

00:03:40.448 --> 00:04:06.060

Karen Gainey: so that's great. That's great. Just just before we start I would just as a reminder I'm recording the audio for this and transcribing it through. Zoom and I'll I'll remind you at the end. But if you'd like to get a a copy of the Transcript at the end, just to check anything for context or to make sure you're happy.

20

00:04:06.355 --> 00:04:12.860

Karen Gainey: With the interview. You're very welcome, but that being said, don't feel obliged to do that at all. It's just an option.

21

00:04:12.860 --> 00:04:15.178

Participant 13: I probably I probably won't do it.

22

00:04:15.510 --> 00:04:17.509

Karen Gainey: It's it's it'll be extra work. Yeah.

23

00:04:17.510 --> 00:04:18.070

Participant 13: Option.

24

00:04:18.079 --> 00:04:21.459

Karen Gainey: You've got more a lot on your plate. But yeah.

25

00:04:21.459 --> 00:04:26.489

Participant 13: I mean, unless I say something. Oh, my! I probably shouldn't have said that. Then I may change my mind later.

26

00:04:26.490 --> 00:04:49.198

Karen Gainey: You tell me what, if if that happens and I'll make a note of the timestamp, and I'll just remove that. Okay, it will be fine. I have to apologize if I seem a little bit low. Energy. I'm not good with mornings, because I have chronic pain and fatigue. And so I

27

00:04:50.710 --> 00:05:05.630

Karen Gainey: it. I just just please don't take it as any reflection on yourself, the interview or anything. It's just purely I'm tired, and not my best at the moment. So.

28

00:05:05.630 --> 00:05:14.659

Participant 13: As as an interviewer. You're just asking some questions, so I'll be doing most of the talking, I'm sure, so that'll probably help a lot.

29

00:05:14.660 --> 00:05:17.600

Karen Gainey: Good. That's the plan. Very good.

30

00:05:17.600 --> 00:05:20.109

Participant 13: So what time is it? Is it 8 or 7.

31

00:05:20.530 --> 00:05:23.289

Karen Gainey: 10 in the morning.

32

00:05:23.640 --> 00:05:24.390

Karen Gainey: In the morning.

33

00:05:24.390 --> 00:05:25.100

Participant 13: Okay.

34

00:05:25.410 --> 00:05:30.520

Karen Gainey: Yeah, that's early for me. That's yeah. Yeah.

35

00:05:30.880 --> 00:05:33.809

Karen Gainey: Yeah. What time is it there for you?

36

00:05:34.020 --> 00:05:35.220

Participant 13: 5 Pm.

37

00:05:35.850 --> 00:05:36.940

Karen Gainey: Pm.

38

00:05:36.940 --> 00:05:43.769

Participant 13: See, you know I'm I know there are people that are late morning, late evening people. I'm sure you must be one of those. I'm just the.

39

00:05:43.770 --> 00:05:44.220

Karen Gainey: Very much.

40

00:05:44.220 --> 00:05:48.559

Participant 13: Early morning, and come about 4 o'clock in my afternoon.

41

00:05:49.270 --> 00:05:55.723

Karen Gainey: Oh, we we should have flipped it. I'll catch you in 12 h.

42

00:05:56.160 --> 00:05:59.429

Participant 13: I was. I was considering that, except

43

00:05:59.870 --> 00:06:06.070

Participant 13: it would have all the, you know, other obligations that I have, and stuff like that. It was just within the short window we had about the.

44

00:06:06.070 --> 00:06:06.410

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

45

00:06:06.410 --> 00:06:14.179

Participant 13: Week or so. There wasn't too much wiggle room I had, so I thought my Sunday, my Sunday afternoon.

46

00:06:14.680 --> 00:06:22.790

Karen Gainey: Of course it's Sunday. Oh, well, thank you, that's very precious time. I'm very grateful, even more so.

47

00:06:23.190 --> 00:06:23.680

Participant 13: No, you're.

48

00:06:23.680 --> 00:06:46.789

Karen Gainey: So, yeah, that's very nice, very nice. I very much appreciate it. And your journal, I'm very interested because it's there's a few things that are unique about your journal that are, you know, unique to (Publisher).

49

00:06:47.100 --> 00:06:49.926

Karen Gainey: But we'll get in. Get into that

50

00:06:50.500 --> 00:07:04.823

Karen Gainey: But I guess maybe just to set the scene. If you like, I'll just give you a very quick snapshot of why I'm doing this, how I got here, and then love to hear hear about your role?

51

00:07:05.260 --> 00:07:33.159

Karen Gainey: as an editor, and how that all works. This is my final project in my Phd. (Name)'s 1 of my supervisors, and I started with a scoping review on the author guidelines for writing plain language summaries, and then follow that up with kind of a compliance study, checking a comparison of the

52

00:07:33.280 --> 00:07:46.109

Karen Gainey: author, guidelines and actual plain language summaries to see how much they corresponded. Your journal wasn't 1 of them included in that compliance check.

53

00:07:46.230 --> 00:07:50.199

Karen Gainey: but the results were quite interesting.

54

00:07:50.280 --> 00:08:16.239

Karen Gainey: The level of compliance really varied. But more recently, I've got a study under review where I interviewed much like this, a group of people who have chronic medical conditions, so high users of health information, who read plain language summaries to find out from their perspective what's important, what they like why they use them, etcetera.

55

00:08:16.240 --> 00:08:41.180

Karen Gainey: So I've taken the results of all of that. And I'm talking to journal editors to try and find out what are some of the perspectives. You have any barriers or facilitators, and just understand that relationship between the Journal publisher.

56

00:08:41.850 --> 00:08:59.619

Karen Gainey: how it all works. So I can kind of come full circle. We know what's out there. We know what readers want, but what's the reality at the publishing end, and what's possible. So do you have any questions? Or does that make make sense.

57

00:08:59.790 --> 00:09:07.259

Participant 13: Yeah, yeah, it makes sense. I mean, I don't have. I mean, so far. There's I'm not confused about anything. I mean, I have a

58

00:09:07.260 --> 00:09:10.010

Participant 13: good what what you're trying to do, and you know it makes sense.

59

00:09:10.010 --> 00:09:10.450

Karen Gainey: Right.

60

00:09:10.450 --> 00:09:11.000

Participant 13: And also.

61

00:09:11.000 --> 00:09:11.409

Karen Gainey: All right.

62

00:09:11.410 --> 00:09:13.588

Participant 13: Forward to hearing what the questions are.

63

00:09:13.900 --> 00:09:20.430

Karen Gainey: Perfect. Thank you so much. All right. Well, could I? Just yeah.

64

00:09:20.830 --> 00:09:37.360

Karen Gainey: Could we start? Maybe if you wouldn't mind just giving me an idea of your role with (journal) and the relationship with (Publisher) as a starting point, and we can go from there.

65

00:09:37.990 --> 00:09:52.199

Participant 13: Sure. So I'm a co-editor in chief. And so give a little bit of history. The I. I was an associate editor for a while, and then I went to.

66

00:09:52.370 --> 00:09:53.380

Participant 13: I guess.

67

00:09:54.060 --> 00:10:07.390

Participant 13: kind of senior associate editor for a year or so, and then we had a single editor-in-chief for the longest time, (name), and

68

00:10:07.610 --> 00:10:12.064

Participant 13: but when he talked about me, maybe taking over as

69

00:10:13.260 --> 00:10:18.709

Participant 13: as the as the editor in chief, I told him that that role is really

70

00:10:19.610 --> 00:10:27.010

Participant 13: it's huge. And so I would prefer that that right now we work together as co-editor in chief.

71

00:10:27.170 --> 00:10:30.539

Participant 13: And so we did that together, he and I co-editor-in-chief.

72

00:10:30.760 --> 00:10:38.510

Participant 13: And then I like that model a lot because it helps divide the division of labor. And so we have. So then.

73

00:10:38.920 --> 00:10:42.839

Participant 13: (name), suggested (name), as a

74

00:10:43.270 --> 00:11:07.020

Participant 13: as a person that might be the other co-editor in chief, and she agreed to be that way, and so I would assume, for here, on, out, we're likely to always have 2 co-editor in chiefs. Who knows? Maybe in the future we may even have 3 as many articles as we get. But right now we have 2 co-editors in chief. And so this is my 2223, 24, 4th year in that role.

75

00:11:08.150 --> 00:11:14.480

Participant 13: And the I mean the our relationship with (Publisher). They are the publisher.

76

00:11:15.435 --> 00:11:21.133

Participant 13: We get a stipend, and it varies by level of of of

77

00:11:21.980 --> 00:11:42.220

Participant 13: You know, seniority in terms of what your responsibilities are. So (name), in my stipend is is at the highest level. It's it's not a lot, but it's it's at the highest level followed then by a couple of deputy editors who do paper vetting and stuff like that, so

78

00:11:42.380 --> 00:11:45.770

Participant 13: I can tell you more about my job later. But yeah.

79

00:11:45.770 --> 00:12:02.570

Participant 13: relationship with Elsifer. So we have this couple, this about 2 mid-level people who do some vetting of papers about whether or not they're the review. And then we have the people doing really the bulk of the grunt work or the associate editors, and they are the ones who are actually soliciting reviewers

80

00:12:02.740 --> 00:12:18.349

Participant 13: for manuscript, and so they get paid a very modest stipend as well. So it gets less and less as you move on down. That doesn't mean that the (name) and I don't solicit reviewers. We do. We usually, you know, our associate editors do one a week.

81

00:12:18.570 --> 00:12:42.070

Participant 13: (name) and I sometimes have to do anywhere between like 2 to 4 a week, because of just the sheer number of submissions that that we're getting, which is another thing we could talk about, maybe at a later time. So anyway, that's our relationship with with else we get a stipend with them. And our structure is really 3 tiers of (name), our deputy editors, and then our associate editors.

82

00:12:42.690 --> 00:12:45.840

Karen Gainey: Yep. Okay. I am.

83

00:12:46.790 --> 00:12:55.310

Karen Gainey: Oops sorry. My PIN. Yeah, no, thank you. I I guess.

84

00:12:57.290 --> 00:13:03.080

Karen Gainey: Sorry. I just wanna make sure. I?

85

00:13:05.900 --> 00:13:06.720

Karen Gainey: Yep

86

00:13:08.430 --> 00:13:37.870

Karen Gainey: sorry. My brain's not working. My brain's a little bit slow. Bear with me. So I noticed I had a look last night at the author instructions for your journal. And noticed that. So yeah, so one thing I want to get my head around is, I noticed you've got highlights, which is quite common with the (Publisher)journals.

87

00:13:38.660 --> 00:13:48.020

Karen Gainey: From your perspective. Do you think of those as a plain language, summary, or something different.

88

00:13:49.020 --> 00:14:07.649

Participant 13: I think those are designed to be plain language summaries. Because why would you have highlights? You would have highlights, so that people that were glancing at your article at the article would get an idea of like what's the so what of things? And and most of the time, I mean, I guess you could say, What's the so what of

89

00:14:08.090 --> 00:14:17.009

Participant 13: you know? You could identify what you, as an author think are the so Watson things, and that could be very technical, very scientific. But our journal is very.

90

00:14:17.140 --> 00:14:42.340

Participant 13: I mean, you know, we're academic journal, but we're also have catered to both academics and people who are doing research as well as clinicians. So we're not a clinical journal like Jama, or you know, or you know, Lancet, or something like that. But we are a journal where a lot of our people

91

00:14:42.770 --> 00:14:45.210

Participant 13: who are readers

92

00:14:46.532 --> 00:14:56.569

Participant 13: publishers, I mean publishing articles, authors, and all of that. They're people who are clinicians. So they're like, you know, clinical investigators.

93

00:14:56.770 --> 00:15:02.170

Participant 13: And so they they get. They are balancing, doing research.

94

00:15:02.560 --> 00:15:21.207

Participant 13: And they've got the as practitioners. The what this means the so what of things? So Pac has always been kind of focused. You know, on that. It's like, it's it's applied research. We certainly doesn't mean that we're not conceptually driven, or theoretically grounded, or or or whatever

95

00:15:21.780 --> 00:15:31.820

Participant 13: not. All of our papers have a conceptual angle to it, and that we wish more of them would. But nevertheless, we, you know, they they basically are doing research focused on

96

00:15:31.950 --> 00:15:37.099

Participant 13: things related to (topic).

97

00:15:37.240 --> 00:15:47.050

Participant 13: And so it's most of is focused on the. So what of why this matters to people? So the highlights are designed to be.

98

00:15:47.831 --> 00:15:51.808

Participant 13: common language kinds of things for the most part.

99

00:15:52.300 --> 00:16:07.929

Participant 13: honestly, we don't pay too much attention to them unless they're just outrageous. And and they're not really a subject of review. Except for a few people, you know, some people on their highlights will say 3 or 4 sentences for one. They're supposed to be bulleted points, that's all.

100

00:16:07.930 --> 00:16:28.860

Participant 13: And so the so. But we don't really necessarily monitor that that much. But most people know that that's what they're what they're what they're supposed to do. And so it is as close as we get to. Probably plain language summaries. It's not explicitly designed to be that way.

101

00:16:28.960 --> 00:16:39.920

Participant 13: But if you say. Tell me what the highlights of this study are for the readers, for people who are going to be looking at it, to kind of figure out what it's like, and it but it necessarily then becomes more

102

00:16:40.020 --> 00:16:45.139

Participant 13: plain language things, because even though we may have researchers

103

00:16:46.058 --> 00:16:50.849

Participant 13: who are looking at it, we, that we're so interdisciplinary that you cannot.

104

00:16:50.850 --> 00:16:51.250

Karen Gainey: Hmm.

105

00:16:51.250 --> 00:17:03.000

Participant 13: Be so insular within your discipline and have a highlight. It's got to be something relevant to, you know, (topic), and so so.

106

00:17:03.200 --> 00:17:11.979

Participant 13: whether in part by design, but certainly part by default. Yes, long answer to those are. That's as close as we have probably to our plain language. Summaries.

107

00:17:12.770 --> 00:17:37.331

Karen Gainey: Yeah, yeah, no, that that makes total sense. Because I was trying to get an understanding of who they're aimed at. And I I can appreciate, because your journal, as you say, it's very interdisciplinary. I imagine the audience for the highlights would depend on the type of article or the topic for the article

108

00:17:37.930 --> 00:17:59.920

Karen Gainey: and so I noticed in the instructions that wasn't specified, who it should be written for. But I did get the sense that it was obviously different to the abstract. Yeah. So just wanted to try and get an understanding of the purpose. From your perspective that those highlights played.

109

00:18:00.550 --> 00:18:01.780

Karen Gainey: and

110

00:18:02.810 --> 00:18:27.049

Karen Gainey: if and I, in my scoping review, saw that very much across all (Publisher) or most (Publisher) journals, very, very consistent format. So, as you say, I'm sure authors are very familiar if they've submitted to (Publisher) the highlights, or having read articles very standardized.

111

00:18:27.370 --> 00:18:34.429

Participant 13: And I don't know if (name) was. I don't know, because she's on your committee. If she was also one of the people you interviewed, but she and I both.

112

00:18:34.430 --> 00:18:34.980

Karen Gainey: No.

113

00:18:35.000 --> 00:18:39.070

Participant 13: As well as a lot of us, are really kind of frustrated with (Publisher).

114

00:18:39.220 --> 00:18:43.199

Participant 13: because they've increasingly become more of a 1. Size fits all.

115

00:18:43.420 --> 00:18:59.400

Participant 13: And so some of the special kinds of things we did for our journal, for example, section on practice implications which we have done forever and ever and ever. And that's the practice implications is the so what for a clinician? Let's say, if you're not a researcher, you know, we just said, you know

116

00:18:59.810 --> 00:19:12.409

Participant 13: the practice. So here's the findings. And here's what it matters for clinical practice. Or, you know, educating people, you know. Here's here's what how you use it and doing your work in the field

117

00:19:13.220 --> 00:19:35.539

Participant 13: really like that a lot. And we still ask that people do it. But we can't require it anymore. Because now they're just becoming so singular in their format in terms of what every, what everything is, and so, and they've done it in other, not only for the practice implications, but from the researcher side of things for other kinds of things as well.

118

00:19:35.540 --> 00:19:49.299

Participant 13: And and so (name) and I both are kind of frustrated as well as some of our associate editors with regard to the homogenization of what (Publisher) is doing with their journals. Just so. They have consistency in the way they look

119

00:19:49.660 --> 00:19:58.430

Participant 13: without being very supportive of the the the

120

00:19:58.740 --> 00:20:03.620

Participant 13: tailoring it, how we tailor it to our situations in terms of what our aims and scope are

121

00:20:03.920 --> 00:20:07.309

Participant 13: now. They give us some latitude to do that.

122

00:20:07.580 --> 00:20:11.810

Participant 13: but it's within the instructions to the authors which.

123

00:20:11.810 --> 00:20:12.400

Karen Gainey: Hmm.

124

00:20:12.670 --> 00:20:31.889

Participant 13: Are just almost like suggestions. That's, I think sometimes that's the way it works out their suggestions. But the requirements are now only these kinds of things. You have to have this, this and this. So, so we have to do more of the monitoring of of whether or not those things are present that we would like to see present

125

00:20:32.894 --> 00:20:48.750

Participant 13: as opposed to the editorial staff. Who, you know, might I mean the production staff, who might say, you know, this doesn't fit because you're missing this or that, but what they're they would say is missing this or that meaning. It's sent back to the author, after they have submitted it

126

00:20:49.410 --> 00:21:05.270

Participant 13: to correct a few things from the production point of view or from the the editorial manager point of view. But those are not our things, those are things for the. And so the things we would like to see, on the other hand, are things that we just have to incorporate in the review process.

127

00:21:07.040 --> 00:21:32.170

Karen Gainey: Gotcha. Yeah, that's that's 1 of the things I'm really trying to understand is that relationship between the journals and the publisher and the level of autonomy you have, and and where and how those decisions are made, and and the barriers to being able to implement any changes, or

128

00:21:32.830 --> 00:21:39.940

Karen Gainey: formats or programs isn't the right word but initiatives that you'd like.

129

00:21:39.940 --> 00:21:55.059

Participant 13: Yeah. So so that we we don't have a lot of control over the structure, the formats, the sections of the manuscript, the all of that we can just. We can just make comments. Please do this within certain sections.

130

00:21:55.340 --> 00:22:02.039

Participant 13: So in your conclusion, mention something about practice implications. But if if if

131

00:22:02.530 --> 00:22:23.039

Participant 13: but it just says, the structure of the article needs to be, you know, background or introduction methods, you know, results, discussion and conclusions. So we can we in the instructions, but they've got to read in there to see that. So I would say half the papers we get right now do not have a practice implications, whereas used to be 85% of them did.

132

00:22:23.280 --> 00:22:40.339

Participant 13: And now we're saying that about the production process now, the editorial process, they have no control over, and whatever we want to do is fine. So if we want to say, hire this person as an associate editor, that we have a budget, they are in.

133

00:22:40.690 --> 00:22:53.860

Participant 13: Us for complaints about. Well, our budget's really tight, you know. They do all that kind of stuff. But you know. So we get to decide who gets what roles we decide what papers are published. You know we we decide now.

134

00:22:55.070 --> 00:22:56.930

Participant 13: Our journal, I think

135

00:22:57.040 --> 00:23:02.659

Participant 13: you know, has its act together as do probably most so they may have to for some journals that

136

00:23:02.920 --> 00:23:28.720

Participant 13: do not, or have some problems. They may have to be more involved on the production on the, on, the on the Elsa for side. But for us they just said they trust us, you know, because, because you know, so far the product is good. So they they they trust us. And you know, I said, add this person to the editorial board, you know. Blah, you know this and that, and fine, whatever whatever you like, whatever. So we have a great deal control over content.

137

00:23:29.010 --> 00:23:29.480

Karen Gainey: Boom.

138

00:23:29.480 --> 00:23:41.520

Participant 13: But we do not have much control over how things are structured in the manuscript. That's where they're one size fits all, and we don't have a lot of control over what budget we get.

139

00:23:41.520 --> 00:24:07.250

Participant 13: except for the fact to just plead that we really need a little more help and a little more, you know, if you want to publish more papers, that's the only thing they sometimes say is, we'd like for you to publish more papers. But we're not pushing you. We're not pushing you. We'd like for you to publish more papers, but you know you can only do so much with your editorial staff. And so if they want more papers published, that means more papers reviewed, then we need to get more support.

140

00:24:07.250 --> 00:24:29.540

Participant 13: And so they've nicked and dimed it here, there over the last couple of years, but it still can't compete with the influx of papers that we're getting now. I know you're interested in the plain summary elements of it, and not so much in the challenges we face. And you know, with this whole onslaught of articles and stuff that are coming our way.

141

00:24:29.856 --> 00:24:40.603

Participant 13: So I don't want to get us off track on that. I mean, that's that's that's a thing. And it's a it's it's a problem. But you're interested in the plain language summaries. So

142

00:24:40.920 --> 00:24:47.049

Participant 13: we highlights are still required, but the practice implications are not

143

00:24:47.300 --> 00:24:57.749

Participant 13: as one of the required elements, but we can include it kind of as a suggestion of this also include in here this and this and this under the category of discussion, inclusions.

144

00:24:57.750 --> 00:25:01.169

Karen Gainey: Yeah, no, I appreciate that. And

145

00:25:03.020 --> 00:25:11.980

Karen Gainey: I understand. Everything's, you know, connected. So please don't feel you've got to kind of limit this discussion to just

146

00:25:12.492 --> 00:25:22.277

Karen Gainey: the plain language summaries or the highlights. If you feel that you know other elements are relevant because I understand it's nothing happens in a vacuum.

147

00:25:22.640 --> 00:25:23.130

Participant 13: Okay.

148

00:25:23.130 --> 00:25:36.150

Karen Gainey: And also, if you've had experience in an editorial capacity with other journals, feel free to draw on that as well. I meant to say that at the beginning, that that's

149

00:25:36.670 --> 00:25:38.609

Karen Gainey: totally totally fine.

150

00:25:38.710 --> 00:25:46.609

Karen Gainey: Also, I should say, if you need a break or want to stop, or anything, just let me know, or if something comes up.

00:26:33.160 --> 00:26:47.117

Karen Gainey: So I guess, if I please excuse me if I use the word plain language summary. I'm using it quite generically, understanding that that for you your version is called highlights.
But

160

00:26:47.690 --> 00:26:52.370

Karen Gainey: so that's just quite a generic generic term.

161

00:26:53.940 --> 00:27:04.180

Karen Gainey: Also, it's it's kind of the one I'm used to saying, with my brain not working great. I probably default to that.

162

00:27:04.180 --> 00:27:10.580

Participant 13: What you're talking about, though, and why you're looking at the stuff there that you wanted to look at and ask at. I will say this.

163

00:27:10.580 --> 00:27:11.240

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

164

00:27:11.240 --> 00:27:19.140

Participant 13: Because you're interested in plain language. Summary. There's the issue of plain language period, and and we sometimes make

165

00:27:19.320 --> 00:27:21.970

Participant 13: decisions on manuscripts.

166

00:27:22.080 --> 00:27:36.839

Participant 13: That might be, you know, might be pretty good, but they are so technical and so narrowly focused that they don't appreciate the interdisciplinary readership of our audience, or not sensitive to it. And basically, it's like this is, this doesn't have enough

167

00:27:37.500 --> 00:27:45.769

Participant 13: general appeal to reach out to people who would be whatever they are. Health service researchers, nurses, you know.

168

00:27:45.890 --> 00:28:14.260

Participant 13: physicians, you know, cancer specialists, I mean, a lot of them aren't going to be interested in something that's not in their area. But when you write to something you cannot be like if you're doing large language models, which is now a thing people do nowadays with, you know, data, mining tweets and stuff like that. You know, you can get very technical about these kinds of things, and you can have very complex graphs and things like that. And we tell them, no, no, that does us no good.

169

00:28:14.410 --> 00:28:23.380

Participant 13: you know. That's that's hard to process for people that are not familiar with this. So make your arguments in ways that people can get and understand.

170

00:28:23.670 --> 00:28:27.069

Participant 13: And for audience, it's going to be fairly.

171

00:28:27.210 --> 00:28:31.399

Participant 13: They're they're researchers. They are published.

172

00:28:31.520 --> 00:28:32.990

Participant 13: They know their stuff.

173

00:28:33.350 --> 00:28:47.709

Participant 13: But as they're looking at things in which they try to make connections and different papers, if they find something of interest, you got to be able to talk in a language that most people, regardless of their academic backgrounds, their disciplines and whatnot.

174

00:28:48.010 --> 00:28:52.639

Participant 13: we'll be able to understand what it is that you're doing. So it's not like a layperson.

175

00:28:53.040 --> 00:29:02.010

Participant 13: but it is like somebody who, you know, I'm a social scientist, or this other person is, you know, I'm a you know, oncologist, you know.

176

00:29:02.460 --> 00:29:03.380

Participant 13: Got a

177

00:29:03.540 --> 00:29:10.789

Participant 13: you got to say stuff that we're both interested in. Say, this element of communication that relates to this aspect of cancer care.

178

00:29:11.000 --> 00:29:26.150

Participant 13: You got to write it in a way that the Social Science Person sees where you're going with it, as does the oncologist who's looking at it in terms of the connection between, say, the communication and the outcome, you know, and that kind of stuff. So in a way.

179

00:29:26.790 --> 00:29:32.300

Participant 13: by design or by just the very nature of our journal.

180

00:29:32.780 --> 00:29:53.120

Participant 13: We have to be oriented to a bit more plain languageness. So, for example, if you go to Jama, bmj, you know lancet, or something like that. They may have a highly technical aspect, you know, of treatment you know of, you know, doing. And they use all of you know they got this protein and that, and they've got all the you know, all that stuff going on which I'm going.

181

00:29:53.320 --> 00:30:15.380

Participant 13: you know. Do a plain language. Summary of that, I mean well, may not even understand that, you know, but they're very technical for that audience, and that's the kinds of stuff published. We don't. We don't get that way. We're really basic stuff education (topic) so basic things that people need to be able to understand what it is that you're talking about.

187

00:30:43.390 --> 00:30:51.920

Karen Gainey: because there is a difference between, say, the lay public general public and a non and just a non-expert.

188

00:30:52.570 --> 00:31:03.530

Karen Gainey: And I think, what if I'm understanding what you're really talking about is someone who's just a non-expert in a particular area, but still has

189

00:31:04.070 --> 00:31:16.330

Karen Gainey: a clinical, or I liked your term clinical investigator. I hadn't heard that before, researcher or clinical investigator, but they're just not particularly expert in that

190

00:31:16.470 --> 00:31:22.719

Karen Gainey: specific discipline or field. So that makes a lot of sense.

191

00:31:24.270 --> 00:31:29.880

Participant 13: Yeah. Our our clinical investigators usually are going to be people that were trained as internists.

192

00:31:30.080 --> 00:31:35.870

Participant 13: Oncologists, you know, geriatricians, you know, obstetrics, whatever.

193

00:31:36.230 --> 00:31:41.230

Participant 13: But their interest is in health services. That is the delivery of care

194

00:31:41.560 --> 00:31:46.010

Participant 13: and the education of people. So when they

195

00:31:46.660 --> 00:31:51.809

Participant 13: write an article, they know a lot about their stuff, but they may not know a lot about communication

196

00:31:51.920 --> 00:31:59.820

Participant 13: or patient education practices, or whatever. So you've got to write about that in a way that they understand

197

00:32:00.520 --> 00:32:03.339

Participant 13: in terms of how that's relevant and important.

198

00:32:03.340 --> 00:32:03.710

Karen Gainey: Yep.

199

00:32:03.710 --> 00:32:16.259

Participant 13: As opposed to dismissive like. Yeah, everybody knows how to do that. No, no, you got to talk them through. Show the importance of how that plays out. There's a science behind that that they've got to understand, you know, most fundamentally.

200

00:32:16.520 --> 00:32:18.719

Participant 13: just like when they have to write

201

00:32:19.320 --> 00:32:22.659

Participant 13: and they incorporate. You know, normally, our

202

00:32:22.980 --> 00:32:32.679

Participant 13: rarely do. We have single authored papers. So most of the time we've got a team of investigators, and they all represent different kinds of expertise. So in that particular case.

203

00:32:32.800 --> 00:32:38.869

Participant 13: they've got to talk about their stuff, the very clinical side, in a way that's accessible to what

204

00:32:39.030 --> 00:32:43.730

Participant 13: you know. What a general audience, a social scientist might understand.

205

00:32:43.960 --> 00:32:52.780

Participant 13: So if you're talking about genetic mutation or something like that, you know, they got to explain it in a way that a geneticist would think, Duh, I know that.

206

00:32:52.930 --> 00:33:09.029

Participant 13: No, yeah, I mean, yes, you do. But my audience does not necessarily. And so you've got to kind of explain that, so they can kind of get what the upshot of it is from the clinical angle of which they're trying to look at it in terms of the delivery of care, angle.

207

00:33:10.030 --> 00:33:26.699

Karen Gainey: Yeah, right? So it's putting that clinical information in the healthcare or communication context and being able to marry the 2 together to show how this has an impact, or why this is important.

208

00:33:27.760 --> 00:33:28.350

Participant 13: Right

209

00:33:29.480 --> 00:33:45.319

Karen Gainey: In unison. Yeah. And I've heard from a couple of other people the concept of having, or a move for their journal towards having the abstract be somewhat

210

00:33:47.030 --> 00:33:55.290

Karen Gainey: or not not formally considered, a plain language summary, but one in the abstract itself, to be

211

00:33:55.400 --> 00:33:59.170

Karen Gainey: plain language enough that it's accessible

212

00:34:01.060 --> 00:34:12.889

Karen Gainey: to virtually anyone who might read the journal. What are your thoughts on that kind of idea? And is that what you're kind of getting at.

213

00:34:13.409 --> 00:34:32.089

Participant 13: If we were a very specialty discipline, and not so interdisciplinary. So my guess is, some of the people that may have said that may come from a very, from a specialization, that is, you know, very technical, and and all of that. When I say very technical, I'll explain that you know.

214

00:34:32.090 --> 00:34:34.250

Karen Gainey: No, you're right. You're a hundred percent right?

215

00:34:34.500 --> 00:34:40.300

Participant 13: And and so so we're we're not that way. By the very nature of what we do.

216

00:34:40.440 --> 00:34:43.439

Participant 13: we? It's almost by default.

217

00:34:43.739 --> 00:34:50.900

Participant 13: It's going to have to be accessible, because if the reviewers look and our view reviewers come up from all over the place, you know they might be a

218

00:34:51.159 --> 00:34:51.969

Participant 13: you know.

219

00:34:53.699 --> 00:35:21.319

Participant 13: you know, anthropologist, they might be a, you know, oncologist they might be, you know, they could be any any discipline, social science, clinical science, I mean, they could be. They're from all over the place, and they're going to be reviewing something. And you got to make sure, because that they're interested in that topic, but from different angles. And so if they're going to be doing something like that, they've got to be, you know, it's got to be accessible. So for us.

220

00:35:21.360 --> 00:35:23.919

Participant 13: That is not an issue our abstract

221

00:35:24.270 --> 00:35:33.090

Participant 13: to be about as plain language as you can get, I mean, and I don't think we would necessarily want to make them any more plain, languagey.

222

00:35:33.996 --> 00:35:36.420

Karen Gainey: Yes. Reviewers may Critique.

223

00:35:36.680 --> 00:35:47.320

Participant 13: And suggest revisions or even reject because of it's too technical, or it's too narrow for our case. It's usually just so narrow. It's just not relevant. So

224

00:35:48.000 --> 00:35:52.829

Participant 13: but for us, that's not really, that's really not gonna gonna be a thing.

225

00:35:52.950 --> 00:36:02.820

Participant 13: So just a comment about, you know, the the writing things in plain language, in a very technical field. You know, we understand things by the words

226

00:36:03.210 --> 00:36:06.270

Participant 13: that we learned and the words we learn

227

00:36:06.440 --> 00:36:11.350

Participant 13: have meaning in the context in which we learn the words right? And so

228

00:36:11.560 --> 00:36:17.709

Participant 13: it's hard for me to explain some scientific processes very complicated, because I know it.

229

00:36:17.900 --> 00:36:22.060

Participant 13: I've got the terminology for it, and it has certain

230

00:36:22.280 --> 00:36:42.050

Participant 13: it means a certain thing for me as an expert in that, but it's not necessarily translatable into an everyday thing that I can do with ease. It's like, you know, it's like, How do you explain this? Well, the words that I use to understand it.

231

00:36:42.220 --> 00:36:47.270

Participant 13: Their common words are not ones that I'm very familiar with.

232

00:36:48.570 --> 00:36:49.629

Participant 13: Just a matter of

233

00:36:50.050 --> 00:36:59.190

Participant 13: well, find a way. You know that kind of thing, because people in publishing and journals in real technical fields, their whole world is in that technical field. In the language of it.

234

00:36:59.190 --> 00:36:59.690

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

235

00:36:59.690 --> 00:37:13.700

Participant 13: And so and so that's what makes it hard. So I can see a technical journal, maybe trying to do that more if they're trying to increase readership or the scope of their appeal other than the being more insular within the what the people in that

236

00:37:14.170 --> 00:37:19.550

Participant 13: field of study are interested in highly specialized information and knowledge.

237

00:37:20.830 --> 00:37:23.997

Karen Gainey: No, that's really insightful.

239

00:37:29.490 --> 00:37:32.867

Karen Gainey: And you. This is obviously something you've

240

00:37:33.500 --> 00:37:39.689

Karen Gainey: You've got your head around because it sounds like, really, that's not not

241

00:37:40.070 --> 00:37:45.989

Karen Gainey: relevant for your journal, because the aim is for your whole, the whole paper to be quite accessible.

242

00:37:46.270 --> 00:37:46.860

Participant 13: Yeah.

243

00:37:47.040 --> 00:37:54.679

Participant 13: it can't be success accessible to everybody. We understand that if nothing else. Because I'm just not interested in that topic.

244

00:37:54.920 --> 00:37:58.710

Participant 13: Yeah. But if I am interested in it, it needs to be accessible

245

00:37:58.870 --> 00:38:01.450

Participant 13: from people, from a variety of disciplines.

246

00:38:02.200 --> 00:38:02.910

Karen Gainey: Yes.

247

00:38:03.430 --> 00:38:11.889

Karen Gainey: yes. Now that makes a great deal of sense, and that that kind of puts the role of the highlights in a different context.

248

00:38:13.680 --> 00:38:14.690

Participant 13: Yeah.

249

00:38:15.160 --> 00:38:26.299

Karen Gainey: So rather than which which makes sense. Why, they're not really a plain language, summary as such, because that's

250

00:38:26.550 --> 00:38:33.599

Karen Gainey: not really needed, perhaps for your journal, but rather a

251

00:38:34.450 --> 00:38:46.458

Karen Gainey: exactly what they are. Probably that that term is really very appropriate. Literally a highlight. Here's what is important.

252

00:38:48.540 --> 00:38:49.330

Karen Gainey: So I guess.

253

00:38:49.330 --> 00:38:59.979

Participant 13: That's that's a good summary. Because when I do a highlight per journal, I want to talk about the clinical relevance. If there's some methodological angle on it. Like, say, let's

254

00:39:00.330 --> 00:39:18.259

Participant 13: researchers need to be more explicit about embracing the assumptions that they're making about their their modes of measurement. So so but that may also be coupled with a statement saying that,

255

00:39:19.030 --> 00:39:26.160

Participant 13: the communication can have an effect on the cancer care outcome through its effect on.

256

00:39:26.260 --> 00:39:54.429

Participant 13: you know patient agency or something like that. So you might have that as a highlight followed by researchers need to be explicit in their assumptions that they're embracing when they make choices about how they're going to measure a behavior or communication. So I mean, those may all be the things. And when I put those in there. I'm trying to say, Okay, I'm really putting those in there trying to highlight different things of what this research is to connect to potential

257

00:39:54.730 --> 00:40:00.779

Participant 13: people. I mean potential audiences who might look at them. To say, Is this something I want to look at.

258

00:40:01.760 --> 00:40:21.429

Karen Gainey: Yeah. Yeah. And that's actually one of the things. When I was talking to people who read plain language summaries, one of the reasons they had say all have had chronic medical conditions. They're reading these summaries. One of the main reasons was to see if

259

00:40:21.670 --> 00:40:44.480

Karen Gainey: there was, if they were useful for them to help with their own medical condition and to see they were looking for. So that's why I'm interested in the type of information in the highlights, and how purposeful that is from the journal's end

260

00:40:44.770 --> 00:40:53.220

Karen Gainey: is that people were looking to find information that's actionable, practical, and could help them make treatment decisions.

261

00:40:53.660 --> 00:41:23.659

Karen Gainey: For example, if they had cancer, or, you know, particular type of cancer looking for a new treatment or a new approach that they might then be able to discuss with their doctor, and even take that summary a printout to their doctor and discuss it, to open up that line of inquiry, because these were people who were keen on having an evidence-based approach to their health care.

262

00:41:25.170 --> 00:41:35.169

Karen Gainey: So they saw the plain, liquid summary, as a way of saying, Well, is, is this paper relevant to my needs?

263

00:41:35.370 --> 00:41:46.939

Karen Gainey: The oh, what's in it for me. Is this targeted to me? And should I read on further or can I just discard this? So it was kind of a vetting process.

264

00:41:47.150 --> 00:41:47.830

Participant 13: Nothing.

265

00:41:48.967 --> 00:42:04.809

Karen Gainey: So it sounds like, that's exactly from your perspective what the highlights are doing, trying to reach out to different people say, here, there's something for you here. There's something for you here. This is why you should read the the article.

266

00:42:04.970 --> 00:42:08.673

Participant 13: Yeah, I I think in in in that particular case.

267

00:42:09.200 --> 00:42:27.357

Participant 13: so the people who are and sorry about how my lighting is going crazy here. It's because it's getting close to the sun's getting down, and so I've got going through trees and stuff. So I'll be going. I'll be. It's like, I'm morphing in and out of darkness and lightness. So so don't worry about me. It's not me. I'm okay.

268

00:42:28.163 --> 00:42:29.190

Participant 13: I lied

269

00:42:32.200 --> 00:42:38.000

Participant 13: But see when people will not come to us to try to figure out a diagnosis.

270

00:42:38.450 --> 00:42:40.319

Participant 13: That's not what our journal does.

271

00:42:40.510 --> 00:42:46.720

Participant 13: People will not come to us to find out what's the best treatment for Hodgkin's lymphoma.

272

00:42:46.880 --> 00:42:54.189

Participant 13: you know, or something? They will not come to us. On what alternatives and complementary medicine are, you know?

273

00:42:54.420 --> 00:43:00.570

Participant 13: That's not what we do, we? We are about the process of care, and so

274

00:43:02.020 --> 00:43:14.669

Participant 13: People will come to us, both clinicians and patients. Sometimes with regard to I mean they come to us with regard to something strikes them about problems of communicating with their doctors.

275

00:43:15.400 --> 00:43:22.000

Participant 13: you know. Then somebody might be real curious about you know how to better communicate with your doctor. They may run across hard stuff.

276

00:43:22.140 --> 00:43:24.840

Participant 13: you know. You know. How's the best way to

277

00:43:25.430 --> 00:43:42.689

Participant 13: educate people about. You know about something, you know. If they have whole, you know they they don't know much. They have low health literacy. So most of the time, I mean, people will come to us for that. But most of the time when you've got it go. Okay. I now found out that I've got this diagnosis.

278

00:43:42.910 --> 00:43:48.860

Participant 13: or I've got these symptoms. What is my diagnosis? So let me start doing it. And then, or

279

00:43:48.990 --> 00:43:56.050

Participant 13: I've got this diagnosis. Now, what's my options for treatment? So you have a lot of people doing that doing that kind of stuff, you know.

280

00:43:56.050 --> 00:43:56.620

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

281

00:43:57.000 --> 00:44:02.709

Participant 13: Let me. You know my my wife had an atypical lipoma that ended up being yes.

282

00:44:02.910 --> 00:44:16.919

Participant 13: kind of sarcoma, but not really, you know everything worked out, but it was like what the hell! This is very rare, googling up all the things, all the things trying to find out very technical kinds of summaries that were that were coming out. And it's like.

283

00:44:16.920 --> 00:44:17.480

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

284

00:44:17.480 --> 00:44:29.640

Participant 13: You know, so that we were doing that and could could use the plain language summary. But yeah, so so it'd be interesting. I mean, I could see a place for a journal or a service

285

00:44:29.940 --> 00:44:33.900

Participant 13: that they have vetted plain language summaries available to people

286

00:44:34.010 --> 00:44:52.190

Participant 13: that people could then Google up to that place on those topics to get the plain language summary. That would then be a link to perhaps the article, or something like that. And you know nowadays with Chat Gpt, you're getting people to do plain language summaries, probably all the time increasingly

287

00:44:52.450 --> 00:44:55.399

Participant 13: using chat, and so.

288

00:44:55.400 --> 00:44:57.840

Karen Gainey: Think of that. Sorry. Now. Go on.

289

00:44:58.000 --> 00:45:06.949

Participant 13: But I mean, I mean, it's I mean, so I'm a i'm a luddite when it comes to new technologies. So I'm on the back end of any adoption process.

290

00:45:08.828 --> 00:45:17.689

Participant 13: you know, Nancy is on the front end of a lot of this stuff, and so I get to learn a lot with regard to stuff, and

291

00:45:17.820 --> 00:45:30.200

Participant 13: I mean she's embraced it for a lot of things, knowing full well what its limitations are, but not for this, not not for the the the serious stuff, like figuring out.

292

00:45:30.340 --> 00:45:40.619

Participant 13: you know. If you have this thyroid thing, it's abnormal, and then you try to go go figure out what it is, and you go find out. You go to the doctor, and they go well, most people have abnormal, but we just want to check it and make sure. Because you have

293

00:45:40.730 --> 00:45:44.639

Participant 13: this history of this one thing, we just wanna make sure. Just wanna make sure.

294

00:45:44.640 --> 00:45:45.170

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

295

00:45:45.170 --> 00:45:45.530

Participant 13: Okay.

296

00:45:45.530 --> 00:45:45.900

Karen Gainey: Yes.

297

00:45:45.900 --> 00:45:46.480

Participant 13: So

298

00:45:47.010 --> 00:46:01.150

Participant 13: chat gpt, I don't think serves that purpose, but it serves a lot of purposes, chatgpt one time, and soon may be serving that purpose as it's evolving. But a lot of people are using it, if they just

299

00:46:01.510 --> 00:46:06.030

Participant 13: use it as a resource and not as the thing, you know.

300

00:46:06.030 --> 00:46:06.400

Participant 13: Yes.

301

00:46:06.400 --> 00:46:21.200

Participant 13: you know, but but that's a separate thing. But but you know I've done even things for articles in my classes. I would say, what's a plain language. I didn't use the word plain language summary, but just like what's a what's a summary to use in class

302

00:46:21.550 --> 00:46:23.880

Participant 13: for what this article is about.

303

00:46:24.040 --> 00:46:39.379

Participant 13: So do that, and then so you could give it. It comes out immediately. There it is, and you go. Oh, no! Oh, yeah, yeah, no. So you have to adjust it a little bit. So I I fully expect that we're gonna have some of

304

00:46:40.210 --> 00:46:52.179

Participant 13: there. There's going to be that's gonna be going to start taking shape a bit, if not already. With regard to what the plain language summaries are about sources for plain language, summaries.

305

00:46:52.760 --> 00:47:00.070

Karen Gaine: Yeah, what? What do you think of that? Good, bad, indifferent depends how it's used.

306

00:47:00.480 --> 00:47:02.780

Participant 13: Yeah, I mean it. Yeah, I think.

307

00:47:04.960 --> 00:47:10.690

Participant 13: I know in the way that I used it with my class, I said, Look, here's your assignment for writing about this topic.

308

00:47:11.160 --> 00:47:15.929

Participant 13: and and I give real structured sequence of what they're supposed to do. So they can't just say.

309

00:47:16.540 --> 00:47:24.310

Participant 13: you know, vomit up something that's about this about this topic they have. So I've structured it so that Chat Gpt can't do it.

310

00:47:24.540 --> 00:47:40.859

Participant 13: But what Chat Gpt can do is, they say, write an article where you talk about on this topic, where you do this, and then connect it to this and connect it to this, and then connect it to this. So I gave him an example of that, and it was it really confused it a lot because there was

311

00:47:41.320 --> 00:47:46.050

Participant 13: references that were inaccurate or fake. I mean, they weren't fake in a way that

312

00:47:46.670 --> 00:47:57.520

Participant 13: they're like fake news, I mean, fake news is like, you know, but whatever but they were fake in a way that they got the authors right. But the article titled wrong in the wrong journal.

313

00:47:57.560 --> 00:48:18.210

Participant 13: you know. And so so they got, and the date is wrong. It's not that, but it's this, but that's what this article did. But you did. You said it was this article, so I said, look at

all the stuff here that is wrong. And so I said, it's a great way to kind of get the lay of the land of something, and, you know, get initial

314

00:48:18.510 --> 00:48:27.670

Participant 13: points on it, thoughts on it, you know, summaries of things on it and things. But then I also told them, you know, really for these kinds of assignments that I'm having.

315

00:48:29.910 --> 00:48:43.329

Participant 13: Google Scholar is the best thing you can do. Just just put in your keywords. Come up with your the things that come up. Look at the abstracts and work with those that's probably the best way to work through the different things.

316

00:48:43.490 --> 00:48:50.430

Participant 13: because Chat Gpt is not there yet. Now there may be more sophisticated AI entities, of course, but

317

00:48:50.959 --> 00:48:58.949

Participant 13: but anyway, so I I don't think I mean, I mean, it's a thing you can't, you can't. It's here to stay and and evolve.

318

00:48:59.120 --> 00:48:59.660

Participant 13: But.

319

00:48:59.660 --> 00:49:00.400

Karen Gainey: Yes.

320

00:49:00.400 --> 00:49:04.479

Participant 13: The the if. If I was

321

00:49:04.880 --> 00:49:08.089

Participant 13: learning how to write, learning how to think.

322

00:49:08.270 --> 00:49:13.250

Participant 13: relying on Chat Gpt is a lazy person's way of doing it, and you're not going to learn much.

323

00:49:13.490 --> 00:49:19.439

Participant 13: If I was a person newly diagnosed with something, I would welcome anything that could

324

00:49:20.410 --> 00:49:26.309

Participant 13: get the lay of the land just like that, and put in a summary that I would understand.

325

00:49:26.580 --> 00:49:33.760

Participant 13: but understand it in the way that this might not be completely right, but at least it kind of

326

00:49:34.030 --> 00:49:36.199

Participant 13: is a starting point for looking at stuff.

327

00:49:36.200 --> 00:49:37.120

Karen Gainey: Starting point.

328

00:49:37.530 --> 00:49:44.630

Participant 13: So. Yeah, I mean, I'm not seasoned in this at all. I mean, like I said, my wife is is much more. And there's some people that are like.

329

00:49:45.030 --> 00:49:47.509

Participant 13: I mean, they use it for everything.

330

00:49:48.060 --> 00:49:48.460

Participant 13: Yeah.

331

00:49:48.460 --> 00:49:49.040

Participant 13: 7.

332

00:49:50.769 --> 00:49:55.079

Participant 13: You know, for us, we're having challenges people using it for reviews.

333

00:49:55.840 --> 00:50:05.300

Participant 13: writing sections of their paper, and sometimes you can really tell in a review or in a section of the paper. This is so Chat Gpt. And that's a problem.

334

00:50:05.730 --> 00:50:09.410

Participant 13: If it's clearly if it becomes something that.

335

00:50:09.530 --> 00:50:11.209

Participant 13: Did you really write this.

336

00:50:11.340 --> 00:50:19.299

Participant 13: you you need to own it, no matter who started the 1st draft. You need to own it at the end. If you make it say all the things you want it to say.

337

00:50:20.150 --> 00:50:20.810

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

338

00:50:21.010 --> 00:50:26.728

Karen Gainey: So I know most journals. I'm sure pretty much. All of them now have

339

00:50:28.940 --> 00:50:35.350

Karen Gainey: policies around the disclosure of generative AI, yeah, yeah.

340

00:50:36.460 --> 00:50:38.220

Karen Gainey: Alright, that's

341

00:50:38.720 --> 00:50:54.100

Karen Gainey: that. Pretty much that echoes very much sentiments I've heard from from other people, and I think your phrase, it's a starting point kind of sums it up because one of the things that I know I had to write a

342

00:50:54.100 --> 00:51:16.860

Karen Gainey: plain language summary for a paper I've got under review at the moment, and it took me about an hour and a half, and I kind of have an idea of how to do it, and used a I don't know if you're familiar with the Shell editor, a health literacy tool developed by some colleagues, which is terrific.

343

00:51:18.800 --> 00:51:34.040

Karen Gainey: Yeah, yeah, it's it just gives you a readout. You put your copy of text in it, gives you the readability. Use a complex language or percentage highlights, any long sentences.

344

00:51:34.350 --> 00:51:47.409

Karen Gainey: Person centered language, whole range of outputs, and then you can modify it, check it again. So I use that. And it's it. It still took me a while. So it's it's it's a.

345

00:51:47.640 --> 00:51:53.011

Karen Gainey: It takes it in unique set of skills to write these sort of summaries.

346

00:51:53.920 --> 00:52:02.550

Karen Gainey: just to kind of write it in the the right kind of way, and and be able to pull out the right kind of information.

347

00:52:03.215 --> 00:52:05.940

Karen Gainey: So I guess, thinking about

348

00:52:06.230 --> 00:52:10.860

Karen Gainey: the highlights and the purpose of them. You commented that

349

00:52:11.000 --> 00:52:21.780

Karen Gainey: that there's if I'm remembering correctly that peer reviewers don't tend to comment very much. Is that right on the the highlights.

350

00:52:23.420 --> 00:52:29.669

Participant 13: Occasionally. So they they. So when you look at reviews I would say, maybe

351

00:52:32.340 --> 00:52:38.420

Participant 13: well, I mean so. I trust our associate editors, so we don't

352

00:52:38.690 --> 00:52:42.220

Participant 13: carefully review the reviews that they got.

353

00:52:42.330 --> 00:52:48.349

Participant 13: You know. We look at the reasons for their decision, but we don't go in deep diving into what the reviews are.

354

00:52:48.350 --> 00:52:48.820

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

355

00:52:48.820 --> 00:52:50.750

Participant 13: But in the papers that we

356

00:52:50.880 --> 00:52:58.930

Participant 13: sent to get reviewed, to which then, we have to make a decision and associate editor is not the one, you know, we're basically the associate editor making the decision.

357

00:52:58.930 --> 00:52:59.330

Karen Gainey: Yes.

358

00:52:59.330 --> 00:53:02.074

Participant 13: Into ourselves. The

359

00:53:02.890 --> 00:53:08.849

Participant 13: the I would say of the ones that I process, I would probably say maybe one out of 4, 1 out of 5

360

00:53:08.960 --> 00:53:18.240

Participant 13: make a statement about the highlights, and they usually are either critiquing them because they're too long, or

361

00:53:18.540 --> 00:53:28.620

Participant 13: sometimes they critique them on, not on the content. I mean, I guess I mean, sometimes I guess they do. But I think in terms of

362

00:53:29.840 --> 00:53:38.600

Participant 13: the fact that they're making a highlight about something that is overstated, based upon the article itself.

363

00:53:39.180 --> 00:53:43.480

Participant 13: you know. Sometimes people will say, Here's a highlight of my study, you know. You know.

364

00:53:43.650 --> 00:53:46.360

Participant 13: we cured cancer. No, you didn't.

365

00:53:46.360 --> 00:53:47.010

Karen Gainey: Oh!

366

00:53:47.010 --> 00:54:02.420

Participant 13: You know, I mean, they make they make something that's a little bit of an overstatement. And so I mean, appreciate those reviewers, because so many reviewers just ignore them. in my opinion, and it may be that they don't. But I'm just saying that they do, because they aren't.

367

00:54:02.630 --> 00:54:04.560

Participant 13: They? Aren't making comments about them.

368

00:54:05.220 --> 00:54:06.070

Karen Gainey: Yes.

369

00:54:06.600 --> 00:54:11.379

Participant 13: But there, we don't see them as major features

370

00:54:11.490 --> 00:54:15.690

Participant 13: of the reviewing process on quality of the article.

371

00:54:16.350 --> 00:54:22.970

Participant 13: as our eyes are toward accessibility, based upon

372

00:54:23.370 --> 00:54:34.559

Participant 13: what they're doing and accessibility and quality. So the quality issue for us is really really important. But quality is in part accessibility based upon what we're reading.

373

00:54:35.310 --> 00:54:41.779

Participant 13: but we don't really extend that to the highlights. Many of us don't. Some reviewers do.

374

00:54:41.910 --> 00:54:45.429

Participant 13: in fact, some associate editors do, and good for them.

375

00:54:45.610 --> 00:54:48.690

Participant 13: But for us, that's just like a yet an additional task

376

00:54:48.980 --> 00:55:03.670

Participant 13: that we're already doing a lot. And so, you know, the review process is is, you know, we're we're all overwhelmed, as as we all know. So so I would say, I would say, it's not a major area for critique, but it is

377

00:55:04.000 --> 00:55:10.639

Participant 13: a source of critique, sometimes for some reviewers and some associate editors on something that is

378

00:55:11.570 --> 00:55:15.569

Participant 13: either misstated, or probably more importantly, poorly

379

00:55:15.830 --> 00:55:21.370

Participant 13: formatted, informed, you know, in terms of being too long, or, you know.

380

00:55:22.180 --> 00:55:24.549

Participant 13: not relevant really to what the article is.

381

00:55:25.580 --> 00:55:29.140

Karen Gainey: That's interesting. So it's it's

382

00:55:29.500 --> 00:55:38.950

Karen Gainey: more so that it's either overstated and not consistent with the conclusions that could be drawn from the data

383

00:55:39.070 --> 00:55:47.650

Karen Gainey: and taking things out of context, or doesn't really fit the definition of a highlight like a clear, short, concise statement.

384

00:55:48.770 --> 00:55:54.739

Participant 13: But that's such a minority, that's such a. Those those comments are so few

385

00:55:55.800 --> 00:56:00.260

Participant 13: and so I would say, probably most often than not. I mean to be honest, I mean.

386

00:56:00.520 --> 00:56:00.860

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

387

00:56:01.000 --> 00:56:03.339

Participant 13: Most of the time. People aren't paying attention to them.

388

00:56:04.150 --> 00:56:17.179

Karen Gainey: No that, and that's that's and it's and if there's no comment at all, it's hard to know if there's no comment, because they didn't look at them or no comment, because they had no issue with them. Review.

389

00:56:17.180 --> 00:56:27.520

Participant 13: Or it's like, Hey, highlights are supposed to say these things. This is what they did. And so I'm not going to pay attention to that, you know. Getting your article published is not a function of the highlights

390

00:56:27.970 --> 00:56:36.219

Participant 13: getting your articles published something else, and that's what my job is to pay it, says a reviewer, to pay attention to that to see if it's worthy.

391

00:56:36.950 --> 00:56:37.440

Participant 13: Yeah.

392

00:56:37.650 --> 00:56:39.890

Participant 13: So it's it's almost as though

393

00:56:42.120 --> 00:56:45.665

Participant 13: we don't have somebody who would be the highlight editor.

394

00:56:46.656 --> 00:56:49.203

Karen Gainey: Oh, what a title!

395

00:56:49.840 --> 00:56:59.989

Participant 13: Highlight editor, and who would look at it and say, Okay, now that your articles accepted. Now let's look at the quality of your highlights.

396

00:56:59.990 --> 00:57:01.709

Karen Gainey: Sounds like a good job for me.

397

00:57:04.110 --> 00:57:05.330

Karen Gainey: Hand up.

398

00:57:05.940 --> 00:57:16.179

Participant 13: So we'd have to convince the Publishing Company to be that that so you know, this is worth investing in, and their response will be. Show me how it affects our bottom line.

399

00:57:16.490 --> 00:57:20.780

Karen Gainey: Yeah. Oh, we might fall down on that bit.

400

00:57:21.210 --> 00:57:23.234

Participant 13: Unless we find a way.

401

00:57:23.640 --> 00:57:28.429

Karen Gainey: Find a way. Okay? Well, I submit at the end of June. So we've got a few months.

402

00:57:28.880 --> 00:57:55.760

Participant 13: But but you know, for the for the plain language summaries, I mean, even though (journal) may not be a good journal to talk about the challenges we have and all of that kind of stuff. And in fact, we're probably not. That's a big deal, you know, because people are looking to the Internet and other places to find out about stuff that bothers them. Their family, you know, their friends. And they're really worried about it. And

403

00:57:55.960 --> 00:58:00.379

Participant 13: science is very technical, and it's very frustrating to try to make sense out of it.

404

00:58:00.490 --> 00:58:02.849

Participant 13: and we certainly don't need the misinformation

405

00:58:03.000 --> 00:58:13.720

Participant 13: that is so much out there on any number of things. And so having scientists or someone.

406

00:58:13.940 --> 00:58:41.419

Participant 13: you know, it's what we call science communication, I mean, y'all probably have the same thing. Science communication. What is that? Basically, it's how do you communicate science to the general public? You know, that's that's a job for journalists, for all practice, for for what we're used to. You know, they're the ones or someone with those skills are the ones that say, Okay, let me tell you how to do that. Do the upshot of this. I talked to the producers of the research.

407

00:58:42.090 --> 00:58:50.630

Participant 13: I get a sense of it, and could talk with them about the plain language, everything of it and how it matters. I then go and write my article to the general public

408

00:58:50.770 --> 00:59:12.599

Participant 13: talking about this thing in a way they understand. So there's a role for those people, and they already have a role for that, especially in, I know at Texas A. And M. We have that primarily, for in veterinarian science. You know we have. We have a lot of veterinary science here, and some in the medical sciences as well. They'll just have

409

00:59:12.850 --> 00:59:14.789

Participant 13: plain language summaries of these

410

00:59:15.020 --> 00:59:43.060

Participant 13: these findings in the lab. You know, they're so technical. And they're so lab like, you know, and they're doing this. And it's the implications they have for treatment or down the road, but they want to talk about it because it's relevant public, you know, it's not like we're here, you know, burning test tubes which we are burning test tubes and stuff like that. But on stuff that matters that you don't understand how it matters. That's when you need your science communicator to come in and talk about the relevance of that in terms of

411

00:59:43.960 --> 00:59:49.329

Participant 13: what this allows us to do in the next steps. So those are. Those are hugely important roles.

412

00:59:49.440 --> 00:59:50.500

Participant 13: Obviously.

413

00:59:51.420 --> 01:00:20.350

Karen Gainey: Yeah, I really am on board with that. And it was actually, that's actually the reason I'm doing this. Phd, I've got chronic health conditions myself. And I saw so much misinformation in Facebook groups, and really felt like I was butting my head against a brick wall, and just one day decided I should do something about it, and that's what led me to be

414

01:00:20.730 --> 01:00:24.338

Karen Gainey: to be here and

415

01:00:26.220 --> 01:00:35.380

Karen Gainey: I'm not going to go into academia. I actually want to be a health communicator, science communicator.

416

01:00:35.380 --> 01:00:36.190

Participant 13: Yeah.

417

01:00:36.190 --> 01:00:52.080

Karen Gainey: That's really my passion and plain language. Summaries is just one tool that's out there. But I think it's a very underutilized tool, is what I've discovered, and there's a lot more potential for it.

418

01:00:52.730 --> 01:01:02.259

Karen Gainey: But what this study is really helping me understand is what the very real practical barriers are at the publishing end

419

01:01:04.190 --> 01:01:08.283

Karen Gainey: that are in place, that

420

01:01:09.080 --> 01:01:26.189

Karen Gainey: as you were saying, the way (Publisher) wants things done that limits what your journal can do. If you wanted to change the way the highlights are structured, for example, or the or something like that, or even the title

421

01:01:27.630 --> 01:01:30.732

Karen Gainey: that's not something that that's possible.

422

01:01:31.830 --> 01:01:37.610

Participant 13: I would say it, it might be. It's just not a high priority for any of us.

423

01:01:37.790 --> 01:01:38.150

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

424

01:01:38.150 --> 01:01:46.819

Participant 13: I mean for us. It's the body of the research and the you know the whole thing it's and the highlights are should be a fair

425

01:01:47.170 --> 01:01:49.680

Participant 13: number of fair 3 to 4 bullets.

426

01:01:49.790 --> 01:02:02.359

Participant 13: Oh, what the highlights of the article are! Are they reasonable? Yeah, that's fine. So so the highlights are not a priority to us. They're probably plain language summaries ish in nature

427

01:02:02.740 --> 01:02:03.180

Karen Gainey: Yep.

428

01:02:03.180 --> 01:02:13.950

Participant 13: But it's in part because, as I said, we have to reach to such interdisciplinary audiences that you know it ends up being pretty plain languagey

429

01:02:14.160 --> 01:02:19.700

Participant 13: from a from a from a standpoint of regardless of your academic background. You could read this

430

01:02:19.880 --> 01:02:25.170

Participant 13: and understand what's going on here in terms of what you're doing and what you're finding.

431

01:02:26.200 --> 01:02:39.809

Karen Gainey: Yeah. So I was curious when you were talking about the type of comments that reviewers feedback about the highlights, that jargon and those sort of things wasn't 1 of them.

432

01:02:41.000 --> 01:02:49.040

Participant 13: No, no, - I don't. I don't. I don't recall that. As I said, we don't get too many comments on the highlights, but I. Usually

433

01:02:49.290 --> 01:02:56.359

Participant 13: they either they're you're you're overstating something, or it's not clear the point that you're making

434

01:02:56.540 --> 01:03:01.049

Participant 13: for those reviewers that pay attention to that. And a lot of reviewers don't, so.

435

01:03:01.610 --> 01:03:04.809

Karen Gainey: Yep, all right. How's your soup going?

436

01:03:05.560 --> 01:03:08.620

Karen Gainey: It's it's good. I probably need to stir it.

437

01:03:08.960 --> 01:03:14.680

Karen Gainey: We've I just have about 5 min worth of questions. If that's all right, do you want.

438

01:03:14.680 --> 01:03:16.900

Participant 13: Yeah, that's fine. No, that's fine. That's fine.

439

01:03:16.900 --> 01:03:18.440

Karen Gainey: Okay? All right.

440

01:03:18.840 --> 01:03:22.022

Karen Gainey: I just wanted to ask if there's any

441

01:03:22.540 --> 01:03:35.540

Karen Gainey: consumer. If if there's a team of consumers that are involved in any part of the the process of peer review, or reviewing the highlights at all.

442

01:03:35.710 --> 01:03:42.969

Participant 13: No, we. We don't have that. I mean, we. We do have research, a lot of our research because we're trying to develop

443

01:03:43.610 --> 01:03:59.989

Participant 13: resources for communities for patients. You have to have community members or patients involved in the process of helping guide you and where they're coming from. So we have a lot of studies on, you know, a number of studies on participatory research.

444

01:04:00.070 --> 01:04:18.589

Participant 13: You know, we talk about the co-creation with all those stakeholders and the in stake. The end users are part of the research process, you know, giving, you know, you know, I mean, that's pretty standard fare but you know, depending on. When you get them involved in participatory research, you usually get them involved early on in the process.

445

01:04:18.680 --> 01:04:24.280

Karen Gainey: You know. So we have a number of those kinds of things, but they're not really aimed at.

446

01:04:24.640 --> 01:04:32.149

Participant 13: The the legibility of the of of the

447

01:04:32.410 --> 01:04:39.300

Participant 13: of the article itself, and more, the the obviously the research being responsive to the needs of the people. They.

448

01:04:39.680 --> 01:04:42.099

Participant 13: the researchers say they're trying to help.

449

01:04:42.560 --> 01:04:43.080

Karen Gainey: Yes.

450

01:04:43.080 --> 01:05:09.002

Participant 13: You're trying to help me. You need to understand a little bit about me in terms of what I need and what I think works, and what I think doesn't work. So you you need to listen to me. So it's I mean, that's pretty standard fare on the development of these kinds of resources. So we do a lot of that kind of stuff. I mean, for that kind of work. I mean, it's it's it's a requirement. And so we do a lot of that. But we don't have people involved in the

451

01:05:10.890 --> 01:05:15.510

Participant 13: in the basically, the translation of the science into plain language.

452

01:05:16.390 --> 01:05:20.504

Karen Gainey: Yep, excuse me. Yep, understood.

453

01:05:21.910 --> 01:05:24.630

Karen Gainey: I noticed that.

454

01:05:25.387 --> 01:05:41.779

Karen Gainey: There's the yeah, the something that I've not seen before. I saw in the author instructions the option to put embed video or animation within an article.

455

01:05:43.990 --> 01:05:49.469

Karen Gainey: How does that work and do many authors take that option up.

456

01:05:51.010 --> 01:05:54.370

Participant 13: In for the so

457

01:05:54.530 --> 01:06:07.289

Participant 13: (name) handles the (topic) kinds of things side of things, and I handle mostly the communication share decision making kinds of things. So my guess is, (name) may actually have more of that

458

01:06:07.810 --> 01:06:10.080

Participant 13: than I might have. But

459

01:06:10.750 --> 01:06:14.800

Participant 13: excuse me, we we you know, we have supplemental tables so you can click on a link

460

01:06:15.550 --> 01:06:19.490

Participant 13: to get to the supplemental tables. But

461

01:06:19.900 --> 01:06:28.030

Participant 13: yeah, soon as within a Pdf, you can click on a link which you can now get access to the actual video and stuff. Then

462

01:06:28.710 --> 01:06:35.350

Participant 13: I don't see a lot of that where you click on something. Then you see a video?

463

01:06:35.856 --> 01:06:39.999

Participant 13: But again, the of the papers I review or get reviewed

464

01:06:40.740 --> 01:06:42.790

Participant 13: on my end searching for reviewers.

465

01:06:42.980 --> 01:06:45.180

Participant 13: I don't see that happening.

466

01:06:48.340 --> 01:06:53.639

Participant 13: I don't see that happening much with regard to the reviewers, comments, or anything.

467

01:06:53.810 --> 01:06:55.800

Participant 13: but they're welcome to do that.

468

01:06:56.453 --> 01:07:02.900

Participant 13: You know, so they can provide, you know, an example of the excuse me, of the of the resource that they

469

01:07:03.490 --> 01:07:25.280

Participant 13: have developed or that they used. You know, things like that. I don't see a lot of necessarily a lot of comments of the on that in the reviews. So they have that option. But I just don't see it on my end of the articles that I process Chris and I. We divide them up in her area, my area, but she may see more on her end, because she's dealing more with educational products.

470

01:07:25.460 --> 01:07:30.160

Participant 13: People develop this stuff than I am on my end, and.

471

01:07:30.160 --> 01:07:30.720

Karen Gainey: Okay.

472

01:07:31.610 --> 01:07:32.920

Karen Gainey: So a lot of school.

473

01:07:32.920 --> 01:07:38.279

Participant 13: So I mean, that's an option elsewhere has that as an option. But I don't see a lot of it.

474

01:07:38.970 --> 01:08:00.189

Karen Gainey: Yeah, I've not seen it. It seems quite novel, especially the animation. So yeah, I'll ask her about it. So I guess just to wrap up. Where do you see? Or where would you like? This area of plain language summaries to go? Where do you think it'll go in the future?

475

01:08:04.230 --> 01:08:06.040

Karen Gainey: An ad, either, with your journal.

476

01:08:06.040 --> 01:08:11.109

Karen Gainey: I mean I mean, I can say a number of ways. I'd like to see it go in the future.

477

01:08:11.670 --> 01:08:23.760

Participant 13: But I guess. But let me, because I've already given some examples of like personal issues and stuff like that, let me just answer that in the context of where I would like to see that to go for something like (journal).

478

01:08:24.069 --> 01:08:24.549

Participant 13: or sorry.

479

01:08:24.550 --> 01:08:24.890

Karen Gainey: Yep.

480

01:08:24.899 --> 01:08:35.379

Participant 13: And medicine some of the same, you know, journals that are social sciencey, health, professiony kinds of things, that we're mingling those kinds of things together.

481

01:08:35.899 --> 01:08:36.299

Karen Gainey: Yep.

482

01:08:36.300 --> 01:08:39.210

Participant 13: Psychology, you know all, all that kind of stuff.

483

01:08:44.060 --> 01:08:45.920

Participant 13: I think it would be.

484

01:08:46.890 --> 01:08:49.490

Participant 13: I think it would be good if there were

485

01:08:50.279 --> 01:08:56.550

Participant 13: some service on plague, plain language, summaries that are

486

01:08:56.899 --> 01:09:04.510

Participant 13: things related to why communication matters, you know, practices for patient education.

487

01:09:04.630 --> 01:09:12.149

Participant 13: You know something that would be so be something that that would more broadly represent

488

01:09:12.670 --> 01:09:21.979

Participant 13: things that people might be interested in. So on the communication side of things, it might be a clinician wanting to learn more about being a better communicator, maybe, or

489

01:09:22.350 --> 01:09:31.290

Participant 13: or healthcare organization wanting somebody to learn more about being. They're wanting one of their people to learn more about me in communication. So so, even though we

490

01:09:31.460 --> 01:09:49.010

Participant 13: are broad and interdisciplinary, we are we. Our audience is almost always researchers, almost always researchers. A few practicing people that are just. They're interested in what we're doing from communication point of view, education point of view, because as clinicians, they just really think that that's important.

491

01:09:49.390 --> 01:09:50.829

Participant 13: But but they're kind of.

492

01:09:50.939 --> 01:10:01.089

Participant 13: you know, they're an exception. So we would love to have things that would be more broadly of interest, not necessarily to everyday consumers like regular people.

493

01:10:01.490 --> 01:10:16.049

Participant 13: We're all regular people, I know, but in our role, people in the role of regular people as opposed, it would be nice to get clinicians that might be more reach out to them, you know. I think sometimes the plain language summary would, as would would be, as

494

01:10:17.100 --> 01:10:38.810

Participant 13: you know as as valuable for somebody that would be like. I mean, I'm sure you all have journals for healthcare practitioners that are like, you know, Australian medicine or something like that, where, you know, they're basically kinda really plain language things for clinicians on things related to patient care or to

495

01:10:38.910 --> 01:10:55.012

Participant 13: whatever. I can only imagine what they would be in terms of patient care, you know, helping under patients understand dealing with health literacy. You know all of those kinds of things because the regular run of them I mean the regular Joe Jane

496

01:10:55.470 --> 01:10:57.669

Participant 13: practitioner doesn't read our journals.

497

01:10:58.270 --> 01:11:02.309

Participant 13: I mean academics who are doing research that our clinicians do.

498

01:11:02.450 --> 01:11:05.380

Participant 13: but the regular Jane and Joe's.

499

01:11:05.680 --> 01:11:29.830

Participant 13: who would like to have access to something on something they don't know a lot about literacy communication things they might take for granted. Or maybe they're struggling with. I think that's where there could be a role for plain language, not for the person looking up information, for a diagnosis for treatment. But for the, you know, the person providing health care services

500

01:11:30.220 --> 01:11:35.550

Participant 13: dealing with patients to get access to something basic fundamental

501

01:11:35.580 --> 01:12:05.089

Participant 13: about how to deal with this, because ultimately it's not about the science, it's about communication, or you know, or in addition to the science, it's about communication. It's about educating people, I mean, how do you deal with these people that you're so frustrated with? And yet they're not doing anything. And so what's what am I doing wrong, and I'm blaming them. You know those kinds of things. So I would think something that would to me would be something be very, very, very useful, because those things could then be things that

502

01:12:05.100 --> 01:12:06.080

Participant 13: many

503

01:12:06.500 --> 01:12:12.840

Participant 13: healthcare providers might be able to use to help get some ideas about what they might do in their practice.

504

01:12:13.940 --> 01:12:19.139

Karen Gainey: Right. That makes sense because it sounds like there's a real gap that that's not being addressed.

505

01:12:19.220 --> 01:12:41.749

Participant 13: I think so. You know I mean my my healthcare, my family. Well, my Gp, my my family Medicine Person, because I have written a book on clinical negotiation. So once once again I got changed from one provider to another. So I went and talked to her, and I just said, hey? 1st time I see you here, I'm going to give you this a copy of my book.

506

01:12:41.860 --> 01:12:46.540

Participant 13: and she says, Oh, well, that's interesting.

507

01:12:47.033 --> 01:13:01.529

Participant 13: Yeah. So he asked about communication, the challenges of communication. Well, I tell you what, sometimes Patience can be very challenging. We started talking about this kind of kind of stuff, you know, and things like that, you know. Be nice to know. I mean, how do you do? I mean, I'm sure.

508

01:13:01.880 --> 01:13:18.110

Participant 13: although she definitely could use better communication skills. That's for sure. But I'm sure that a number of clinicians would be, could, you know, could benefit might might have an interest in something like that. That's more than the rinky Dink kind of.

509

01:13:18.410 --> 01:13:19.270

Participant 13: you know.

510

01:13:19.410 --> 01:13:35.969

Participant 13: You know, nonverbal communication is so important. You need to smile. 85% of communication is nonverbal. It's like it makes me want to throw up. When I hear stuff like that. It's so naive, it's so dumb it's so stupid, and

511

01:13:36.300 --> 01:13:38.319

Participant 13: we got to be better than that.

512

01:13:38.580 --> 01:13:38.970

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

513

01:13:38.970 --> 01:13:44.980

Participant 13: Clients and make it stuff that people say. Oh, I've got it! I kind of see what's going on. So.

514

01:13:46.170 --> 01:13:49.670

Karen Gainey: Well said, well, said, Great place to end.

515

01:13:50.380 --> 01:13:57.140

Karen Gainey: especially since my lawnmower man has just turned up. And oh, yeah, I'm good. Okay, making noise.

516

01:13:57.140 --> 01:14:00.130

Participant 13: Your lawn, and I can go to soup, and then.

517

01:14:00.130 --> 01:14:05.720

Karen Gainey: Thank you so much, Rick. That was terrific. I really appreciate your time.

518

01:14:05.720 --> 01:14:08.979

Participant 13: Well, I I mean good good luck with your project, Karen. I really love talking.

519

01:14:08.980 --> 01:14:09.920

Karen Gainey: Thank you.

520

01:14:09.920 --> 01:14:11.660

Participant 13: It was really fun. And so.

521

01:14:11.660 --> 01:14:12.110

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

522

01:14:12.110 --> 01:14:22.846

Participant 13: Let me know if you need anything else. And good luck with your project sounds really, really important and really practical, and that's always a good thing.