JSNA Quality Review Criteria

Quality Review forms part of the overall JSNA process which has a clear governance structure and defined roles and procedures. The role of the quality review is to be a constructive process whereby JSNA chapters are critically appraised against the criteria set out below, with feedback being provided to authors.

Quality review objectives are to:
1. Assess conformity of JSNA chapters against set criteria to ensure we maintain high quality and consistency across our JSNA
2. Provide a constructive platform for development and improvement
3. Prevent the dissemination of unsuitable information

The quality review should be carried out in a supportive and constructive manner with suggestions and recommendations made for improvements. Therefore, it is hoped to be a positive and useful process for authors.

Key review criteria
- Is the topic clearly defined?   - Does the data tell a story about the local area?   - Have the dimensions of local inequalities been fully explored (demographically, geographically etc)?   - Have the relevant protected characteristics covered under the Equality Act 2010 *(Ethnicity, religion, age, gender, sexual orientation, disability (mental & physical), pregnancy/maternity & gender reassignment)* been appropriately acknowledged throughout and gaps identified where information is not available? If they are not relevant to the chapter topic has this been explained?   - Is there a clear and concise summary of community assets?   - Has the voice of the local population been incorporated and utilised to influence conclusions?   - Has evidence of effective interventions/approaches been presented?   - Are the impacts for the short and longer-term future understood and evidenced?   - Is there a clear and reasonable rationale expressed in support of any conclusions drawn?   - Are recommendations made appropriate for informing wider strategic objectives and commissioning decisions?   - Are statements/claims made throughout appropriately referenced to ensure credibility?   - Are there any issues of accuracy that need checking?   - Are there any other comments regarding content (style, language, formatting, length etc)?   - From information provided does the level of engagement with relevant partners in producing the chapter appear to be appropriate and sufficient?

Instructions to reviewer:

Please read the JSNA chapter with the quality requirements, outlined above, in mind. Please use the feedback template below to provide your comments, referencing specific figures or page numbers if necessary to help the authors. In addition, you can make comments directly in the electronic version of the JSNA report using tracked changes.

As a reminder of JSNA formatting requirements please see the JSNA template guidance. A summary of the template is:

Topic information box

Executive summary

Introduction

Unmet needs and gaps

Recommendations for consideration

Full JSNA Report

What do we know?

1. Who is at risk and why?

2. Size of the issue locally

3. Targets and performance

4. Current activity, service provision and assets

5. Local Views

6. Evidence of what works

7. What's on the horizon?

What does this tell us?

8. Unmet needs and service gaps

9. Knowledge gaps

What should we do next?

10. Recommendations for consideration

Nottinghamshire Health & Wellbeing Board

JSNA Quality Review Feedback Form

To be completed by reviewer	
Chapter	
Chapter owner	
Chapter author(s)	
Reviewer	
Date of review feedback	

Each key question has prompts below of some things to consider that relate to that question. These are aimed to help guide the feedback but are not exhaustive.

Key review questions	Sections this most closely relates to	Comments
1. Is the topic clearly defined? ✓ Does the executive summary provide a useful overview of the chapter? ✓ Is it clear who is at risk & why? ✓ Has the impact on health and wellbeing been explored?	*1*	
2. Does the data tell a story about the local area? ✓ Is there a clear narrative around the data giving it meaning and context? ✓ Can areas of need be determined? ✓ Is data presented from across the County? ✓ Is data presented accurate and appropriate for sharing i.e. nothing confidential?	*2, 3, 4, 5*	

3. Have the dimensions of local inequalities been fully explored (demographically, geographically etc)? ✓ *Have vulnerable groups been identified?* ✓ *Have the relevant protected characteristics covered under the Equality Act 2010 (Ethnicity, religion, age, gender, sexual orientation, disability (mental & physical), pregnancy/maternity & gender reassignment) been appropriately acknowledged throughout?*	*2, 3*	
4. Is there a clear and concise summary of community assets? ✓ *Does it appear there has been a thorough exploration of assets?* ✓ *Does the chapter reference community assets beyond commissioned services?*	*4*	
5. Has the voice of the local population been incorporated and utilised to influence conclusions? ✓ *Is there evidence of meaningful engagement work?* ✓ *Has the voice of local people been used to inform conclusions around needs?*	*5, 8, 9, 10*	
6. Has evidence of effective interventions/approaches been presented? ✓ *Are these current and evidence based?*	*6*	
7. Are the impacts for the short and longer-term future understood and evidenced? ✓ *Does this consider the impact of the covid-19 pandemic?* ✓ *Does this include both positive and negative impacts?*	*6, 7*	

8. Is there a clear and reasonable rationale expressed in support of any conclusions drawn? ✓ *Have the unmet needs and service gaps been appropriately identified* ✓ *Are the recommendations supported by evidence provided within the chapter e.g. in the data, local insight, evidence of what works etc sections. Is there follow through?* ✓ *Have recommendations around the relevant protected characteristics covered under the Equality Act 2010 (Ethnicity, religion, age, gender, sexual orientation, disability (mental & physical), pregnancy/maternity & gender reassignment) been incorporated?*	*8, 9, 10*	
9. Are recommendations made appropriate for informing wider strategic objectives and commissioning decisions? ✓ *Are the recommendations clear?* ✓ *Do they identify appropriate priorities based on what has been identified within the chapter?* ✓ *Are people appropriately identified to lead on recommendations?* ✓ *Is it possible to determine how this chapter might have a positive influence on outcomes?*	*10*	
10. Are statements/claims made throughout appropriately referenced to ensure credibility? ✓ *Are reputable sources used?* ✓ *Are up to date references used as much as possible?* ✓ *Is local insight of an acceptable quality and standard?*	*All*	

11. Are there any issues of accuracy that need checking?	*All*	
12. Are there any other comments regarding content (style, language, formatting, length etc)?	*All*	
13. From information provided does the level of engagement with relevant partners in producing the chapter appear to be appropriate and sufficient? ✓ *Has it been made clear who has been involved in the production of the chapter?*	*All*	

Formatting Checklist:

Are the headings correct as per template?	
Is the font Arial size 11?	
Number of pages (template guidance ~ 30)	
Are pages numbered on bottom right hand side?	
Is there a header with the Health & Wellbeing Board logo, title & date?	
Is the text aligned to the left and margins normal?	
Are charts presented appropriately as per guidance - title, axis labelled, source?	
Do figure and table numbers match the narrative?	

Are figure and table numbers consecutive?	
Have recommendations been copied exactly to exec summary and are in a table format?	
Do references all follow the vancouver format?	