

Karen Gainey: Yeah, yeah, that's how it works. Alright. Well, thank you for agreeing to do this. It's really excited. To talk to you, because your journals are so different and interesting. You represent. So I think this could be super interesting. But I just wanted to before we we start. Just a reminder that I'm recording the audio for this, and zoom will be trans. Well, Zoom is

21

00:03:42.990 --> 00:04:03.359

Karen Gainey: providing a transcript of this, and I've said everybody. I'll remind you at the end if you'd like to look at the Transcript to check anything for context or clarify any of your responses. You're very welcome to do that, but I feel obliged, so I know it's an extra task. But just if you'd like to.

22

00:04:03.360 --> 00:04:04.609

Participant 10: No, that's very.

23

00:04:04.610 --> 00:04:05.140

Karen Gainey: Welcome, to.

24

00:04:05.140 --> 00:04:05.800

Participant 10: Thank you.

25

00:04:06.190 --> 00:04:10.870

Karen Gainey: Yeah. And please tell me if you need a break or want to stop at any time.

26

00:04:12.100 --> 00:04:12.700

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

27

00:04:12.700 --> 00:04:15.899

Participant 10: That should be fine. I've got a cup of tea, so I should be oh, good

28

00:04:15.900 --> 00:04:16.916

Participant 10: should be all right.

29

00:04:17.170 --> 00:04:20.440

Karen Gainey: Okay, great. And how are you for time?

30

00:04:21.360 --> 00:04:32.991

Participant 10: I'm good. What have I got today? I haven't got anything. It's it's it's 8 30 here, and I don't think I have anything. Oh, well, I have. I mean, my next meeting is 9 30. So I have an hour. If that's okay,

31

00:04:34.060 --> 00:04:37.210

Karen Gainey: Yeah. Usually takes about 45 min.

32

00:04:37.210 --> 00:04:37.670

Participant 10: Cool.

33

00:04:37.670 --> 00:04:45.340

Karen Gainey: But just so we I know if things go a bit bit over how much leeway we've got, so I don't want to make it late.

34

00:04:45.530 --> 00:04:48.570

Karen Gainey: So you're in the (Country). In (City).

35

00:04:48.570 --> 00:04:51.110

Participant 10: Am. Yes, yeah. I'm in (City). Yeah, yeah.

36

00:04:51.110 --> 00:04:51.730

Karen Gainey: Great.

66

00:06:39.040 --> 00:06:53.900

Karen Gainey: It's terrific. It's terrific, all right. So it's a little while since. I know we've we've connected some time ago on LinkedIn

67

00:06:54.592 --> 00:07:03.300

Karen Gainey: and cause. I know you're you're right in this kind of plain language space, and.

68

00:07:03.300 --> 00:07:12.239

Participant 10: Yeah, it tried to be. It seems to have taken on a life of its own a little bit. It kind of started with, you know, just a a meeting, or whatever, and it kind of spiral.

69

00:07:12.480 --> 00:07:13.020

Karen Gainey: Really.

70

00:07:13.020 --> 00:07:22.345

Participant 10: Yeah, it's quite interesting, really. I mean, I've always been quite. I don't know if I've always been quite. And you really know about it for about the concept for quite a while. But

71

00:07:22.760 --> 00:07:44.449

Participant 10: yeah, I got invited to take part in a sort of a workshop work stream type thing that was organized by an organization called (name), which is patient, focused medicines development organization and got involved in in developing some guidelines with them I was sort of an editor, publisher type representative on a group of all different sorts of

72

00:07:44.700 --> 00:07:58.450

Participant 10: people within publishing. And yeah, from there. Then, once you start getting involved with those sorts of things. It's it's oh, would you come and help with, you know, get involved in this. And then you start thinking about how you can embed it in your own job. And all this kind of thing, and it kind of yeah snowballed, I would say.

73

00:07:58.450 --> 00:08:03.294

Karen Gainey: Yeah, great. Yeah, no, that's really good. So

74

00:08:04.240 --> 00:08:21.940

Karen Gainey: I guess I'm really keen, because I know you've got quite a depth and breadth of experience in this area, and are affiliated with a couple of journals. From what I can gather, the (journal), research, and learning.

75

00:08:21.940 --> 00:08:23.120

Participant 10: Rows of the time.

76

00:08:23.460 --> 00:08:24.125

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

77

00:08:24.790 --> 00:08:25.440

Participant 10: Yeah, yeah.

78

00:08:25.440 --> 00:08:26.820

Karen Gainey: So I want to kind.

79

00:08:26.820 --> 00:08:29.050

Karen Gainey: I'm sorry or sorry. Go on.

80

00:08:29.050 --> 00:08:31.790

Participant 10: Sorry I was. Gonna say, would you like me to give me give you any sort of

81

00:08:31.980 --> 00:08:36.830

Participant 10: background to what I do? Would that be helpful. I don't really not ready for.

82

00:08:37.650 --> 00:09:00.380

Karen Gainey: Yeah, because I had a look at the author guidelines from both. Because I don't know if you're if, perhaps if I start and give you a snapshot of how I came to be doing this study. This is the final study in my Phd, so I started doing a scoping review on author guidelines from health and medical journals, and then.

83

00:09:00.380 --> 00:09:00.730

Participant 10: And.

84

00:09:00.730 --> 00:09:11.809

Karen Gainey: Followed that up with a compliance study to compare the guidelines to actual plain language. Summaries didn't include either of yours, but just to see how closely they aligned.

85

00:09:11.810 --> 00:09:12.410

Participant 10: Interesting.

86

00:09:12.410 --> 00:09:37.880

Karen Gainey: And that was some interesting results. Then I've actually, just before we started, sent off revisions for a paper where I spoke to some end users. Some people with

chronic medical conditions who read plain language summaries quite a lot to see what they think is important, what they like, what they don't like

87

00:09:37.880 --> 00:10:03.369

Karen Gainey: about a range of different aspects. So I'm putting. I've put it all together and formulated some questions to get a perspective from the editorial publishing end to see, I guess, what's possible. What are any barriers, facilitators, and how that decision making process works. So I can kind of get. We've got an idea of what's out there, what people want. Now I want to find out

88

00:10:03.510 --> 00:10:06.580

Karen Gainey: how that might gel together.

89

00:10:06.580 --> 00:10:07.869

Participant 10: Oh, interesting. Yeah.

90

00:10:07.870 --> 00:10:24.080

Karen Gainey: So yeah, I'd love for you to draw on any and all experience from any journals you might have been involved in are involved in. But yeah, I'd love for you to start with a snapshot of what you do.

91

00:10:24.080 --> 00:10:25.925

Participant 10: Yeah. Yeah. Absolutely.

92

00:10:26.540 --> 00:10:27.290

Karen Gainey: You're gulped in.

93

00:10:27.290 --> 00:10:43.469

Participant 10: Yeah. So I've I've worked in in publishing in this sort of the editorial side of things just over 20 years now, started in 2,003, and I've always worked within the the editorial sort of commissioning editor, general development editor

94

00:10:43.800 --> 00:10:50.899

Participant 10: sort of space. And then I gradually work my way up to editorial director, and so I was for most of most of the large chunk of that

95

00:10:51.010 --> 00:11:14.637

Participant 10: of my career. I was at a company called the (Publisher), and they published a portfolio of about 35 journals, all within the kind of clinical and translational medicine. Space. So that was where. So I did quite a work, that sort of doing journal launches. And then I was the editorial director. So that was where I launched the (Journal).

96

00:11:15.280 --> 00:11:39.899

Participant 10: which is a (topic) journal. So I've worked on that that launched in 2012. So I've worked on that sort of consistently throughout. But in 2022, myself and 2 other colleagues from (Publisher) left that organization and founded our own Company, and we were lucky enough to be able to acquire the (Journal), and bring that with us as our kind of.

97

00:11:39.900 --> 00:11:40.370

Karen Gainey: Oh!

98

00:11:40.370 --> 00:12:09.059

Participant 10: Launch product, so I could have always thought it was mine, anyway, because I launched (Publisher), but very kindly. The owner of the company allowed us to do a sort of management buy out of that. And that's what kind of started (Organisation) publishing. We also have a website called (name). That was a partner website for that journal which is so got the journal, this traditional journal. And then the website is more things like webinars and blogs and news and all that kind of thing. Even the same health economics outcomes research, real world evidence, space.

100

00:12:09.894 --> 00:12:22.120

Participant 10: So that's kind of my day job. But at the same time, around that sort of time, because I was going a bit mad, and, you know, wanted all everything to be new in 2022. I also started the role at the (Journal) So.

105

00:12:34.260 --> 00:13:02.370

Participant 10: yeah, sorry. Yes, that is a society journal. So there's an association called (name). So that's a membership organization for X. So (Publisher) is a member. All the big publishers, all the Big 5 publishers and members also sort of vendors that serve the publishing industry as well. Oh, beautiful.

109

00:13:13.452 --> 00:13:23.029

Participant 10: So yeah. So then, publishing is the Journal X. So it publishes about publishing. Basically, it's a bit meta. So I, as a sort of a

110

00:13:24.739 --> 00:13:36.509

Participant 10: what's the word freelance role on on the side of what I normally do? I am the editor-in-chief of (journal) So I'm involved in the publication of articles about the publishing industry, or things that serve

111

00:13:36.510 --> 00:13:57.430

Participant 10: the publishing industry, or sort of people who work within that. So within publishing, but also sort of supporting areas, so librarians and librarian services and universities and vendors and all sorts. So I work on my sort of scientific journal as my day job, and then (journal) is more around the publishing industry itself. So that kind of embeds me in.

112

00:13:57.430 --> 00:13:59.570

Participant 10: I don't know best practice, and and.

113

00:13:59.940 --> 00:14:00.310

Karen Gainey: The same.

114

00:14:00.310 --> 00:14:18.889

Participant 10: Within publishing, which would be really interesting as a as a role, because it keeps me up, especially now that we're sort of now a small company on our own. It keeps me up to date with what everyone else is up to within larger publishing organizations. So that's kind of where I'm at, but within plain summary, plain language summaries. As I say, started off, that a few years ago.

119

00:14:23.570 --> 00:14:26.699

Karen Gainey: Does that use the (Publisher) kind of.

120

00:14:26.700 --> 00:14:27.250

Participant 10: Yes.

121

00:14:27.250 --> 00:14:28.329

Participant 10: Framework. Yes.

122

00:14:28.330 --> 00:14:29.569

Participant 10: Yeah. So, yeah. So.

123

00:14:29.570 --> 00:14:29.940

Karen Gainey: It's like.

124

00:14:29.940 --> 00:14:56.140

Participant 10: So it's owned by the Society, and then we publish it in partnership with with (Publisher). So, although I don't actually work for (Publisher). I am. So I find it really odd, because I'm like an editor editor in chief of that journal which is what I've been used to in my normal job as dealing with as a publisher. So I'm the person that (Publisher) have to deal with as the editor-in-chief of that. And in the same way, like an academic editor of a medical journal. I suppose.

125

00:14:56.550 --> 00:14:59.680

Karen Gainey: Yeah, no, sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt. I just want to.

126

00:15:00.130 --> 00:15:09.619

Karen Gainey: One of the things I'm wanting to understand is that relationship and level of autonomy when it comes to publishers, journals, and editorial decisions.

127

00:15:09.620 --> 00:15:15.529

Participant 10: It's quite interesting, I guess, because on the (Publisher) side we own and publish the journal ourselves. So we have

128

00:15:15.770 --> 00:15:43.869

Participant 10: entire autonomy. I would say over over that. So I write the author guidelines for that. I can log into the website and make changes if I want to. I can make updates all that kind of thing. With the (Publisher). With the (journal), I can still obviously have the control over what things the policies and that kind of thing. But within that kind of (Publisher) framework, I guess so I can make updates to the website. But I have to go via somebody at (Publisher), who will approve it and then do it, for it's not the same as (name), so I can just log in and.

129

00:15:43.870 --> 00:15:44.290

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

130

00:15:44.290 --> 00:15:50.885

Participant 10: Stuff if I want to. Yeah. So yeah, it's quite interesting experience. Actually, because I'm yeah, working with a big publisher like (Publisher) is.

131

00:15:51.574 --> 00:15:57.419

Participant 10: you know, it's it's useful in itself, because you have. You tap into their resources a bit. And that kind of thing so.

132

00:15:58.000 --> 00:16:07.440

Karen Gainey: Yeah, it's it's because I know they also offer a service for outsourcing plain language summaries. Yes.

133

00:16:07.440 --> 00:16:09.650

Participant 10: We do that with the chorus as well. We partner with.

134

00:16:09.650 --> 00:16:10.170

Karen Gainey: Oh, yeah.

135

00:16:10.170 --> 00:16:11.620

Participant 10: Anyway. So we'll come to that.

136

00:16:11.620 --> 00:16:18.416

Karen Gainey: Yes, I want to talk about that as well. But sorry I interrupted you. I probably hope you haven't lost your train of thought.

137

00:16:18.700 --> 00:16:20.939

Participant 10: No, no, that's okay. I think I was getting to the plain language bit.

138

00:16:20.940 --> 00:16:22.360

Karen Gainey: Language. Yeah.

139

00:16:22.360 --> 00:16:35.239

Participant 10: Yeah. So this started when I was at (Publisher). And so, as I said, I got involved in this initiative with the (organization), who were putting together a sort of a how to a series of how to guides for sort of patient engagement activities.

140

00:16:35.240 --> 00:16:35.600

Karen Gainey: So.

141

00:16:35.600 --> 00:16:56.030

Participant 10: And within that one of the work streams was around co-creation of plain language summaries, and I got invited to be part of that group to develop that how to guide. And that's kind of, I guess, where it all started. It was around about the same time. At (Publisher) we were starting to think about the inclusion of plain language, summary abstracts within articles. But it's quite early days.

142

00:16:56.295 --> 00:17:07.570

Participant 10: When I start because I work on this a few years ago now. And yeah, as I say, it kind of then kind of grew out of there. We cause I was sort of involved in this this group. I then became a bit of a

143

00:17:08.130 --> 00:17:19.252

Participant 10: a pro pls person within the publishing, and started to sort of have them within the (Publisher) journals. And then sort of speak to them a bit more at sort of industry.

144

00:17:19.819 --> 00:17:31.984

Participant 10: conferences. And another organization I'm I'm involved in is is Map IS. Mpp, which is the International Society of Medical Publication professionals. So I've spoken a few times.

145

00:17:32.620 --> 00:17:39.230

Participant 10: conference and things I started, you know getting. And once you start talking about things at conferences, you start. You people invite you. Okay, they keep.

146

00:17:39.230 --> 00:17:41.039

Participant 10: Oh, yeah, talk about it.

147

00:17:41.150 --> 00:17:41.680

Participant 10: Yes.

148

00:17:42.750 --> 00:17:43.160

Karen Gainey: Yes.

149

00:17:43.160 --> 00:18:00.059

Participant 10: And I guess the other. The other big thing that I was involved in, which started at (Publisher), was the plain language summary of publication article. So this is a standalone, plain language article so based on an original research paper.

150

00:18:00.550 --> 00:18:20.069

Participant 10: but translated into into plain language and published as its own entity. So whereas we started with the plain language, abstracts, which I think are the most sort of widely used plain language thing within journals. Now the plain language summary of publication. The PLSP was something that myself and a colleague at (Publisher) developed originally.

151

00:18:20.270 --> 00:18:34.189

Participant 10: and we published, I think, the 1st one of those within our journal X. That's our journal, our journal. That was a (Publisher), because of all was mine. And then again, that's another thing. That kind of spiraled. It sort of hit a bit of a

152

00:18:34.360 --> 00:18:48.329

Participant 10: an interest and a need, I guess, particularly within Pharma sponsored research. There was a lot of interest from the pharmaceutical companies in publishing these plain language, Standalone plain language articles that just went a bit further than the

153

00:18:48.823 --> 00:19:16.059

Participant 10: the plain language abstract. They use sort of a combination of text and graphics more like a sort of a heavy duty infographic, I guess. But were it an article entity in their own right, so they had all the sort of the benefits of that from being able to be cited and discovered on medline and and all these types of things, whereas a plain language, summary, abstract, or supplementary materials, can sometimes be a bit harder to

discoverability wise. They're a bit harder to track down sometimes. So again, that's something that's kind of

154

00:19:16.160 --> 00:19:29.219

Participant 10: spiraled over time as well. We publish those within the (journal), and but also other publishers have now taken it up. So this is like (Publisher) and (Publisher), for example, have now sort of rolled out.

155

00:19:29.490 --> 00:19:30.060

Participant 10: Yeah.

156

00:19:30.060 --> 00:19:30.990

Participant 10: SP.

157

00:19:30.990 --> 00:19:37.329

Participant 10: Program. So that's been, that's quite interesting, really, is it really something that

158

00:19:37.430 --> 00:19:40.279

Participant 10: hit a bit of a nerve? I think of

159

00:19:40.480 --> 00:19:43.619

Participant 10: how many people were interested in doing so. That was something interesting to be involved.

160

00:19:45.605 --> 00:19:46.850

Participant 10: Yeah.

161

00:19:47.490 --> 00:19:48.280

Karen Gainey: Yeah, so go.

162

00:19:48.280 --> 00:19:57.489

Participant 10: I was going to say, because we had a lot of autonomy again. We had quite a lot of autonomy autonomy when we were at (Publisher). So we were able to kind of develop that.

163

00:19:57.610 --> 00:20:07.016

Participant 10: Yeah. Back in the day, whenever that 1st one was published, I think it was about 2020 20, something like that. The 1st one came out in Journal X and

164

00:20:07.610 --> 00:20:08.439

Karen Gainey: And then the other.

165

00:20:08.440 --> 00:20:11.029

Karen Gainey: The 1st plsp.

166

00:20:11.280 --> 00:20:14.443

Participant 10: Yeah. So that that was the 1st one. So we

167

00:20:14.910 --> 00:20:35.590

Participant 10: we developed that alongside the company, the sponsor, and the authors that wanted to to develop it, which came about because they had wanted to publish a pls within a paper within another journal. But that journal hadn't allowed pls at that time, but because they'd done the work to develop it. They wanted to know if they could publish it as a separate thing with us, and we thought.

168

00:20:35.590 --> 00:20:36.410

Karen Gainey: Oh!

169

00:20:36.410 --> 00:20:40.810

Participant 10: Not. We were sort of excited, and then we sort of got into sort of the the

170

00:20:40.910 --> 00:20:46.149

Participant 10: procedure and the process that needed to come with that to make that a possibility, and.

171

00:20:48.580 --> 00:20:50.670

Karen Gainey: Quite an organic kind of a.

172

00:20:50.670 --> 00:20:58.870

Participant 10: Yeah, yeah, it was. It's just one of those things that kind of the things slotted into place at the right time, because we were quite interested in plain language, content because of this.

173

00:20:58.870 --> 00:20:59.340

Karen Gainey: Hmm.

174

00:20:59.340 --> 00:21:08.840

Participant 10: Projects we've been involved in, and it seemed like a you know, a good idea. It just seemed like a sensible, and you know, why, why shouldn't there be this entity? That's, you know, accessible for

175

00:21:09.440 --> 00:21:14.299

Participant 10: not, you know, patients, but not just patients. People just more broadly that are non expert in

176

00:21:14.540 --> 00:21:38.740

Participant 10: in the sub, in the very nitty gritty of a subject area, but still have an interest, for whichever reason, whether that's a patient or whether that's a, you know, a nurse or a health policymaker. Someone within a hospital, that's, you know, maybe not interested in all the very granular research. But the outcomes of that. And the findings are very, very relevant to their jobs and lives if they're a patient for a patient advocate. So

177

00:21:39.070 --> 00:21:55.409

Participant 10: yeah, yeah, it just was one of those sort of things that fell into place, I think. And yeah, it's been really, really gratifying to see it taken up by other publishers. You know we're no longer a (Publisher) journal, in fact, it doesn't exist well, really anymore, because it got it got acquired by (Publisher).

178

00:21:55.410 --> 00:21:55.910

Karen Gainey: This year.

179

00:21:55.910 --> 00:22:03.060

Participant 10: Long after we left. So it doesn't really exist as its own entity anymore. Those journals have been have been acquired by (Publisher). So.

180

00:22:03.330 --> 00:22:06.069

Karen Gainey: It's nice they've kept that format, though, of the PI.

181

00:22:06.070 --> 00:22:27.918

Participant 10: Yeah, really encouraging. Yeah, because obviously, within (Publisher), we over the, you know, the few years that we started doing these, there were people that were very heavily involved in that in terms of the editorial side of things. So when they became absorbed by (Publisher), they could have gone either way, they could have said, Oh, no, we're not used to that bit. We'll just cut that bit off and do what we know, but they've they've stuck with it and

182

00:22:28.170 --> 00:22:37.740

Participant 10: incorporated it. And you know, for all I know, that's 1 of the reasons they were interested in acquiring it. In the 1st place, you don't. You know you don't know these things, but you know they certainly haven't shut it down. So that's that's a good thing.

183

00:22:37.740 --> 00:22:44.109

Karen Gainey: Yeah. Yeah. And and now, (Publisher) have picked it up, and could well be.

184

00:22:44.110 --> 00:22:44.889

Participant 10: Yes, I can.

185

00:22:45.210 --> 00:22:47.379

Karen Gainey: It's gonna be the way.

186

00:22:47.380 --> 00:22:47.790

Participant 10: There is.

187

00:22:47.790 --> 00:22:48.150

Karen Gainey: This guy.

188

00:22:48.150 --> 00:23:07.189

Participant 10: Keen on it. I think that the thing with the larger publishers is it does take a while to get these things through the bigger the publisher, the slower it can be to initiate,

especially new initiatives like that. So it takes quite a lot of effort, I think, to push something as new as that through. So they've done. Really, you know, (Publisher) and (Publisher).

189

00:23:07.370 --> 00:23:13.550

Participant 10: you know, to get those going. And (Publisher), I think, is another journal that's been quite, not exactly the same. But they do sort of a similar types of.

190

00:23:14.030 --> 00:23:29.949

Participant 10: you know, really interesting types of different materials. They do a lot of things like podcast type, content, and those sort of other types of media. They've been very, you know, nothing, nothing to do with us and the plsp. But you know before that they were very involved in those kind of

191

00:23:30.070 --> 00:23:34.800

Participant 10: different outputs. Yeah, I remember the journal article.

192

00:23:35.050 --> 00:23:38.600

Karen Gainey: Their guidelines. There, with Springer nature.

193

00:23:38.940 --> 00:23:40.799

Participant 10: Yes, I think they are. Yeah, yeah.

194

00:23:41.160 --> 00:23:50.929

Karen Gainey: They have very detailed guidelines for writing their Ps. Out of a lot of them. That were one of the more detailed.

195

00:23:50.930 --> 00:23:54.029

Participant 10: Yeah, they've been. They've been doing it for quite a while. So yeah, that's really, yeah.

196

00:23:55.520 --> 00:23:56.020

Karen Gainey: In that sense.

197

00:23:56.020 --> 00:23:59.070

Karen Gainey: Seriously, yeah, yeah, yeah, definitely.

198

00:23:59.550 --> 00:24:07.391

Karen Gainey: Yeah. Oh, that's that's great. I actually, I'm I'm so glad you brought up the plsp because

199

00:24:08.340 --> 00:24:16.260

Karen Gainey: Whether I realized it in the past or not. I hadn't noted down that that

200

00:24:16.660 --> 00:24:21.679

Karen Gainey: your journals had published them so I wouldn't have asked about them.

201

00:24:21.910 --> 00:24:22.850

Participant 10: Yeah, well.

202

00:24:22.850 --> 00:24:32.209

Karen Gainey: And I really wanted to know about them. So I actually had on my list to try and engage some people from (Publisher) to talk about these.

203

00:24:32.210 --> 00:24:34.529

Participant 10: Definitely, yeah, yeah, so like.

204

00:24:34.530 --> 00:24:39.079

Participant 10: yeah, I think that'd be really interesting. Because within that big organization, it would be interesting to see, I think how that

205

00:24:39.390 --> 00:24:45.539

Participant 10: process worked of getting something from the idea through to now. They're starting to publish them within.

206

00:24:45.540 --> 00:24:46.050

Karen Gainey: We have.

207

00:24:46.050 --> 00:24:50.069

Participant 10: For a big publisher quite a short space of time. So yeah, yeah.

208

00:24:50.070 --> 00:24:53.229

Karen Gainey: Yeah. Well, they don't have them with all their journals. There's about.

209

00:24:53.230 --> 00:24:53.700

Participant 10: No.

210

00:24:53.700 --> 00:25:06.580

Karen Gainey: About 50, a dozen or 15 really like to drill down but if it's all right, if we could talk about them and the plain language summaries either just

211

00:25:06.580 --> 00:25:06.940

Karen Gainey: absolutely.

212

00:25:06.940 --> 00:25:14.070

Karen Gainey: separately or collectively. That would be brilliant. Just so I can understand how they're similar. But how they're different as well.

213

00:25:14.070 --> 00:25:15.160

Participant 10: Absolutely.

214

00:25:15.160 --> 00:25:42.319

Karen Gainey: And however you want to break that up and address it, I'll leave up to you, but it's all. It's all of value, so I should should say this. I've got a bunch of questions, and you've kind of already touched on some aspects. Please don't worry if I ask you questions, and you think, oh, I just don't know the answer to that, because that's the case with everybody. I've got a lot of different questions that just may not be applicable to your journal.

215

00:25:42.320 --> 00:25:43.240

Participant 10: Absolutely. That's.

216

00:25:43.650 --> 00:25:44.040

Participant 10: Okay.

217

00:25:44.040 --> 00:25:49.192

Karen Gainey: But please don't feel bad, or please don't feel like you've got to try and come up with an answer.

218

00:25:49.660 --> 00:26:05.490

Karen Gainey: and please as well, don't feel like like, I really want to know the ins and outs whether it's good, bad, ugly, indifferent, difficult challenging. It's all really really important and useful.

219

00:26:05.780 --> 00:26:16.650

Karen Gainey: So yeah, I guess just kind of building on what you're talking about. Well, I guess

220

00:26:17.710 --> 00:26:23.949

Karen Gainey: I was looking at the different journals. And so obviously, it's what kind of

221

00:26:24.520 --> 00:26:31.768

Karen Gainey: as you? And as you were speaking, what really strikes me as being the main difference is that

222

00:26:32.800 --> 00:26:37.354

Karen Gainey: because you is own the right word for (Publisher)

223

00:26:37.860 --> 00:26:41.480

Participant 10: Yeah, yeah, yeah. So I'm I'm co-founder Co owner.

224

00:26:41.973 --> 00:26:42.960

Karen Gainey: Yep. Yep.

225

00:26:42.960 --> 00:26:43.460

Participant 10: Okay.

226

00:26:44.610 --> 00:26:46.447

230

00:26:58.620 --> 00:27:07.259

Participant 10: and I'm editorial director, and Joe is our publishing director. But yeah, so when there's only 3 of you, you'll do a bit of everything.

231

00:27:07.260 --> 00:27:09.564

Karen Gainey: Yeah, yeah, for sure.

232

00:27:10.280 --> 00:27:17.859

Karen Gainey: So you've obviously got much more autonomy than you do with with (journal)

233

00:27:18.390 --> 00:27:26.474

Karen Gainey: So I guess I just want to kind of understand how that impacts decisions around

234

00:27:27.730 --> 00:27:57.259

Karen Gainey: from things. So maybe if I can explain what I'm trying to get at when when I spoke to the participants. Once they they related some things that from their perspective were really important, and it came down to things like that, and that that changed or influenced their decision to read a pls or not. Even things like the label it was given, whether it was called.

235

00:27:57.260 --> 00:27:57.780

Participant 10: Okay. Yeah.

236

00:27:57.780 --> 00:28:08.100

Karen Gainey: Summary plain language or other words, there's some words I like some words they didn't, so I'm trying to understand.

237

00:28:08.590 --> 00:28:11.989

Karen Gainey: Oh, and the use of jargon.

238

00:28:12.670 --> 00:28:20.349

Karen Gainey: how it was formatted, the length and all of those decisions so trying to understand

239

00:28:21.060 --> 00:28:28.390

Karen Gainey: with you being involved heavily in setting all those things up. What drove some of those choices.

240

00:28:29.080 --> 00:28:39.989

Karen Gainey: So I know with with (name). You've used the term plain language summary, but I wasn't sure if they were mandatory. I believe they are mandatory.

241

00:28:40.120 --> 00:28:40.690

Karen Gainey: include.

242

00:28:40.690 --> 00:28:50.259

Participant 10: They are now, they they only as as of the beginning of this year, within the (journal) starting to

243

00:28:50.810 --> 00:29:02.800

Participant 10: to be honest almost even when they weren't mandatory. It was most articles were including them, and we did. We use the strongly encourage wording within the

244

00:29:02.980 --> 00:29:22.770

Participant 10: sort of dialogue I had with authors and that kind of thing. So if they didn't have a plain language summary. So when I say when I say just plain language. I just mean that text based abstract, plain language summary. So if they didn't have that when a paper came in, then that was one of my points of feedback sort of at the Peer review process I would

245

00:29:22.770 --> 00:29:40.189

Participant 10: about the Peer review comments, but also then in my editorial comments I would strongly encourage them to include a plain language, summary, abstract, that stage, to try and push them through, and one way or another most, even though before we mandated, most papers did include a plain language summary.

246

00:29:40.190 --> 00:29:53.109

Participant 10: And then we just thought, sometimes in publishing it's it's quite good to start sort of with the suggesting that authors do something, and then we move into strongly encouraging that they do something, and then we finally mandate that they must

247

00:29:53.370 --> 00:29:56.630

Participant 10: must do something as a sort of a soft

248

00:29:56.790 --> 00:30:13.109

Participant 10: encouragement into into a certain area. So and I think as well. Now it is a lot easier to create those plain language summary abstracts. I think there's, I just say, some publishers, you know, have partnerships with organizations that can help

249

00:30:13.430 --> 00:30:15.619

Participant 10: Create them if needed.

250

00:30:15.730 --> 00:30:33.179

Participant 10: We partner with a company that can provide that for authors if they want to. I don't know that they get a great deal of uptake from our authors, because a lot of what we publish is because of the nature of the research and stuff. A lot of it is sponsored by Pharma companies, or has some kind of.

251

00:30:33.180 --> 00:30:33.610

Karen Gainey: Yep.

252

00:30:33.610 --> 00:30:48.920

Participant 10: Funding behind it like that so often. There will be medical writers involved in the writing as well. So they, you know, capable of creating those themselves without the need of any vendors or whatever. But also, I think now, with sort of.

253

00:30:49.486 --> 00:30:50.620

Karen Gainey: Authors as.

254

00:30:50.620 --> 00:30:51.670

Participant 10: Yes, yeah.

255

00:30:51.900 --> 00:31:08.320

Participant 10: So they work. So medical writers will work. Sometimes they'll be authors themselves, but sometimes they'll just be providing writing assistance to the authors, but they can they can support that without the need, for I mean they are the vendors in that sense, so they don't need other vendors to come in and help those services.

256

00:31:08.550 --> 00:31:23.300

Participant 10: But also, I think now, with AI, you know, availability of AI tools. I think there's more scope for authors, even if they haven't got those kind of services available to them. I think there's more scope to be able to write a reasonably good

257

00:31:23.460 --> 00:31:25.370

Participant 10: summary, and

258

00:31:25.490 --> 00:31:35.909

Participant 10: and so consequently that's why we started mandating it from this from new submissions coming in this year. But it wasn't a particularly difficult step, because so many of them had them, anyway. So it was

259

00:31:35.910 --> 00:31:36.350

Participant 10: right.

260

00:31:36.350 --> 00:31:37.540

Participant 10: And that's how you move.

261

00:31:38.450 --> 00:31:38.990

Karen Gainey: Right? Well.

262

00:31:38.990 --> 00:31:40.920

Participant 10: But yeah, yeah, sorry.

263

00:31:40.920 --> 00:31:53.558

Karen Gainey: Yeah, I want to probe all of that. You've touched on basically all of my questions, which is brilliant. What sort of what? What do you think of the

264

00:31:54.110 --> 00:31:56.490

Karen Gainey: How do I phrase this? The

265

00:31:58.130 --> 00:32:15.910

Karen Gainey: do you need to make do do the the summaries, and I'm using the term plain language summaries quite generically. Do they meet your requirements, or do they need much tweaking at your end before they are acceptable from your perspective?

266

00:32:16.300 --> 00:32:42.449

Participant 10: I generally find again, specifically for this particular journal, the comparative perfectionist Journal. I find that they're usually of a reasonable quality. I mean, sometimes I'll have minor suggestion. I mean some. Some of them are, you know, the very odd one isn't very good, but some mostly speaking. I find them quite okay. I mean, the way we ask in our guidelines from them to be structured is a series of 3 questions. So it's a

267

00:32:42.690 --> 00:32:49.269

Participant 10: what? What's this about? What were the results? What does that mean? Type head is similar to a, I guess an academic

268

00:32:49.600 --> 00:33:12.860

Participant 10: aims, methods, results, type abstract, but with breaking it down into those 3 headings. So sometimes I'll find they'll submit an abstract. That is just a 1 block of one paragraph of text. So I asked them to break that up into the headings, or, you know, think tweaks like that often required. But, generally speaking, they're not too bad. When I worked at (Publisher), and we had them across a much broader spectrum

269

00:33:12.860 --> 00:33:25.479

Participant 10: of journals. I found that we found generally the quality to be quite variable. I mean again. This was a few years ago, so things have progressed, I'm sure, but I think depending on sometimes the

270

00:33:26.480 --> 00:33:55.139

Participant 10: not so much the clinical area as much. But there's sort of the writer, the author base of a particular journal with the Cer Journal I work a lot with, as I say, papers that are sponsored by Pharma companies. They'll go through lots of levels of approval before they come to me. They'll be checked and double checked, and you know they'll work with medical writers all these kind of things, so things tend to be reasonably polished by the time they reach me with some of the other journals. You're working a lot more directly, perhaps, with academic authors.

271

00:33:55.290 --> 00:34:20.199

Participant 10: You're working a lot with people, perhaps, who English isn't their 1st language. All these kind of things and perhaps aren't as familiar with plain again. This is because it's a few years ago weren't as familiar with plain language content. So in that case the quality was sometimes quite variable, and you would need to, perhaps input a little bit more into into that so that comes to then that comes back to the publishing company. So what kind of resource you're prepared to

272

00:34:20.330 --> 00:34:37.459

Participant 10: put into that in terms of polishing of of that kind of content? Beyond your sort of standard copy editing and and whatever else? So yeah, with with the journal that I work on. Yeah, I find them decent, decent quality. And yeah.

273

00:34:37.460 --> 00:34:42.548

Karen Gainey: Okay? And that makes sense the reasons why? Because they've come through those

274

00:34:43.290 --> 00:35:08.820

Karen Gainey: checks and the type of checks they've come through. They're coming at a high standard in the past when they weren't, when they're quite variable, the ones that weren't as good. Do you have a sense of other than maybe the authors were, didn't have English as their 1st language. Do you have a sense of like? Were there any trends in the type of aspects that were

275

00:35:09.930 --> 00:35:10.800

Karen Gainey: making the.

276

00:35:10.800 --> 00:35:13.890

Participant 10: I mean, I think I think sometimes I mean, I think.

277

00:35:14.470 --> 00:35:18.970

Participant 10: and you know I'm guilty of this as well you you get as when you're writing it

278

00:35:19.600 --> 00:35:44.829

Participant 10: as an academic, you're very embedded in that language of how that is conveyed. You know. That's how you've read it. That's how it's been taught to you. That's how you speak about it. With your peers at conferences. It can be quite difficult to get the level right for the language of a plain language summary, I think, particularly again, when they were a bit newer, and people weren't as familiar with. So people would sometimes go either way. They could either go far too

279

00:35:45.010 --> 00:35:46.140

Participant 10: basic.

280

00:35:46.550 --> 00:36:02.270

Participant 10: so that it almost lost. You know the the sense, you know. It became almost too, I don't want to say dumb down, but you know too plain, I guess. Or it was almost indistinguishable from the academic abstract. It was. There was was no difference. It was.

281

00:36:02.270 --> 00:36:02.630

Karen Gainey: Yes.

282

00:36:02.630 --> 00:36:05.080

Participant 10: If they hadn't got the the level of.

283

00:36:05.080 --> 00:36:05.500

Karen Gainey: Yeah, let's.

284

00:36:05.500 --> 00:36:16.000

Participant 10: Of plainness, right, I guess, and I think it's a real skill to work to write well in. In plain language it's not as easy as it 1st

285

00:36:16.080 --> 00:36:44.649

Participant 10: sounds. I think, terminology and yeah terminology of words that you're just very, you know, and I think as well things like abbreviations and all that kind of thing that you just say them constantly, and when you're so so familiar with them, you don't think to that, you'd need to necessarily explain. You know, just it's it's like subliminal, almost. I guess you don't. You know what language you use? So yeah, it's an unconscious bias, I guess. But yeah, yeah, I think that was, that was the issue in.

286

00:36:45.330 --> 00:36:48.639

Karen Gainey: The wording rather than the content as such, but the wording influence.

287

00:36:48.640 --> 00:36:56.469

Participant 10: Yeah, I mean, generally speaking, the authors, you know, they got that. It was an abstract. They're very familiar with writing the the

288

00:36:56.630 --> 00:36:58.979

Participant 10: scientific abstract. That that was

289

00:36:59.300 --> 00:37:11.550

Participant 10: that was fine. It was getting. Yeah. It was getting that language level, right, I think, and I think as well. Sometimes the it to some level, the level of detail within that as well. I mean, I'm thinking, probably more around the

290

00:37:11.820 --> 00:37:18.990

Participant 10: the Pls key. So the standalone articles. Obviously, they're a bit. They're usually like 4 or 5 pages long. So there's more.

291

00:37:18.990 --> 00:37:19.559

Karen Gainey: Goes into.

292

00:37:19.560 --> 00:37:20.370

Participant 10: Those

293

00:37:20.945 --> 00:37:30.980

Participant 10: than an abstract level. But what we find with those and what we, what happens with the Plsps is that they are reviewed by patient reviewers.

294

00:37:31.190 --> 00:37:57.509

Participant 10: and what we found with some of the earlier plsps that we worked on was that when the patients came to review them they would see the original paper that was being summarized, and they would see the plain language summary publication alongside it, and they were actually asking for more detail to be brought in from the original paper, because, you know, things have been stripped out. The authors have taken things out that they thought, you know, that's too complicated, or that's not relevant. But actually, the patient reviewers were really keen to have some of this more.

295

00:37:57.790 --> 00:38:12.580

Participant 10: you know, even quite, you know, technical information. But you know, conveyed in a in a plain language sense. So I think, having that dialogue was really helpful for us as the editors as well. So, okay, this is this is what the patient? Yeah, these are, you know, one or 2 patients

296

00:38:12.700 --> 00:38:34.879

Participant 10: representing everybody in the whole world. You know, you're not gonna obviously hit what everybody finds the most useful. But it was useful for us to sort of get that patient perspective on what level of detail they found what they wanted to know from the original paper, making sure that was pulled through into the into the plain language. So yeah, there can be a little bit of a level of making sure all the detail is in there.

297

00:38:35.090 --> 00:38:39.032

Participant 10: and and then you get into the difficulty as well of sort of

298

00:38:39.770 --> 00:38:53.879

Participant 10: reading age levels. And there's sort of tools you can use to run content through. And if you get a score of so and so, it's a reading age of whatever. But sometimes, when you're working with the plain language content, you know, as soon as you put a word in

299

00:38:53.930 --> 00:39:18.619

Participant 10: the name of a disease, or whatever else it sends the reading levels shooting up. So then the authors would think, Oh, does that mean I need to take that out altogether. It's like well, no, you can't write an abstract about myocardial infarction without using those words, but you know, define it, perhaps have a you know how it's pronounced, you know these kind of things to. But when they're simply using those tools to look at reading age, and the score comes out, as you know this is university level.

300

00:39:18.870 --> 00:39:24.180

Participant 10: Then they said, I've done it wrong, and it was like, well, not necessarily. But you know, you just need to think about

301

00:39:24.590 --> 00:39:39.699

Participant 10: why those words have been. You know, things like that. So it was a difficult balance. I think again, because everyone was sort of feeling their way a little bit at the beginning of getting these things. I mean, I think we still are, but particularly in the early early days. There wasn't that level of

302

00:39:39.890 --> 00:39:42.410

Participant 10: knowledge or experience with it, so.

303

00:39:43.180 --> 00:39:45.390

Karen Gainey: Highly nuanced when I thank you

304

00:39:45.390 --> 00:40:08.099

Karen Gainey: people because they were high users of health information, and often used pls to look up information about their illnesses. They were interested in information from the pls that were actionable. For example, if they had cancer, they were looking for the latest medication that they might be able to use in conjunction with their treating physician

305

00:40:08.570 --> 00:40:23.199

Karen Gainey: or to take take to them to ask questions. And so they wanted they did. They didn't want that background information, but they wanted something that was the kind of what's in it for me or the how does this impact me?

306

00:40:23.650 --> 00:40:41.550

Karen Gainey: part of it, but they wanted that to be quite specific and detailed. But one thing they did comment was that jargon. And it really hit me that if you've been diagnosed with a particular illness, you know what that word means. So it's not jargon to you.

307

00:40:42.230 --> 00:40:42.860

Participant 10: Yeah.

308

00:40:43.310 --> 00:40:44.700

Participant 10: And that's that's absolutely.

309

00:40:44.700 --> 00:40:46.770

Karen Gainey: Exactly what you've been saying.

310

00:40:47.830 --> 00:40:52.280

Participant 10: Yeah, yeah, it. It's tricky. Because, you know, you, you get

311

00:40:52.590 --> 00:41:16.660

Participant 10: different levels of experience as a patient. There's a difference between when you're very 1st getting the news of a diagnosis to somebody that's perhaps had an illness for a period of time, or it's a chronic illness that they've lived with. For, you know, a number of years. There's a lot of different levels within a patient's experience of their own disease. You know you don't. Tomorrow you could be diagnosed with anything. If you're suddenly a patient of something that you've never heard of before. So that very 1st

312

00:41:16.920 --> 00:41:32.282

Participant 10: contacts, you know, it's different. So when you start becoming a bit more of a there's, there's they sort of refer to different patients within sort of publishing as sort of patient experts and people that become more sort of advocates for their

313

00:41:32.640 --> 00:41:33.010

Karen Gainey: Yep.

314

00:41:33.010 --> 00:41:45.790

Participant 10: Disease and become more experienced. And then they read an awful lot of this plain language content, and they become themselves a bit more embedded in the jargon. So they, you know, you sort of almost you sort of lose that sort of initial

315

00:41:45.910 --> 00:41:47.809

Participant 10: naivety, I guess, about.

316

00:41:47.810 --> 00:41:48.200

Karen Gainey: Mr.

317

00:41:48.200 --> 00:41:49.470

Karen Gainey: Terminology and click.

318

00:41:49.470 --> 00:41:49.810

Participant 10: Is it.

319

00:41:49.810 --> 00:41:50.200

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

320

00:41:50.200 --> 00:42:01.719

Participant 10: And it can be difficult to pitch it again. You can't make. We came up when we were working on the very early guide. This, how to guideline for developing pls, however, many years ago that was.

321

00:42:01.880 --> 00:42:25.620

Participant 10: this was a bit of a sticking point really is like, you cannot make it everything for everybody. So trying to sort of reach a middle ground is is difficult, and you know some people will say these certain versions have got it right, and others have got it wrong, and it's you know it depends on the person reading it, if it's right for them. So you have to try and strike a balance. A balance, I guess, of not being patronising, but also explaining where

322

00:42:25.870 --> 00:42:32.479

Participant 10: explanation is. And you know detail is included. Making sure it's properly explained, and.

323

00:42:32.480 --> 00:42:32.930

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

324

00:42:32.930 --> 00:42:38.610

Participant 10: Perhaps explained in different ways to how you would within a traditional academic paper.

325

00:42:40.050 --> 00:42:50.888

Karen Gainey: How? How do you have you had any feedback from people who read the Plsps, or the pls or authors on this process of

326

00:42:51.520 --> 00:42:54.859

Karen Gainey: we're either working with consumers or just putting them together.

327

00:42:55.890 --> 00:43:20.610

Participant 10: Yeah, well, I mean, as I say, we work with the plsps. We work with patient reviewers to provide the peer review of those pieces. So we'll do a review of them sort of in an academic sense, to check that. The information has been translated correctly, like dosages, and all these kind of things have come through accurately. But from the patient reviewers. What we're more interested in getting from that sort of review is

328

00:43:20.630 --> 00:43:28.760

Participant 10: is the the readability, the the clarity of what's come across, and you know we have changed things over time.

329

00:43:28.800 --> 00:43:32.630

Participant 10: I think. You know we've done quite a few published quite a lot of plsps now.

330

00:43:32.750 --> 00:43:43.309

Participant 10: And so we kind of have a not a set format. But we have sort of standard things that we do every time in terms of even things like the colors that we use, and like the contrast of.

331

00:43:43.370 --> 00:43:59.019

Participant 10: to make sure that it's accessible for people to read, and and that kind of thing, and that's a lot of that has come from patient reviewers looking at things, saying, you know things that often in, you know, we come from the editorial the publishing background. We want it to look nice.

332

00:43:59.020 --> 00:44:23.980

Participant 10: so we will structure a page to look nice and to be clear, and to fit neatly within a page, because that's what we want to do within a journal, and that's what we've always tried to do is keep the columns the same height and all this kind of thing. That's what we've been bothered about in editorial, and it's sort of in some ways. It's sort of picking those things out of the window a little bit. And actually, it's like, well, that's not the most accessible way that might be your standard palette of colors that you like to use in your journal, but

333

00:44:24.100 --> 00:44:30.169

Participant 10: that's not the best in this particular. You know. That kind of thing. So feedback like that has been really useful from them.

334

00:44:31.530 --> 00:44:40.269

Karen Gainey: Yeah, and that's coming out of particular conditions, migraine or neurological conditions or sight.

335

00:44:40.660 --> 00:44:49.880

Participant 10: Yeah, yeah, exactly. So, what sort of best practices are in terms of accessibility of of content. Has been quite interesting.

336

00:44:50.580 --> 00:44:57.869

Participant 10: and yeah, I mean again, it does sometimes come down to the preferences of that particular patient reviewer. But I think they do try their best to kind of be.

337

00:44:58.020 --> 00:45:02.569

Participant 10: you know, to think, represent, try and be representative of of

338

00:45:02.780 --> 00:45:06.090

Participant 10: of everyone else. So yeah, that's been quite

339

00:45:06.250 --> 00:45:08.430

Participant 10: eye opening, you know, and interesting to.

340

00:45:08.580 --> 00:45:15.118

Participant 10: And again, just pull you out of what you've been doing for 20 odd years within editorial, you know. It's

341

00:45:15.430 --> 00:45:15.930

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

342

00:45:15.930 --> 00:45:31.539

Participant 10: It's it's interesting. There's certain there's just certain things that are. You know, your style guide and your you know the way you've always done it. You define things on their 1st use, and then you don't define them again for the rest of the manuscript, and that's just how you do it, and these are the rules, and we stick to the rules.

343

00:45:31.540 --> 00:45:32.920

Karen Gainey: That's right. Yeah, yeah.

344

00:45:32.920 --> 00:45:45.870

Participant 10: Yeah. But within the, you know, patient reviewers to say, Well, why can't we have it again, you know, to find something again. It'd be really useful, I think, to to pull this out into a definition, or, you know, whatever else. And these kind of things are.

345

00:45:46.290 --> 00:45:52.310

Participant 10: you know, much more obvious to someone coming at things with fresh eyes. That haven't been

346

00:45:52.760 --> 00:45:56.179

Participant 10: publishing other things for a long time and got stuck in their ways.

347

00:45:56.630 --> 00:46:05.540

Karen Gainey: Yes, and I. And so what I'm sort of try sort of what I'm understanding is because

348

00:46:06.020 --> 00:46:15.369

Karen Gainey: you you have that autonomy to make these decisions with only 2 others to consult with.

349

00:46:16.112 --> 00:46:25.110

Karen Gainey: You've got that opportunity to action them quite quickly. If you want to make decisions, and

350

00:46:25.790 --> 00:46:36.359

Karen Gainey: you don't have the interaction, say, like you do with (journal), of going through the larger, very established publishing house like wireless.

351

00:46:36.360 --> 00:46:37.939

Participant 10: Who has, and I think.

352

00:46:37.940 --> 00:46:39.660

Karen Gainey: Frameworks.

353

00:46:40.280 --> 00:46:45.540

Participant 10: And the difference. The difference as well, is with obviously with the the chorus Journal.

354

00:46:46.320 --> 00:47:07.720

Participant 10: I edit it. I am the editor of it. I, you know, have that control over it. It obviously has an editorial board. But ultimately, if I want to push something, you know, I want to mandate pls. Then I can do that. That's fine. I think. With the (journal) my role is different. I am the editor in chief. So I'm sort of. I'm a freelance person bought into to do that role.

355

00:47:08.098 --> 00:47:25.819

Participant 10: But I don't own the journal. It's not. I'm not publishing. It is the (Publisher's) journal. It's their society journal. So any major changes. So, for example, this the journal, this is just the (journal) journalist has become open access. That was a big decision to make for the organization about whether that's.

356

00:47:26.360 --> 00:47:44.109

Participant 10: you know, a viable model for them that has to go through the outs board of directors to be approved as a big sort of business model change. It also had to be discussed with the journal's editorial board via they had to discuss it with me, you know, and they had to. And then I had to speak with the editorial, my editorial board about that. And so when you're trying to push things through

357

00:47:44.360 --> 00:47:55.729

Participant 10: an academic journal like that that has that editor in chief structure also, then, is owned by one organization, but is published in partnership with a big publisher like (Publisher). There's different layers of, you know.

358

00:47:56.820 --> 00:48:20.529

Participant 10: not difficulty. But you know everyone has to be in the same loop. You have to have these discussions. Everyone has to agree that it's the right thing to do. You know, at a small level. You know, you don't have to get something improved by the the board of directors to update something in the author. Guidelines, for example, for (journal) you know, if you want to, you know, rewrite them, or change bits and, boss, but if you I wanted to

359

00:48:20.590 --> 00:48:37.419

Participant 10: introduce, I don't know if I wanted to introduce a new article type like we did with the PLSP. Back at (Publisher). At the very least, I would need to discuss that with the editorial board, and I'd have to speak with (Publisher) just around the logistics. Would that be if I was introducing something? It was a different format or something like that. I work

360

00:48:37.430 --> 00:48:56.799

Participant 10: once I I accept the papers for them publishing it goes into their production system. So the production editors and everybody work at their wily employees. So if I'm suddenly gonna introduce an article that has a different layout and structure, and it's got loads of infographics in it. And you know, that's quite an undertaking to embed into a production process that is tailored around

361

00:48:56.940 --> 00:49:22.349

Participant 10: text-based, you know, obviously with figures. But you know, text based traditional articles, you know, that's quite that's quite a thing, and I think that's been one of the things that's taken a little bit of time at places like (Publisher) and (Publisher) is to work out. Not that not that they didn't want to do it, but just to work out what the process was to get these types of different types of formats through. And it's the same way that you introduce anything like that. I'm sure Adis had when they 1st started doing podcast articles and all these kind of things. You just have to have the

362

00:49:22.480 --> 00:49:33.769

Participant 10: logistics behind it. And the bigger the organization, the more logistics and levels there are to make sure everybody's on board and has, you know, everything that they need. But also, then you have more resources. So

363

00:49:33.970 --> 00:49:34.650

Participant 10: yeah.

364

00:49:34.650 --> 00:49:43.819

Karen Gainey: That's right, but you want to do it and hit the ground running and have it all set in place. So how did it work with (Publisher) was that

365

00:49:44.020 --> 00:49:50.539

Karen Gainey: was each journal somewhat independent? Or was it just an easier process to do these.

366

00:49:50.540 --> 00:49:53.375

Participant 10: So we it was. All the journals were quite

367

00:49:54.370 --> 00:50:09.520

Participant 10: collective. We didn't. It wasn't the same kind of model as you'd see in in (Publisher) and (Publisher), or whatever, with that very sort of we we had in-house editors that did all the day to day running of those journals, and we were all at 1 point. We're all in the office together, you know. You could. You could talk to

368

00:50:09.580 --> 00:50:31.260

Participant 10: journal X or and then the production editor was sat over there, and it was so. Yeah, back in the old days in the good old days. But I mean again, all the journals had an editorial board, but they didn't have that level of power that you perhaps have with an external academic editor in chief that would need that kind of approval. If we decided at the top level of (Publisher), we want all our journals to offer

369

00:50:31.370 --> 00:50:57.329

Participant 10: plsp as an article type, or we want all the journals to start, including Pls abstracts. Then that was our decision to make. And so again, it was easier to push that through. So yeah, again, that was that was quite. And again, I think that's you know. That's why we were able to do that 1st plsp in in Journal X, because we had that control over, we decided it was. You know, we didn't just do it on a whim, but we know we decided that we wanted to do it, and then we could work.

370

00:50:57.500 --> 00:50:58.350

Participant 10: And

371

00:50:58.580 --> 00:51:13.620

Participant 10: I think one of the biggest difficulties again with that. Once we decided we wanted to do external to any kind of process around copyright permissions. And all these kind of things was the production process of it, because over the years a lot of the production side of journal editing

372

00:51:13.880 --> 00:51:23.063

Participant 10: has been outsourced and streamlined, and all these kind of things. So you have. We have production editors in house. But a lot of the technical stuff was done by

373

00:51:23.723 --> 00:51:50.840

Participant 10: outsourced vendors based in India, or wherever else that do a lot of the processing of the files and stuff. So doing, a Plsp was almost like going back to olden times, where everything was in house, because it was so text and graphic heavy, and it quite a lot of jiggery, pokery to get everything to fit right on the screen on the page. And all this kind of thing. It became a lot more of a manual, a lot of production have become very automated almost of, you know, this is the text. These are the figures. It all flows through

374

00:51:51.170 --> 00:51:56.159

Participant 10: work with the plsp. It went a little bit back to olden times, where having someone in house.

375

00:51:56.450 --> 00:51:59.519

Participant 10: you know, production editing it in in the.

376

00:51:59.520 --> 00:51:59.990

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

377

00:51:59.990 --> 00:52:01.606

Participant 10: School kind of way.

378

00:52:02.010 --> 00:52:04.829

Karen Gainey: Luckily, we've had people. Yeah.

379

00:52:04.830 --> 00:52:33.900

Participant 10: Exactly. Yeah. Yeah. Luckily, we had people at (Publisher) that had experience of we'd always been a bit more hands on. Anyway, you know, we'd sort of gradually outsource things over time. But there were still people that had that level of experience that they could. They could work in that way again refresh their memories of how to do it. And again, I'm assuming within the bigger companies that's been a bit of an undertaking to get that process streamlined effectively to work with that kind of different

380

00:52:33.990 --> 00:52:35.969

Participant 10: type of format.

381

00:52:35.970 --> 00:52:37.170

Karen Gainey: That makes sense.

382

00:52:37.370 --> 00:52:38.729

Karen Gainey: Yeah. So it really comes.

383

00:52:38.730 --> 00:52:39.240

Participant 10: Pleasure.

384

00:52:39.240 --> 00:52:42.899

Karen Gainey: Down to how that that publishing structure.

385

00:52:43.150 --> 00:52:49.169

Karen Gainey: and how those not so much the relationships, but the decision structure.

386

00:52:49.820 --> 00:52:50.599

Participant 10: Yeah, the hierarchy.

387

00:52:50.600 --> 00:52:55.460

Participant 10: Yeah. I guess the hierarchy fits into everything else. Yeah, yeah, you can't

388

00:52:55.460 --> 00:53:03.889

Participant 10: one decision in editorial, and then expect the production to just pick it up. You have to have that conversation of how that's actually going to work and what we're and you

389

00:53:04.380 --> 00:53:23.960

Participant 10: take things back again from productions like this isn't going to be possible. We're gonna need to do it this way. And then, you know, balancing out those, what the sort of the non negotiables are, I suppose, and and what what can be accommodated? Because you do still need to have an efficient production workflow? It can't just be. Every single article is a bespoke beautiful project.

390

00:53:23.960 --> 00:53:24.429

Karen Gainey: That's right.

391

00:53:24.976 --> 00:53:28.799

Participant 10: Sort of level of scale. Yeah, so.

392

00:53:28.800 --> 00:53:29.130

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

393

00:53:29.130 --> 00:53:29.680

Participant 10: Yes.

394

00:53:30.240 --> 00:53:34.569

Karen Gainey: Well, speaking of that, I want to get back to something you mentioned before, which is AI

395

00:53:35.510 --> 00:53:36.020

Participant 10: Hmm.

396

00:53:36.020 --> 00:53:40.574

Karen Gainey: Do you think you've had any? Any authors? Submit?

397

00:53:41.490 --> 00:53:47.959

Karen Gainey: Pls that have used AI, or do you have any thought? What are your thoughts.

398

00:53:47.960 --> 00:53:49.179

Participant 10: Interesting. So

399

00:53:50.020 --> 00:54:02.879

Participant 10: so one of the things that's probably one of the most recent introductions to our author guidelines is our sort of policies around the use of AI, and that's a that's a very moving target at the moment. So, we're kind of

400

00:54:03.510 --> 00:54:13.369

Participant 10: we, we tend to follow wherever possible within our guidelines. We follow external recommendations. So the Icmj guidelines and cope

401

00:54:13.420 --> 00:54:38.900

Participant 10: organization things like that, if we could just incorporate somebody else's suggestions, and so much the better, and that does make it more consistent hopefully across other publishers. But yeah, so our AI policies is kind of based around that. And it's mostly at the moment based around. Just a need to disclose use to us. And we're not saying that authors can't or anything like that. I'm tentatively, quite pro AI myself. I like it. I quite like using it myself for useful tasks.

402

00:54:39.237 --> 00:54:45.700

Participant 10: So. But we do ask the authors disclose it to us, and as yet I've not had a great deal of

403

00:54:46.350 --> 00:54:59.686

Participant 10: a great number of people disclosing to me. I have had people disclose use, which obviously, then, you can include in the paper in the disclosure section or the methodology, or wherever it's appropriate to put it, or both. Sometimes.

404

00:55:01.030 --> 00:55:09.830

Participant 10: so far I've had, you know, a handful of people disclose use in terms of language, polishing that kind of thing.

405

00:55:10.490 --> 00:55:23.130

Participant 10: That's not to say that people haven't but I'm not sure to be, and the difficulty with AI usage is, we're asking for it to be disclosed. But it's not always

406

00:55:23.380 --> 00:55:26.389

Participant 10: if they don't. If authors don't disclose it. It's

407

00:55:26.560 --> 00:55:37.235

Participant 10: at the moment we don't, have we? We, personally within? Because I'm not sure really anywhere else, has the tools to detect its use unless it's the very obvious. Sure. Here's the answer

408

00:55:37.550 --> 00:55:37.990

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

409

00:55:37.990 --> 00:55:40.500

Participant 10: Upsetting things that have been published within zoom.

410

00:55:40.500 --> 00:55:40.830

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

411

00:55:40.830 --> 00:55:41.440

Participant 10: Panels.

412

00:55:42.130 --> 00:55:49.700

Participant 10: Obviously, that's a that's a bit of a red flag within those circles. But you know, if it, if it's been embedded and been used carefully then.

413

00:55:49.770 --> 00:56:14.576

Participant 10: and you know I think some some authors as well are a bit like I didn't even realize that was a suitable thing to disclose, you know, just because I you know, I input it as a question into something. Sales suggest an outline for this or you know that, do I need to disclose that, it seems, and at the moment when we're asked those questions by authors, we're veering on the side of all. Just tell us. Whatever you've done, just tell us, and we can take a view. But I'm sure it's being used

414

00:56:15.030 --> 00:56:17.271

Participant 10: without our without our knowledge.

415

00:56:17.970 --> 00:56:35.827

Participant 10: across the board in all the publishing, and that's 1 of the challenges I guess, of. Then there are there are tools that you can find that allegedly sort of can detect use, I think, to some extent they do a little bit, but it's not. It's not like the tools we use tools, for example, for plagiarism, checking

416

00:56:36.130 --> 00:56:36.640

Karen Gainey: Yes.

417

00:56:36.640 --> 00:56:48.489

Participant 10: That kind of thing. They're not at that level yet where they're embedded in our systems. And so so, yeah, so I think they probably are, but some and some people are disclosing their use to me. But not very many. So far.

418

00:56:48.890 --> 00:56:53.010

Participant 10: I think it's a very useful use of AI. Personally, I think it's a good, a good.

419

00:56:53.010 --> 00:56:53.400

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

420

00:56:53.400 --> 00:56:58.190

Participant 10: Example of how AI could be really helpful in publishing to.

421

00:56:58.190 --> 00:56:59.149

Karen Gainey: So she's speaking. There.

422

00:56:59.150 --> 00:56:59.670

Participant 10: Be similar.

423

00:56:59.670 --> 00:57:05.209

Karen Gainey: You were saying before about authors struggling to make that leap to writing.

424

00:57:05.210 --> 00:57:06.040

Participant 10: Yeah.

425

00:57:06.080 --> 00:57:09.539

Karen Gainey: At that. I want to push on, because I know we've only got a few minutes.

426

00:57:09.540 --> 00:57:14.094

Participant 10: Yeah, I mean, if I'm a few minutes, it's only an internal meeting the next one. So if I'm in a few minutes, that's no problem.

427

00:57:14.270 --> 00:57:39.209

Karen Gainey: Okay, all right, I just want to ask you about really, just 2 more things I got one of, I've actually forgot. Oh, yeah, that's really important. Who do you have a sense, of either or both the journals either for the the pls. What sort of people read them? Do you have any any sense, or is that a bit tricky? I know I'm asking.

428

00:57:39.210 --> 00:57:50.859

Participant 10: Again. It's a it's a tricky one to to find. I mean, I know there's been I've just been at the Ismap Conference in January, and there's always posters around sort of usage.

429

00:57:50.860 --> 00:57:52.499

Karen Gainey: So many great posters.

430

00:57:52.500 --> 00:58:09.350

Participant 10: Yeah, that's probably one of my favorite bits of the whole conference is the posters, and there was an interesting poster about pls being used by Hcps, healthcare providers in their conversations with patients, and so either reading them themselves beforehand to sort of

431

00:58:09.630 --> 00:58:23.980

Participant 10: terminology wise, I guess, but also sort of sharing them with patients in office, and I think they were. They were starting to be used to some extent in that regard which it seems to be an extremely useful because, you know, as we were saying, when you're 1st diagnosed.

432

00:58:24.160 --> 00:58:36.629

Participant 10: you're not an expert patient, or whatever you want to call them, and you're also not necessarily a publishing expert to know these things even exist to you know you can't, can't look for something if you don't know. It exists in the 1st place. But if Hcps are sharing that in that

433

00:58:36.810 --> 00:58:55.839

Participant 10: initial conversation, or, you know, an early conversation with somebody when they receive a diagnosis, or, you know, sharing family members all that kind of thing that seems to be a really useful use of it to me. And so that's an interesting poster, and from our own experience it's really hard to know. You get some level of sort of

434

00:58:56.260 --> 00:59:06.838

Participant 10: analytics, I guess, of of who's looking at papers. You know, geographically, you can find out a little bit, and also we use the Alt metric.

435

00:59:07.360 --> 00:59:10.209

Participant 10: tool a little bit which gives you an indication of

436

00:59:10.847 --> 00:59:27.360

Participant 10: if people are sort of retweeting or share socially sharing on social, and it's a member of the public, or it will say whatever about how accurate that is, I don't really know. One of the things from our particular journal, because it's a health economics journal. It's a bit of

437

00:59:27.670 --> 00:59:37.250

Participant 10: it's sort of further down the line and the sort of the clinical research it's it's it's, you know, often it's treatments that are already approved, that it's looking at more comparisons of

438

00:59:37.450 --> 01:00:03.700

Participant 10: which treatment or drug, or whatever is better, in whatever circumstance, but also a lot of our readership, is more kind of the health policy makers. And so people within like Nice, for example, in the UK, or whoever else, geographically. So we think. And again, we haven't asked them. We just think this. We think that that is a useful feature for those kind of people that again aren't

439

01:00:03.990 --> 01:00:20.910

Participant 10: expert in every single disease area they don't need to be. They don't want to be, but they want that sort of high level summary of this drug was more cost effective than another drug for this population. In these circumstances. You know, that kind of level of information at the health policymaker level can be really

440

01:00:20.980 --> 01:00:34.450

Participant 10: useful. I think so. It's not, you know. Patience is a massively important audience for pls, but it's not the only they're not the only non-expert that that's. And for our particular journal. That is a that's a big audience sort of

441

01:00:34.530 --> 01:00:37.469

Participant 10: kunk for us is is the policymakers so?

442

01:00:37.700 --> 01:00:38.280

Participant 10: And.

443

01:00:38.280 --> 01:00:49.410

Karen Gainey: Yeah, that's that's important. Do you think they any idea if they share those on social media or use them to promote their profile, say the authors of those articles.

444

01:00:50.260 --> 01:00:54.620

Participant 10: I think, a little bit. I mean again, because we work mostly with pharmaceutical.

445

01:00:55.060 --> 01:01:01.030

Participant 10: sponsored research. A lot of those authors are from within pharma companies. They have all sorts of rules around social share.

446

01:01:01.030 --> 01:01:01.370

Karen Gainey: There we go!

447

01:01:01.370 --> 01:01:06.740

Participant 10: That, because so what we do is we share from the journal. So that would, if you know, we would make a

448

01:01:07.060 --> 01:01:12.895

Participant 10: a point of. I mean, we share all of our articles on on social media, mostly  
Linkedin and

449

01:01:13.470 --> 01:01:13.850

Karen Gainey: Hmm.

450

01:01:13.850 --> 01:01:16.130

Participant 10: Well, we're moving away from X

451

01:01:16.510 --> 01:01:16.950

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

452

01:01:16.950 --> 01:01:24.335

Participant 10: And we started. We started experimenting with blue sky. Now. But yeah,  
Linkedin is probably our biggest audience. So we get quite a lot of

453

01:01:25.211 --> 01:01:29.079

Participant 10: you know. Reposts, I guess. I think. Oh, there's a much

454

01:01:29.600 --> 01:01:32.370

Participant 10: keener to repost than they are to.

455

01:01:32.820 --> 01:01:40.449

Participant 10: you know you get, you know, obviously social, and I think this is improving over time as well. People getting more keen to share their work. Social on social media.

456

01:01:40.881 --> 01:01:50.128

Participant 10: It's growing and growing, but it's helpful if we post in the 1st instance, and then they can reshare to their audiences, and and so on. But when we publish the plsp. We do.

457

01:01:50.770 --> 01:02:12.550

Participant 10: also try where relevant to contact any relevant patient advocacy organization. So if they want to share content, then they can. They know they know it's there to to share sort of thing. So yeah, I think with pls, is, it's letting people the right people know it's there. Because we can publish them to. We're blue in the face, but if patients don't know, they exist to look for in the 1st place, and that's

458

01:02:13.250 --> 01:02:19.488

Participant 10: That's quite difficult. And actually, there's some work sort of a cross publisher work going on now to try and

459

01:02:20.340 --> 01:02:41.210

Participant 10: develop something, some sort of pls, finder, tool or sort of repository, or something like that, that would make it easier for those patients, because, you know, they're published. Cross publisher. You don't want to go to each individual. I have a particular type of cancer. I can look across 30 different cancer journals and see if they've got pls that's not very user friendly from a patient.

460

01:02:41.400 --> 01:02:42.879

Participant 10: Quite a few things say.

461

01:02:43.160 --> 01:02:47.360

Karen Gainey: So it's across. A few different publishers need to involve.

462

01:02:47.360 --> 01:02:49.069

Participant 10: We're we're involved.

463

01:02:49.810 --> 01:02:51.590

Karen Gainey: A (Publisher) are involved.

464

01:02:52.020 --> 01:02:53.530

Participant 10: (organisation).

465

01:02:54.680 --> 01:02:56.980

Karen Gainey: Yeah, I know. (name).

466

01:02:57.530 --> 01:02:59.827

Participant 10: Yes. Oh, yes. Yeah. Right. (name).

467

01:03:00.210 --> 01:03:01.699

Karen Gainey: Yeah, that'll be that project.

468

01:03:01.700 --> 01:03:11.019

Participant 10: She's a massive advocate for all these things. Yeah, she's really, really good. The (organisation) people in general as an organization are.

469

01:03:11.020 --> 01:03:11.380

Karen Gainey: Yes.

470

01:03:11.380 --> 01:03:14.329

Participant 10: Are very, very good to work with.

471

01:03:14.330 --> 01:03:15.010

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

472

01:03:15.280 --> 01:03:22.320

Karen Gainey: I must. I'll email her and ask her about it. Yeah, yeah. Oh, that that'd be amazing. I think that's a.

473

01:03:22.320 --> 01:03:29.809

Participant 10: I think it's going to be quite a long, winded thing, but it's certainly something that people are quite keen on anything cross publisher is always challenging.

474

01:03:30.500 --> 01:03:30.970

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

475

01:03:30.970 --> 01:03:50.880

Participant 10: It's not so much the the individual people that are involved in it, because we're all very enthusiastic about it. But it's the what's the logistics of it. What's the funding model for it, you know, who's taking responsibility for this? You know, it's I imagine it's the same sort of academia, you know, if you're going to do things cross, it's like, Well, who's responsible for this? And who's driving it? And and all this kind of thing.

476

01:03:50.880 --> 01:03:55.289

Karen Gainey: But everyone I've spoken to are very enthusiastic about playing.

477

01:03:55.290 --> 01:04:07.479

Participant 10: Yeah, I think that's what's driven it through. A lot of you know, you just need one or 2 people within an organization sometimes to to champion whatever it happens to be. I think you know that's what happened at. Say, I mean, obviously it makes

478

01:04:07.670 --> 01:04:18.590

Participant 10: business sense as well for a publisher, you know, if your competitors are doing a thing and you're not doing a thing. You want to look at that, you know, as a just a competitor advantage thing. But I think.

479

01:04:18.590 --> 01:04:19.200

Karen Gainey: Yes.

480

01:04:19.200 --> 01:04:31.719

Participant 10: Within this particular, within the particular plain language, there's a lot of genuine personal enthusiasm for it with the people that that work on it as well, which has really helped, I think, to to drive it through

481

01:04:32.250 --> 01:04:33.020

Participant 10: field.

482

01:04:33.020 --> 01:04:34.349

Karen Gainey: Think I'm that's it. Thank you.

483

01:04:34.350 --> 01:04:36.560

Karen Gainey: At a good time. It's a really.

484

01:04:36.560 --> 01:04:44.719

Participant 10: Oh, absolutely. It's like, yeah, it's a very evolving. And you know, an interesting still, I think early days. I'm sure there'll be lots of more.

485

01:04:44.720 --> 01:04:46.400

Karen Gainey: Yeah, yeah.

486

01:04:46.400 --> 01:04:48.170

Participant 10: Yeah, absolutely. Absolutely.

487

01:04:48.170 --> 01:04:59.330

Karen Gainey: Yeah, yeah, I'm not doing a postdoc in this area. I mean, I'm not going into academia at all, but certainly be enough to continue on for 20 years in this space.

488

01:04:59.330 --> 01:05:01.590

Participant 10: Yeah, absolutely. Yeah, yeah.

489

01:05:02.280 --> 01:05:09.769

Karen Gainey: Just finally, I guess. Where do you see? Or where would you like to see the future of plain language, summaries, or.

490

01:05:09.770 --> 01:05:10.300

Participant 10: Oh!

491

01:05:10.300 --> 01:05:12.230

Karen Gainey: Plsps? Or where do you.

492

01:05:12.230 --> 01:05:15.019

Participant 10: Yeah, any and all. Yeah, I mean, I think

493

01:05:15.680 --> 01:05:35.544

Participant 10: there's lots of different ways to think about what pls is. So at the moment, I think we're mostly focusing on the the text. And then this is the more infographic type side of things. But I think there's a lot of potential in all sorts of different formats, whether that's audio or video, or, you know, more interactivity. Perhaps I know

494

01:05:36.000 --> 01:05:37.440

Participant 10: very recently

495

01:05:37.820 --> 01:05:59.270

Participant 10: what was a (Publisher) Journal and is now (Publisher), I can't remember which journal it might have been. (journal), has published an interactive Plsp, where there's elements of you know. You click on a graph, and it zooms in and out, and it you can select different bits, and it jumps out the bit that you're interested in, and all that kind of thing, you know, more sort of interactivity that makes it more

496

01:05:59.790 --> 01:06:13.949

Participant 10: digestible. I guess I can dig out which one it was and send it to you. I think it was (journal). Yeah, I'll send it to you afterwards. But that was really interesting to see. So I think there's going to be a lot more development just in the format and the

497

01:06:14.520 --> 01:06:21.450

Participant 10: digestibility and the accessibility of how these things are done. And I think there's a lot still to be done in terms of our

498

01:06:21.750 --> 01:06:27.403

Participant 10: our processes on the journal side of making things as easy as possible for authors.

499

01:06:28.160 --> 01:06:32.109

Participant 10: to include these types of features within their work without it being a great

500

01:06:32.200 --> 01:06:58.269

Participant 10: palava, you know, it's quite an undertaking still, perhaps not so much with the text based pls abstracts. But you know the idea that I'm now going to do an animation that wouldn't know where to begin, you know, unless you're and then you outsource to a vendor, and then that becomes, you know, a cost associated with that. And you have to, you know, thinking about that within your budgets. And what have you? But yeah, thinking about how we can make that an easier process for authors, I'm sure AI as well will have a big.

501

01:06:58.270 --> 01:06:58.700

Karen Gainey: Hmm.

502

01:06:58.700 --> 01:07:22.350

Participant 10: Part to play in all of this. I'm sure we're going to start to see within the publishers systems more AI tools start to be embedded, you know, automatically. Generate me a Pls abstract based on this manuscript. Please press a button, and it it comes into the submission systems. I'm sure there's, you know, that's not probably very far away at all from something that's going to start to be part of the publishers. Process

503

01:07:22.470 --> 01:07:25.929

Participant 10: whether that will sort of drop down into the

504

01:07:26.947 --> 01:07:32.980

Participant 10: the smaller publishers, because again, these sorts of things usually come at cost. Well, they always come at cost.

505

01:07:33.382 --> 01:07:42.849

Participant 10: So it'll be probably the larger publishers that will be able to drive these things forward a little bit sooner. Perhaps. So I guess it's also thinking about making sure that it's something that's accessible to

506

01:07:43.330 --> 01:07:49.458

Participant 10: authors wherever they are choosing to publish. It's not gonna you don't end up with sort of an elite level of

507

01:07:50.240 --> 01:07:53.570

Participant 10: plain language opportunities depending on

508

01:07:54.050 --> 01:07:59.046

Participant 10: where you're choosing to to publish. Because, you know, there's there's a lot of small society journals

509

01:07:59.470 --> 01:08:03.319

Participant 10: that are very, very valuable to their readership, and you don't want people to be

510

01:08:03.430 --> 01:08:18.099

Participant 10: left behind in that sense. But yeah, no, I think you know to end on a positive, I think. Yeah, there's gonna be lots of opportunities, I think, to make it easier to include these kind of features. And as we've already talked about the discoverability of them. As well. Try and make them a bit more.

511

01:08:18.109 --> 01:08:18.539

Karen Gainey: Yes.

512

01:08:18.540 --> 01:08:24.350

Participant 10: Easy for the people that want to read them, to, to know they exist in the 1st place, and to be able to

513

01:08:24.479 --> 01:08:31.140

Participant 10: easily find them without having to trawl through lots of spaces. So websites to.

514

01:08:31.140 --> 01:08:31.720

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

515

01:08:31.720 --> 01:08:32.720

Participant 10: Join on this stuff.

516

01:08:32.720 --> 01:08:40.180

Karen Gainey: Tlsp were were searchable. Oh, sorry! That were a separate citable

517

01:08:41.500 --> 01:08:48.749

Participant 10: Yeah, that was one of the big sort of selling points of it really was. It was, yeah, they have that separate. So doi number that any journalist.

518

01:08:48.750 --> 01:08:49.709

Karen Gainey: Yeah, why?

519

01:08:49.930 --> 01:09:02.220

Participant 10: Yeah. So that means that you know, medline will cite indexing services. But you know indexing services will will cover them the same as any other article, and you can cite them. They are. Then they go.

520

01:09:02.220 --> 01:09:03.010

Karen Gainey: Nice to do.

521

01:09:03.180 --> 01:09:13.020

Participant 10: Contribute to impact factor. If you're bothered about such things as impact factors, you know, the citations get counted, and I do just think they are just more findable that way. If you can search for it on medline. That's a much

522

01:09:13.189 --> 01:09:19.929

Participant 10: quicker step than going into individual publisher or journal websites. So, and then we'll the science of what.

523

01:09:20.330 --> 01:09:21.580

Karen Gainey: On Google as well.

524

01:09:21.580 --> 01:09:26.700

Participant 10: Yeah, Google, you know, Google or scholar, or just Google in general, yeah, yeah, absolutely.

525

01:09:26.700 --> 01:09:27.170

Karen Gainey: It looks like.

526

01:09:27.170 --> 01:09:36.490

Participant 10: We always try to even just easy things, like making sure that things have plain language summary in the title of that those plsp's can massively increase the chances that someone's actually

527

01:09:36.819 --> 01:09:40.420

Participant 10: find it on on medline or wherever else. So just little

528

01:09:40.420 --> 01:09:43.600

Participant 10: things like that can make a big difference. Yeah, thank you.

529

01:09:43.609 --> 01:09:45.039

Karen Gainey: So much.

530

01:09:45.600 --> 01:09:46.100

Participant 10: That's all right.

531

01:09:46.109 --> 01:09:47.659

Karen Gainey: All day, but that's so.

532

01:09:47.660 --> 01:09:49.600

Participant 10: I feel like, rambled.

533

01:09:49.609 --> 01:10:01.319

Karen Gainey: No, you have not. I'm just madly taking a few specific notes on things I want to get back to when I see the Transcript. I hope I haven't made you too late. But.

534

01:10:01.320 --> 01:10:01.700

Participant 10: So.

535

01:10:01.700 --> 01:10:06.989

Karen Gainey: That's absolutely everything was gold. Trust me, that was just so useful.

536

01:10:07.430 --> 01:10:08.010

Participant 10: Good, good.

537

01:10:08.010 --> 01:10:08.370

Karen Gainey: I.

538

01:10:08.370 --> 01:10:14.459

Participant 10: Well, as I say, I will send you a link to that. That interactive pns, because it was quite cool, quite liked it. So.

539

01:10:14.460 --> 01:10:15.189

Karen Gainey: Would love that.

540

01:10:15.520 --> 01:10:16.979

Karen Gainey: Yeah, I would love that.

541

01:10:16.980 --> 01:10:19.750

Participant 10: If there's anything else I've mentioned that it'd be helpful for me to

542

01:10:20.270 --> 01:10:25.960

Participant 10: to share, let me know or if there's anyone I can help put you in touch with. If you want to speak to other.

543

01:10:25.960 --> 01:10:29.340

Karen Gainey: If there's anyone think of, I would love that. Yeah.