

Review of: "The equality agenda: a clear case of smoke and mirrors"

Michaela Guthridge¹

¹ Monash University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Canning tackles the important topic of equality in this very well written article. However, I think the article would benefit from a revised structure. For example, from the outset, and throughout the article, I do not know if this article is an essay or a literature review, with part autobiographical elements, which makes reading confusing. I think the intention of the author was to write an essay, but the author mostly only describes the literature, rather than analyses it. A clear statement of what this article is (essay? lit review?), and then following the conventional structure of either an essay or a literature review would strengthen the article's readability.

Readability will also be enhanced if the author's aim is clearly stated upfront, rather than having the reader guess where the essay is going. Having a clear aim would also allow you to purposively edit your article. For example, the section on health, while very interesting, seems to divert from the main thesis, but as I do not know your aim, I am unsure. A clearly stated aim would allow your reader to follow your argument by signposting what your thesis is. For example, when you discuss the "cognitive elite" I thought you may discuss affective skills, such as emotional intelligence. A clear aim would not have lead me down this path.

An aim would also help you draft a more appropriate title to your article. For a good measure of your article, equality is not discussed and is misunderstand. Equality is between different races, genders, abilities, sexualities etc. Equality, as a human right, is not between different intellects. So the argument surrounding equality and the "cognitive elite" requires more thorough exploration.

Ultimately, the conclusion comes as a surprise because:

1. The title does not reflect the content of the paper
2. The aim is not apparent to the reader
3. The method (literature review? essay? Autobiography?) is confused

Rectifying these structural issues does not mean major revision, just a sentence or so can clarify these missing elements.

Finally, attention to detail in terms of grammar could be slightly improved. For example, indented quotes do not need quotation marks. Paraphrasing does not require page number in the citation. You miss some full stops and capitalisations, and importantly, you do not write in full your abbreviations the first time you mention them.

Otherwise, a very well written, important and interesting article!

