSION	Brief recapitulation / summary of the results taking into account study hypotheses / aims	
Interpretation	Interpretation of the results, taking into account study limitations	
Overall evidence	Assessment of the current state of knowledge in the context of study results and other evidence.	
Implications	Consideration of the implications of the current state of knowledge for further research and or practice	