

WEBVTT

7

00:02:25.350 --> 00:02:36.419

Karen Gainey: So we'll see how we go. Yeah. But thank you very much. This shouldn't take more than about 45 min. But let me just check in. How are you for time?

8

00:02:36.570 --> 00:02:37.339

Participant 16: That's fine!

9

00:02:37.780 --> 00:02:43.870

Karen Gainey: Does that be okay? All right. If anything happens, you need to leave, or you want to stop. Just let me know

10

00:02:44.110 --> 00:02:52.000

Karen Gainey: there's no problem with that. And as a just a quick reminder, I'm recording the audio for this.

11

00:02:52.180 --> 00:03:20.019

Karen Gainey: But I'll remove anything identifying from the Transcript, including your name. Any journals. We discuss place of work, anything like that. And if for any reason you'd like to look at the transcript and review it afterwards to make comments on the context, or just just review it to have a look. You're very welcome. Don't feel obliged. I know it'll be extra work, and I'm sure you're very busy, but you've got that option

12

00:03:24.130 --> 00:03:30.000

Karen Gainey: all right. So I guess I

13

00:03:30.480 --> 00:03:50.065

Karen Gainey: invited you to, or wanted to talk to you mainly because of (name)'s recommendation. With your previous involvement with (journal). But I'm I guess, interested in any involvement you've had with

14

00:03:51.795 --> 00:03:57.440

Karen Gainey: Sorry. My brain's brain's a bit slow. With

15

00:03:58.049 --> 00:04:20.579

Karen Gainey: plain language summaries in an editorial capacity. So I guess. Well, maybe I should start by telling you what the purpose of these interviews is so. This is the final study of my Phd, I've I've started with a scoping review on author guidelines for plain language summaries, and

16

00:04:20.579 --> 00:04:31.620

Karen Gainey: then did a kind of a compliance check to see how closely those summaries or guidelines compared to actual summaries in those journals, with kind of mixed.

17

00:04:31.620 --> 00:04:58.560

Karen Gainey: quite mixed results and under review. I've got an article where I spoke to people who read plain language summaries people with chronic medical conditions because they're high users of health information to find out why they use them, what they like, what they don't like, how they use them, and so forth. So I'll put all of that together to find out, I guess, behind the scenes at the journal and publisher level.

18

00:04:58.560 --> 00:05:22.449

Karen Gainey: how decisions are made. What are there any barriers or facilitators to publishing these summaries. And when I say plain language summary, I use that quite generically, because I know (journal) published highlights, and and these go by very different terms. And the audience can be quite different. So I'm being quite generic.

19

00:05:23.212 --> 00:05:29.237

Karen Gainey: Yeah. So just wanting to understand the decision making. And

20

00:05:29.970 --> 00:05:32.299

Karen Gainey: you know those sort of aspects.

21

00:05:33.860 --> 00:05:58.839

Karen Gainey: and and look to the future to see where you think that might lead us, so feel free to draw on any and all experience, and if there's anything I ask you, you don't know the answer to. Just tell me there's no no problems with that. And please don't feel you've got to just tell me the positive stuff just because it's my

22

00:05:58.840 --> 00:06:17.679

Karen Gainey: my area I'm not wedded to any particular point of view. So I really do want to hear the nuts and bolts, so if I can turn it over to you, love to kind of hear a little bit more about your background and your experience in this area. If I could.

23

00:06:17.930 --> 00:06:22.990

Participant 16: Yeah, I mean, I'm worried that I'm not going to give you very much beyond (name), but most of

24

00:06:23.400 --> 00:06:37.300

Participant 16: I mean all of my real editorial experiences with the (topic), making journals where I was associate editor for many years, and then editor in chief of (journal). And then the founding editor in chief of (journal).

25

00:06:37.420 --> 00:06:37.930

Participant 16: Oh, yeah.

26

00:06:37.930 --> 00:06:38.410

Karen Gainey: Yep. Yep.

27

00:06:39.315 --> 00:06:40.220

Participant 16: Brother.

28

00:06:40.220 --> 00:06:45.079

Participant 16: Sorry other journals have just done review work, but I've never had an editorial role.

29

00:06:46.710 --> 00:06:53.630

Participant 16: The highlights thing in in (journal),

30

00:06:55.110 --> 00:07:03.090

Participant 16: really began right. And it was really (name)'s idea began right, and the transition from from me to (name) is when we started doing it.

31

00:07:03.679 --> 00:07:09.740

Participant 16: Although I think there was always some thought that (journal) was supposed to be a more

32

00:07:11.140 --> 00:07:15.773

Participant 16: public facing and less esoteric kind of methodological journal than (journal).

33

00:07:16.410 --> 00:07:20.270

Participant 16: So yes, makers and patients and folks might be able to

34

00:07:20.400 --> 00:07:24.129

Participant 16: to have a better shot at reading it. A lot of the work in

35

00:07:24.809 --> 00:07:37.369

Participant 16: (journal), even when you know we ask for highlights and and plain language, it can be plain language, but it's not always lay language, because the papers are pretty methodological, so it might be.

36

00:07:37.370 --> 00:07:38.050

Karen Gainey: Yes.

37

00:07:38.050 --> 00:07:40.830

Participant 16: You know you're explaining this to generic

38

00:07:41.260 --> 00:07:44.714

Participant 16: scientist, not to a generic person.

39

00:07:45.770 --> 00:07:46.650

Karen Gainey: Yes, I'm just.

40

00:07:46.650 --> 00:07:56.919

Participant 16: Whereas policy and practice, I think there was some hope that there would be some papers that really would speak to folks who are not researchers who were policymakers or

41

00:07:57.590 --> 00:08:02.590

Participant 16: clinicians making decisions, or patients interested in decision making where

42

00:08:02.970 --> 00:08:09.359

Participant 16: plain language would really mean lay language would really mean that this is something that could be appreciated by anybody

43

00:08:09.540 --> 00:08:16.809

Participant 16: you know, with, let's say, a college education in the case of of (journal).

44

00:08:17.630 --> 00:08:21.780

Karen Gainey: So from understanding, you're meaning really, non experts in that area.

45

00:08:21.780 --> 00:08:23.579

Participant 16: Non experts. That's right.

46

00:08:23.580 --> 00:08:24.730

Karen Gainey: Public. Yep.

47

00:08:24.910 --> 00:08:28.029

Participant 16: Yeah, I think we've certainly.

48

00:08:28.130 --> 00:08:42.539

Participant 16: I guess maybe this is not exactly journal editorial stuff, but at our at the annual meetings with society X. And I've run a couple of those, you know. We've certainly had various efforts to try to find ways to

49

00:08:42.830 --> 00:08:47.459

Participant 16: connect with non-experts and patient communities

50

00:08:47.988 --> 00:08:53.429

Participant 16: around the applications of the work that the society does, and that, you know.

51

00:08:53.840 --> 00:08:56.100

Participant 16: Society's journal, but it obviously publishes.

52

00:08:56.100 --> 00:08:56.580

Karen Gainey: Hmm.

53

00:08:56.580 --> 00:08:57.650

Participant 16: Folks all over.

54

00:08:58.160 --> 00:08:58.780

Karen Gainey: Hmm.

55

00:08:59.070 --> 00:09:01.790

Participant 16: So there has been a push in the

56

00:09:02.120 --> 00:09:07.969

Participant 16: in the meeting sometimes to try to have more plain language.

57

00:09:08.597 --> 00:09:15.030

Karen Gainey: Abstracts, especially when it's been around symposia and panels and things that I've really tried to focus on.

58

00:09:15.030 --> 00:09:15.490

Participant 16: You know.

59

00:09:15.490 --> 00:09:17.979

Participant 16: How do you talk to? To non-experts?

60

00:09:19.320 --> 00:09:20.610

Participant 16: But I don't think that

61

00:09:21.740 --> 00:09:29.599

Participant 16: journal has done a great job. I mean, despite our efforts. And part of that is probably

62

00:09:29.890 --> 00:09:34.169

Participant 16: that subject matter, especially of of (journal).

63

00:09:34.280 --> 00:09:39.941

Participant 16: Really does often require expertise to to get it.

64

00:09:40.860 --> 00:09:51.530

Participant 16: you know, we used to have a a maybe we still have. We used to have a joke around the the journal that if you did a an amazing you know, decision analysis that

65

00:09:51.760 --> 00:09:58.730

Participant 16: said we should be doing this to save people from heart attacks. You'd get it published in JAMA.

66

00:09:58.920 --> 00:10:10.364

Participant 16: And if you did, using decision analysis that said, this is the method that we need to use to understand how to analyze decisions that will eventually save a Zillion people. You'd publish that in (journal)

67

00:10:11.000 --> 00:10:11.420

Karen Gainey: Right.

68

00:10:11.430 --> 00:10:17.710

Participant 16: You would lose the papers that were really designed for a more general audience to more general

69

00:10:17.900 --> 00:10:20.110

Participant 16: kind of higher visibility.

70

00:10:20.240 --> 00:10:26.160

Participant 16: Journals had a big, you know, Pr staff, and and could really kind of stuff. So

71

00:10:26.300 --> 00:10:40.750

Participant 16: you know, I think that that is you know, we looked at things like the BMJ, which had been doing some plain language, summary work, and thought that might be a good model. But they really have a much more people can understand.

72

00:10:40.880 --> 00:10:51.780

Participant 16: Okay, you get vaccinated and you don't get measles. It's harder for them to understand. Here's an epidemiological model of measles and the impact of various preventive strategies on that.

73

00:10:52.190 --> 00:10:53.080

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

74

00:10:53.480 --> 00:11:18.619

Karen Gainey: yeah, because I know, looking at the author instructions for the highlights, it just speaks to the heterogeneity of the audience very appropriate. We encourage key points that refer specifically to the audience audiences who will benefit from understanding the article's findings and explicitly tell them what they should care why they should care about this work.

75

00:11:18.900 --> 00:11:34.789

Karen Gainey: so it's left it purposefully, not so much vague, but open to application specifically to that piece, and not trying to put too much of a

76

00:11:35.596 --> 00:11:39.070

Karen Gainey: I suppose a framework around it, because

77

00:11:41.480 --> 00:11:47.970

Karen Gainey: I I'm assuming I've limit not wanting to limit the authors.

78

00:11:48.200 --> 00:11:51.050

Participant 16: Yeah. And you know, at various points in the history of

79

00:11:51.190 --> 00:11:59.409

Participant 16: the (journal), there have been kind of article types or features

80

00:11:59.530 --> 00:12:03.774

Participant 16: where the whole article was intended to be more of a

81

00:12:04.820 --> 00:12:17.110

Participant 16: you know, translational piece like here write an article about law and (topic), or the psychology of (topic) that really were written to speak

82

00:12:17.760 --> 00:12:20.250

Participant 16: to a very general audience.

83

00:12:20.420 --> 00:12:22.499

Participant 16: But those weren't like

84

00:12:23.290 --> 00:12:36.219

Participant 16: lay summaries of papers that were designed for a more specific audience. Right? They weren't taking. They weren't taking a specific paper and trying to make it accessible. They were writing something accessible. Yes, understood.

85

00:12:36.530 --> 00:12:37.490

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

86

00:12:37.600 --> 00:12:45.119

Participant 16: You know, and and that may be given. The peculiarities of of our particular field in journal like that may be

87

00:12:45.380 --> 00:12:47.970

Participant 16: the way to go as opposed to trying to.

88

00:12:48.470 --> 00:12:51.349

Participant 16: You know, summarize the other thing that we used to do.

89

00:12:51.490 --> 00:12:54.478

Participant 16: I don't know if (name) is still doing it.

90

00:12:55.000 --> 00:13:01.170

Participant 16: is, you know, we used to work with authors to craft tweets

91

00:13:01.310 --> 00:13:08.119

Participant 16: about their papers, and those were really, you know, they were. They were very lay language, and they were also.

92

00:13:08.120 --> 00:13:10.540

Karen Gainey: Yeah. I don't think we discussed that at all.

93

00:13:10.540 --> 00:13:14.340

Participant 16: Yeah, because they were tweaks. They were also very compressed, and, you know, used.

94

00:13:14.340 --> 00:13:14.960

Karen Gainey: Yeah, cool.

95

00:13:14.960 --> 00:13:24.770

Participant 16: Kind of idioms of of twitter at the time. But but that was another kind of it was a sort of plain language, summary right.

96

00:13:24.770 --> 00:13:25.570

Karen Gainey: Yeah, yeah.

97

00:13:26.040 --> 00:13:34.220

Participant 16: But but very condensed. So yeah, I don't think we've had a ton of success with that, and and some of that is

98

00:13:34.360 --> 00:13:37.767

Participant 16: the nature of the articles, and some of that may be that it's

99

00:13:38.450 --> 00:13:44.900

Participant 16: you know. I think when it when it has worked, it's usually had to be the editors really

100

00:13:45.170 --> 00:13:49.290

Participant 16: firmly crafting those things like authors, I think, are very.

101

00:13:49.620 --> 00:14:07.299

Participant 16: you know, focused on what they're doing and and very expert. And it's really hard in a lot of cases for them to, and I include myself in this to see beyond what they already know right, and and imagine themselves in the shoes of somebody who has never heard of this before. And then try to explain it in a

102

00:14:07.440 --> 00:14:12.669

Participant 16: concise and clear way, is a you know. It's a very hard scientific writing task.

103

00:14:12.790 --> 00:14:16.050

Participant 16: And yeah, most of our authors are prepared for it.

122

00:14:57.620 --> 00:15:09.199

Karen Gainey: Yeah, I mean, that's that. That's 1 of the things (name) did touch on and I think he spoke about sorry. It's a couple of weeks since I spoke to to (name).

123

00:15:09.890 --> 00:15:16.677

Karen Gainey: I've done, I think, 8 interviews since then the the idea of

124

00:15:19.250 --> 00:15:27.100

Karen Gainey: a lay or not so much a lay abstract, but an abstract that's more plain language itself.

125

00:15:27.350 --> 00:15:33.029

Karen Gainey: not so much to implement specifically for (journal). But.

126

00:15:33.420 --> 00:15:47.949

Karen Gainey: As a concept, as a kind of a middle ground, because abstracts are a bit longer, and obviously something that many people will only get that far. So

127

00:15:48.120 --> 00:15:52.629

Karen Gainey: what are your kind of thoughts on on that, with that

128

00:15:52.790 --> 00:15:56.429

Karen Gainey: kind of work for your journal where

129

00:15:57.300 --> 00:16:06.410

Karen Gainey: typical pls might not really work? Would that get around that? Or is that not not really right?

130

00:16:08.250 --> 00:16:11.240

Karen Gainey: Still has the problem of the the authors have to write it.

131

00:16:11.240 --> 00:16:12.949

Participant 16: Yeah. You know, I think.

132

00:16:13.380 --> 00:16:20.379

Participant 16: the how you, the format, and exactly how you present it, is probably less a barrier than

133

00:16:20.600 --> 00:16:29.449

Participant 16: just the basic skills and orientation. So many years ago, I went to a workshop

134

00:16:30.428 --> 00:16:36.379

Participant 16: that used to be held by the (Association). I don't think they're holding them right now, but

135

00:16:36.530 --> 00:16:40.180

Participant 16: a workshop that was basically like media training for scientists.

136

00:16:40.180 --> 00:16:41.140

Karen Gainey: I talked to.

137

00:16:41.140 --> 00:16:48.640

Participant 16: To journalists and those kind of skills, I think would be very useful. Right? So yeah, people,

138

00:16:49.680 --> 00:17:00.583

Participant 16: had that kind of training. Here's how you, you know, take something complicated and break it down into a small number of parts and explain those things, and then talk about the implications and how they're gonna matter.

139

00:17:00.870 --> 00:17:01.420

Karen Gainey: Hmm.

140

00:17:01.420 --> 00:17:09.930

Participant 16: I think that you know, with that kind of training one could probably craft much better

141

00:17:10.150 --> 00:17:28.109

Participant 16: plain language summaries of one work, regardless of how they were going to be formatted, or appear in the journal, and they could appear, you know, like BMJ. Used to, on the side, or they could, you know, it could even be the the highlights, or it could appear in the Tweet, or whatever but I think it's it's more the

142

00:17:28.610 --> 00:17:33.470

Participant 16: the time and effort and skills. Who's going to do it?

143

00:17:33.890 --> 00:17:40.950

Karen Gainey: Yeah, yeah, and and it's a different.

144

00:17:41.110 --> 00:17:48.815

Karen Gainey: not just a different skill set, but a different mindset that's required to get out because you've got to wear a different hat.

145

00:17:49.400 --> 00:17:55.510

Karen Gainey: and that may be something, because plain language summaries or highlights are not

146

00:17:55.660 --> 00:18:08.599

Karen Gainey: mandatory for all journals, so some authors may not have had a lot of experience crafting them so. And that's another factor.

147

00:18:09.040 --> 00:18:15.529

Participant 16: Yeah, the other thing, I guess that a lot of folks have a lot of journals have done is visual abstracts.

148

00:18:16.022 --> 00:18:20.339

Participant 16: which I think I hope will be more easily translatable to

149

00:18:20.550 --> 00:18:28.080

Participant 16: larger groups of people, and sort of, you know, and (journal). Has done that occasionally, but hasn't, doesn't have a real program for it. I think.

150

00:18:28.500 --> 00:18:28.870

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

151

00:18:28.870 --> 00:18:31.790

Participant 16: That I haven't seen lately. But yeah.

152

00:18:32.410 --> 00:18:49.710

Karen Gainey: Yeah, it's a lot of journals have that as an optional, like a visual abstract or a graphical people I've spoken to know it's there, but haven't seen much of an uptake. What do you think might be the reasons why?

153

00:18:52.270 --> 00:18:54.890

Karen Gainey: You're not seeing many of them come through.

154

00:18:55.450 --> 00:18:59.879

Participant 16: I. You know, I remember talking about this in

155

00:18:59.990 --> 00:19:19.620

Participant 16: 2020. Actually, there were a couple of reasons that i 1 is, of course, graphical design is also a skill. And it's really easy for scientists to just throw, you know, a complicated chart in the middle of a thing and and label it and consider that a visual abstract which is not so. It's the same problem to some degree. It's a different set.

156

00:19:19.620 --> 00:19:19.960

Karen Gainey: Yes.

157

00:19:20.000 --> 00:19:27.270

Participant 16: But it's the same problem, you know. The other thing that I remember we talked about in 2020 about doing these things was

158

00:19:28.339 --> 00:19:37.149

Participant 16: so (journal), unlike (journal), (journal) is a subscription based journal with some open access articles.

159

00:19:37.300 --> 00:19:41.219

Participant 16: But one of the big things we were.

160

00:19:42.530 --> 00:19:51.890

Participant 16: I won't say struggling with, but we're talking about. Was you really want the lay language summary, or the visual abstract, or whatever to be on the free side of the Paywall.

161

00:19:52.928 --> 00:19:54.960

Participant 16: not behind the Paywall

162

00:19:55.499 --> 00:20:04.580

Participant 16: on the free side of the Paywall. Everybody sees it, and you know there's some greater incentive for everyone to make it good, because it'll interest.

163

00:20:04.580 --> 00:20:04.910

Karen Gainey: People.

164

00:20:04.910 --> 00:20:13.629

Participant 16: In your work, and it'll it'll lead people to pay for the publication. And all this kind of stuff, you know, when it's on the other side, which was the default at the time with our public.

165

00:20:14.420 --> 00:20:30.979

Participant 16: It doesn't really help anybody, because you've already got the article. So you know, you're going to look at the article. Maybe not just the abstract, or whatever you've already committed to having access to the full set of science that's different for policy and practice and other open access journals where there is no paywall.

166

00:20:31.770 --> 00:20:32.270

Karen Gainey: Okay.

167

00:20:32.270 --> 00:20:42.619

Participant 16: And so there, I think, yeah, I think the main uptake issue is really the same thing as the lay language thing is, it requires training that is not often provided to scientists.

168

00:20:43.160 --> 00:20:51.980

Karen Gainey: Yeah. Yeah. And as you say, the same thing. It's it's time, it's skill, it's effort.

169

00:20:54.830 --> 00:21:02.280

Karen Gainey: Maybe unknown benefit or uncertain, unquantifiable benefit.

170

00:21:04.970 --> 00:21:07.359

Karen Gainey: Just do you have a sense of

171

00:21:07.430 --> 00:21:32.260

Karen Gainey: or from your when you're with the journal? So one of the things I'm interested in is that decision making process and a level of autonomy between the journal and the publisher, and I know with different kinds of models, say with a large publisher, say X, it's very different compared to a society

172

00:21:32.764 --> 00:21:42.919

Karen Gainey: operated journal, or a smaller, particularly a very niche one like yourself. If, if, as an editorial

173

00:21:43.130 --> 00:21:45.370

Karen Gainey: team. You wanted to

174

00:21:45.880 --> 00:21:55.249

Karen Gainey: change the way the highlights were done, or make it the audience different. Or however you wanted to change that.

175

00:21:55.360 --> 00:22:01.969

Karen Gainey: how much autonomy would you have to do something like that? Or would the society

176

00:22:02.440 --> 00:22:09.170

Karen Gainey: have they kind of set firmly their expectations around that that part of.

177

00:22:09.690 --> 00:22:19.349

Participant 16: Yeah. So in in the case of (journal). The society owns the journal they contract with (publisher) used to be (publisher X) actually to publish the.

178

00:22:19.590 --> 00:22:23.179

Participant 16: and they contract with the editorial office to edit the journal.

179

00:22:24.066 --> 00:22:35.709

Participant 16: So there's 3 parties and 3 possible kind of independence. Autonomy issues right? Traditionally, the Society's contract with the editorial office

180

00:22:36.000 --> 00:22:52.509

Participant 16: has provided for very strong editorial independence. So if the editor, if the editor said, we want articles to now include this, or look like this, or whatever it is, the society. Would that would be up to the editor, the Society would really.

181

00:22:52.510 --> 00:22:52.850

Karen Gainey: Okay.

182

00:22:52.850 --> 00:22:53.540

Participant 16: Little

183

00:22:54.002 --> 00:22:58.987

Participant 16: recourse. They, except to, you know, review the editor in the future and decide they want a different editor.

184

00:23:00.720 --> 00:23:07.590

Participant 16: when it comes to the and the publishing, the (publisher), or whoever

185

00:23:07.957 --> 00:23:21.819

Participant 16: then the issues of some issues of cost arise. Right? If we're gonna make a change, that's gonna affect the production process in a substantial way, right? Like we wanna add visual abstracts. And there was no visual abstracts on the platform they were using to publish at the time.

186

00:23:22.459 --> 00:23:41.129

Participant 16: They were in the process of changing platforms to one that would have it like we probably wouldn't have been able to get them to give us visual abstracts in advance of that change they were making, anyway, because it would have been a 1 off and very costly for them. So it's less an editorial independence thing there than a, you know, technical capabilities at the cost

187

00:23:41.130 --> 00:23:42.700

Participant 16: situation

188

00:23:42.700 --> 00:23:52.759

Participant 16: so they wouldn't. They never would have said like the publisher wouldn't say, no, you can't do that. What they would say is, if you want to do that, it's gonna cost you a prohibitive amount.

189

00:23:53.228 --> 00:24:04.220

Participant 16: But then they, you know, they changed platforms because other other journals that they were publishing also wanted to do that. They were responsive to that. They had a platform that could do it. And then the journal could say, Yeah, we want to do it

190

00:24:04.330 --> 00:24:14.469

Participant 16: all the time, some of the time, whatever. And that decision would be essentially in the editorial office. So at least, for in our journals there was substantial

191

00:24:14.770 --> 00:24:16.480

Participant 16: editorial independence.

192

00:24:17.170 --> 00:24:21.697

Karen Gainey: Okay, that's actually really interesting. Because one of the things

193

00:24:22.260 --> 00:24:50.615

Karen Gainey: I've noticed with most of the submission portals. Is that just whether or not the journal publishes. So, despite what label the plain language summary might be highlights, key messages, plain language, summary in the submission portal. There's usually no field they're usually required along with the the manuscript.

194

00:24:51.240 --> 00:24:54.130

Karen Gainey: so what I'm

195

00:24:54.490 --> 00:25:07.700

Karen Gainey: understanding is, if a journal wanted to have a separate field for the plain language summary. That's something you'd obviously negotiate with the publisher, because that would be a bit.

196

00:25:07.700 --> 00:25:09.140

Participant 16: The website? Yeah.

197

00:25:09.140 --> 00:25:27.839

Karen Gainey: Yeah, and that might even be another 3rd party scholar, one, or whoever's looking after that. But, as you said, if other journals have also made a similar request. That might, they might feel it's worthwhile making that change. So.

198

00:25:27.840 --> 00:25:29.329

Participant 16: Yeah, and that those usually were not.

199

00:25:29.330 --> 00:25:29.970

Karen Gainey: That.

200

00:25:30.340 --> 00:25:59.419

Participant 16: Those are sometimes slow, but not terribly difficult to have happen. So like having people put in the Tweet that we had authors submit along with papers a suggested tweet, which we usually had to to tweak around. But you know, that was adding one field to scholar, one, as you pointed out, and you know they they have the ability to do that pretty easily. They can turn on like, let's get a new text field that comes through otherwise and or as a workaround. Until that happened, we would just tell people to put it in the manuscript file.

201

00:25:59.900 --> 00:26:04.049

Participant 16: The way they do their abstracts and acknowledgments and stuff now, and we would just pull it out.

202

00:26:04.050 --> 00:26:04.370

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

203

00:26:05.030 --> 00:26:05.690

Participant 16: No.

204

00:26:05.690 --> 00:26:13.470

Karen Gainey: Right? Okay, so would would a journal. So let's go with the the plain language. Summary example.

205

00:26:13.470 --> 00:26:13.890

Participant 16: Yeah.

206

00:26:13.890 --> 00:26:18.400

Karen Gainey: So I'm trying to understand, would say, (Publisher), if if

207

00:26:18.520 --> 00:26:36.219

Karen Gainey: (journal). Said to them, we'd like a separate field for our highlights in the actual portal. Would they be likely to do that just for a single journal, or it would depend. But that's where they'd say yes, but it would cost you, because we're only going to implement that for one journal

208

00:26:36.730 --> 00:26:37.330

Karen Gainey: or.

209

00:26:37.330 --> 00:26:44.750

Participant 16: Would depend. My! And you'd be better talking to somebody like it's scholar one about this. But, my.

210

00:26:44.750 --> 00:26:45.629

Karen Gainey: Sure, that's okay.

211

00:26:45.630 --> 00:26:48.749

Participant 16: Sense. The sense that I got about it was that

212

00:26:49.320 --> 00:27:04.840

Participant 16: scholar one in the background has a whole bunch of basically empty fields that they can turn on and off, and that the publisher can decide what that field is labeled. So they have the ability. If it's little things like we, we want one more. Collect one more text box of stuff.

213

00:27:05.330 --> 00:27:05.950

Karen Gainey: Yep.

214

00:27:05.950 --> 00:27:11.610

Participant 16: They could do that for a single journal without a problem, because they just say, All right, turn on text. Field. C.

215

00:27:12.080 --> 00:27:18.670

Participant 16: Yes, and and that's it. Maybe it was something that was really different, you know.

216

00:27:19.140 --> 00:27:26.020

Participant 16: Probably do that with a file upload, too, or you know, you can always upload a supplemental file. But if it was something that was really different

217

00:27:28.470 --> 00:27:39.539

Participant 16: well, the only thing I can think of recently was, you know, Ringgold, like connecting institution names to databases like that. They probably would only do if they were doing it for everybody.

218

00:27:40.080 --> 00:27:40.750

Karen Gainey: Yeah, that makes sense.

219

00:27:40.750 --> 00:27:46.700

Participant 16: Well, at least make setting it up so that it was available to everybody, and then people could decide whether they wanted the field or not.

220

00:27:46.970 --> 00:27:50.703

Karen Gainey: Yeah, that actually makes a lot of sense.

221

00:27:51.390 --> 00:27:56.019

Karen Gainey: because really it, I mean, it's just a big database or spreadsheet.

222

00:27:56.020 --> 00:27:56.430

Participant 16: Yeah.

223

00:27:56.430 --> 00:28:08.039

Karen Gainey: And then it's just a check box or populating a field. To say, this is a mandatory part of the submission, or it's an open field, and set up.

224

00:28:08.040 --> 00:28:10.889

Participant 16: He said, we want a hundred of these. Then they might. They might balk.

225

00:28:10.890 --> 00:28:28.659

Karen Gainey: Yeah, that's exactly right. Yeah. Yeah. Or if you wanted a, really, I mean with the highlights, and I know they're bullet points. So if you kind of had a complicated structure, you need it accommodated as opposed to a paragraph that you would then format yourself

226

00:28:29.690 --> 00:28:30.799

Karen Gainey: that it'd be

227

00:28:30.960 --> 00:28:44.940

Karen Gainey: so. I know, scholar one or some of these portals aren't really good at form, you know, formatting those kind of things. Just text. They just handle text. That makes a lot of sense.

228

00:28:45.260 --> 00:28:51.720

Karen Gainey: because that's that's been one of the challenges.

229

00:28:51.890 --> 00:29:01.679

Karen Gainey: I guess. With that and the peer review process with plain language summaries not being a delineated element. That's kind of

230

00:29:01.900 --> 00:29:10.930

Karen Gainey: isolated or specified as a kind of a separate entity. It's so.

231

00:29:11.060 --> 00:29:18.316

Karen Gainey: What I'm trying to do is kind of understand the thought processes, or you know what goes into

232

00:29:18.980 --> 00:29:30.589

Karen Gainey: whether it's just, you know, been historically that way, and things are set up and pls or highlights have come on after that, and there just hasn't been

233

00:29:30.740 --> 00:29:40.850

Karen Gainey: the thought to add them, and no one's kind of said, Hey, let's do this, or it's just been too tricky, or it's it's something else, or a combination of the above.

234

00:29:41.340 --> 00:29:51.970

Participant 16: Yeah. Now, if I were doing it today, if I were editing this journal today and wanted to push on the scholar, one of those folks, I would ask them something like, well, is there a way that you can

235

00:29:52.370 --> 00:30:05.870

Participant 16: use a large language model to write us a draft, plain language, summary of an article within the system that we can. If the article is, gonna get accepted or or revised, we can send that to the author and ask them to edit

236

00:30:05.870 --> 00:30:10.760

Participant 16: Dude or the editor maybe could like there'd be at least a start. Yeah, right?

237

00:30:10.760 --> 00:30:14.490

Participant 16: Some kind of some kind of large language model that

238

00:30:14.610 --> 00:30:28.830

Participant 16: could be tuned toward. You know you want this to be at the 8th grade or 12th grade, or whatever reading level you're explaining this to, you know, pretend you're a non expert who's read this paper? Blah blah. So I think you know, and I don't know where they are.

239

00:30:28.990 --> 00:30:34.609

Participant 16: scholar. One of those folks are these days with their AI integration, but somebody will do that at some point.

240

00:30:34.890 --> 00:30:38.648

Karen Gainey: Yeah. So what do you think about that sort of

241

00:30:40.110 --> 00:30:48.740

Karen Gainey: I said. It's inevitable that that sort of tool is going to be used. What are your thoughts on how it should be used?

242

00:30:49.840 --> 00:30:52.010

Karen Gainey: 4 language summaries?

243

00:30:52.010 --> 00:30:54.712

Karen Gainey: Yeah, I think that's a fine use. Actually,

244

00:30:55.310 --> 00:31:01.370

Participant 16: You know, as long as the author and the editor edit right as long as it's not automatic.

245

00:31:02.184 --> 00:31:06.050

Participant 16: You know, as far as I'm concerned. That's along the same lines. As

246

00:31:06.210 --> 00:31:11.130

Participant 16: you know, Microsoft words, grammar and readability statistics.

247

00:31:11.950 --> 00:31:16.860

Participant 16: It can suggest ways to rephrase a sentence that are going to be more readable like.

248

00:31:17.180 --> 00:31:25.090

Participant 16: that's just a fancy version of that. I think that would be a fine. Yeah, I think that'd be a great use actually, for this kind of thing.

249

00:31:25.700 --> 00:31:33.950

Karen Gainey: So if if something like a large language model, generative AI was used to at least sort of make a 1st draft of a

250

00:31:34.480 --> 00:31:37.900

Karen Gainey: plain language summary, or a few drafts.

251

00:31:38.200 --> 00:31:43.570

Karen Gainey: What from your perspective, do you think that's something that should be declared

252

00:31:44.790 --> 00:31:55.409

Karen Gainey: like in the in the, in the way that any use of AI needs to be declared in the man, for if it's used in the manuscript, would that apply to.

253

00:31:55.690 --> 00:32:11.180

Participant 16: Yeah, I mean, I see no harm. I see no harm in disclosing that it could be. If it's a journal wide thing, it could be a blanket disclosure, like, you know, plain language. Summaries for this journal are drafted by blah blah system, and then edited by the authors and editors.

254

00:32:11.180 --> 00:32:13.270

Karen Gainey: Yeah, that makes sense.

255

00:32:13.490 --> 00:32:16.203

Participant 16: As long as the others and editors stand by them right.

256

00:32:16.450 --> 00:32:19.540

Karen Gainey: Yep, yep, okay, that's

257

00:32:20.530 --> 00:32:24.895

Karen Gainey: That's really interesting. Do you think any

258

00:32:26.620 --> 00:32:30.780

Karen Gainey: any journals likely to do that? Have you heard any rumblings.

259

00:32:30.780 --> 00:32:35.769

Participant 16: I mean I haven't. I haven't really paid attention. I can't imagine.

260

00:32:35.770 --> 00:32:36.859

Karen Gainey: Put you on the spot, but.

261

00:32:36.860 --> 00:32:39.909

Participant 16: I can't. I can't imagine that there aren't journals that have

262

00:32:40.370 --> 00:32:52.213

Participant 16: started. You would have talked about doing it. But you know I mean, at least to the degree that they're interested in a plain language. Summary now that I'm thinking about, I think I should talk to (name) and say, Hey, we should, we should try this out.

263

00:32:52.773 --> 00:32:55.689

Participant 16: but yeah, I I don't know of any

264

00:32:56.309 --> 00:33:04.289

Participant 16: but it seems like a very natural move. If a journal cares enough about plain language, summarization.

265

00:33:05.140 --> 00:33:13.720

Karen Gainey: Look. I have to submit my thesis at the end of June. So if you could get that done in the next couple of months and get some results that would be really helpful.

266

00:33:13.720 --> 00:33:15.120

Participant 16: Wouldn't that be great? Yeah.

267

00:33:15.180 --> 00:33:16.690

Karen Gainey: That would be great.

268

00:33:18.010 --> 00:33:31.230

Karen Gainey: That would be really useful. But yeah, it's it's it'd be really interesting. I'm just curious now to you've you've I hadn't even thought of Scholar one or

269

00:33:31.805 --> 00:33:54.010

Karen Gainey: I know there's a couple of major platforms what? They might be kind of thinking up, because I kind of just think of them as there I don't kind of think of had really pondered their connection. To this beyond providing just the platform, the skeleton, if you like.

270

00:33:54.200 --> 00:33:58.239

Karen Gainey: but there's obviously a lot that goes into that.

271

00:34:00.080 --> 00:34:02.999

Karen Gainey: So that's you've really given me a lot to think about.

272

00:34:03.501 --> 00:34:12.500

Karen Gainey: What what else from your perspective, you think might be. Or would you like to be, the future of this kind of area?

273

00:34:12.810 --> 00:34:13.650

Participant 16: Hmm.

274

00:34:17.340 --> 00:34:22.860

Participant 16: I mean the other kinds of translational products.

275

00:34:24.239 --> 00:34:36.710

Participant 16: I mean, the classic translational product of a science article is a journalist writes about it right? Or it's on the radio like there's a studies come out and somebody reports that alcohol is no longer good for you or whatever it is this week.

276

00:34:39.070 --> 00:34:41.209

Participant 16: And then sort of this, the

277

00:34:42.420 --> 00:34:48.140

Participant 16: slightly more democratic version of that is, you know, a journal has a podcast

278

00:34:48.570 --> 00:35:11.860

Participant 16: and the author comes on the podcast and explains it. And maybe they have an interviewer who is supposed to be a non-expert. And you know, help them. And then again, there's, you know, skills and effort required in that. But it's maybe easier than training. Each scientist is you? You get a really good interviewer. You get Barbara Walters to come, and you know, really make it explain it and translate it.

279

00:35:12.570 --> 00:35:13.420

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

280

00:35:13.420 --> 00:35:14.819

Participant 16: You know.

281

00:35:16.000 --> 00:35:27.109

Participant 16: and it's different levels of of effort. And it's who you know where you shift that effort to like, how much is on the author how much of it is on an expert translator of some sort?

282

00:35:27.360 --> 00:35:30.470

Participant 16: Yeah, I mean, I do. I do see the appeal of

283

00:35:30.870 --> 00:35:35.190

Participant 16: author written plain language summaries because the authors invested.

284

00:35:35.320 --> 00:35:38.430

Participant 16: you know it distributes the workout among a lot of people.

285

00:35:39.356 --> 00:35:39.983

Participant 16: It's

286

00:35:40.980 --> 00:35:46.930

Participant 16: You know. The author knows the the subject best, and is not likely to misstate, or less likely to.

287

00:35:46.930 --> 00:35:48.340

Karen Gainey: Mistake, maybe.

288

00:35:48.840 --> 00:35:55.470

Participant 16: But the trade-off is the one we've discussed, which is, they also don't know how to talk about it. Right? They know about they know about it. They don't know how to talk

289

00:35:56.027 --> 00:35:57.040

Participant 16: in this context.

290

00:35:57.220 --> 00:36:02.690

Participant 16: So I think there are a lot of like, it's a continuum of of models.

291

00:36:03.750 --> 00:36:06.450

Participant 16: kind of knowledge translation, and I'm not sure that

292

00:36:07.110 --> 00:36:13.529

Participant 16: there's probably a place for each of them. And figuring out what the right places is is, you know.

293

00:36:13.700 --> 00:36:16.619

Participant 16: tricky and maybe contextually specific.

294

00:36:17.540 --> 00:36:26.799

Karen Gainey: Yeah. You know, when I started my Phd, I really thought there'd be one size fits all. And now

295

00:36:27.020 --> 00:36:30.904

Karen Gainey: I've realized it's a highly nuanced area.

296

00:36:31.790 --> 00:36:36.769

Karen Gainey: and yeah, I've had a real paradigm shift.

297

00:36:37.840 --> 00:36:49.809

Karen Gainey: Do you see? Or do you recall seeing with the highlights them being shared either by the journal or authors on social media, or with consumer groups or societies.

298

00:36:51.060 --> 00:36:57.950

Participant 16: So I think that is really dependent on the authors. Press Office. Right? So.

299

00:36:57.950 --> 00:36:58.440

Karen Gainey: Right.

300

00:36:58.440 --> 00:37:03.840

Participant 16: You know the academic authors, sometimes universities. If there's a finding that's really exciting, they will.

301

00:37:04.250 --> 00:37:17.009

Participant 16: They will talk it up, and they will have a Pr. Office, and they'll do things with it again. Those usually are being published in kind of very well recognized visible. This is Lancet, you know science nature, those kind of journals.

302

00:37:20.880 --> 00:37:26.329

Participant 16: The (journal) at least we had in our contract with (Publisher)

303

00:37:26.970 --> 00:37:30.979

Participant 16: some limited number of press releases that (Publisher) would do.

304

00:37:31.820 --> 00:37:32.290

Karen Gainey: Okay.

305

00:37:32.290 --> 00:37:36.119

Participant 16: For articles if we thought that they deserved greater press.

306

00:37:36.681 --> 00:38:01.280

Participant 16: I don't think we always use them, and I don't think they ever really had a great deal of impact. But again, I think that maybe because of the narrowness of the topics, or because, you know, you send a press release out to to a wire service, and you know you have to just see if anybody is interested enough to pick it up, and if they are, sometimes they just run the release, and sometimes you get a journalist who then does the real translation work? And you know, interviews the authors and things like that.

307

00:38:02.155 --> 00:38:07.910

Participant 16: So I think it's mostly fallen on the authors. Our our Twitter thing was an attempt to kind of

308

00:38:08.270 --> 00:38:17.120

Participant 16: bulk that up to have more social media go out about articles and you know

309

00:38:18.060 --> 00:38:21.559

Participant 16: and and discuss them. One of our.

310

00:38:22.420 --> 00:38:26.040

Participant 16: I think she's an associate editor still at at (journal).

311

00:38:26.884 --> 00:38:35.770

Participant 16 (name). Excellent decision. Scientist actually does a quite a bit of posting of (topic) articles on LinkedIn.

312

00:38:36.190 --> 00:38:38.659

Karen Gainey: I was gonna ask about linkedin. Yeah.

313

00:38:38.660 --> 00:38:43.339

Participant 16: When she does post the article she she does provide what is essentially a

314

00:38:43.500 --> 00:39:02.430

Participant 16: a plain language summary when she posts them, you know, explaining why, it's an important article or an interesting article. She's just doing that on her own, I think, like not from the Journal, and so on. So you know, it's a resources question. Who's got the resources and the skill and the interest.

315

00:39:03.190 --> 00:39:19.859

Karen Gainey: Yes, that's something that's really stood out is this kind of area seems to be driven by people who have an innate passion for health communication, science communication, and it's very resource.

316

00:39:20.190 --> 00:39:29.597

Karen Gainey: limited, or there's limited resources at the often the publisher level to support these kind of initiatives. But

317

00:39:32.110 --> 00:39:33.970

Participant 16: Yeah, that's fair.

318

00:39:33.970 --> 00:39:35.560

Karen Gainey: Driving me crazy.

319

00:39:36.024 --> 00:39:37.879

Participant 16: Pretty thin margins, so.

320

00:39:37.880 --> 00:39:46.273

Karen Gainey: Yeah, it's it's. And so it's often just not a priority. Which is which is understood. And

321

00:39:49.630 --> 00:39:55.876

Karen Gainey: sorry. My cat is absolutely driving me nuts. I've lost my train of thought. But yeah, I think you get you get

322

00:39:56.350 --> 00:39:58.858

Karen Gainey: You get the point and

323

00:39:59.780 --> 00:40:10.260

Karen Gainey: What you've said makes a lot of sense that it's it's really incumbent on the the authors because of the the limited resources.

324

00:40:10.410 --> 00:40:12.349

Karen Gainey: What have you given me? There.

325

00:40:12.660 --> 00:40:18.909

Participant 16: That is, a 2024 article about using Llms to create plain language, summaries of evidence, reviews

326

00:40:19.080 --> 00:40:24.440

Participant 16: from one of our Federal Government agencies.

327

00:40:24.440 --> 00:40:28.150

Karen Gainey: Terrific. I may already have it, but if I don't.

328

00:40:28.150 --> 00:40:30.327

Participant 16: People are trying this, I guess.

329

00:40:30.690 --> 00:40:35.540

Karen Gainey: Right awesome. Oh, yeah, I think I've already got that.

330

00:40:35.920 --> 00:40:39.000

Participant 16: Yeah, there's a few looks like there's a few papers on that kind of thing.

331

00:40:39.120 --> 00:40:41.940

Karen Gainey: That's awesome. Thank you very much.

332

00:40:41.940 --> 00:40:42.620

Participant 16: Sure.

333

00:40:43.020 --> 00:40:44.390

Karen Gainey: Yeah, brilliant.

334

00:40:44.660 --> 00:40:53.479

Karen Gainey: Yeah, it's it's something. It's just it's really. I went to the Cochrane colloquium last oh.

335

00:40:53.590 --> 00:41:00.079

Karen Gainey: October before last, and there was a lot of debate around this kind of area

336

00:41:00.320 --> 00:41:08.840

Karen Gainey: use with evidence summaries, and I think a lot has happened in that year year and a bit year and a half.

337

00:41:10.130 --> 00:41:21.350

Karen Gainey: I think just a little bit more acceptance of the role of of this kind of technology and maybe reluctant acceptance. But

338

00:41:23.020 --> 00:41:41.029

Karen Gainey: a lot more. We're seeing a lot. I'm seeing a lot more research in this area. But cautious optimism, I suppose, of the role it can play, echoing the same sentiments you have. It's a good start, but the human intervention is still needed.

339

00:41:42.125 --> 00:41:45.289

Karen Gainey: And not to not over rely on it.

340

00:41:46.050 --> 00:41:55.701

Karen Gainey: So I will have a look at that. So I that's that's been really helpful. Is there anything from your perspective?

341

00:41:56.460 --> 00:42:03.100

Karen Gainey: that we haven't touched on that you think is really important that I might have missed.

342

00:42:04.620 --> 00:42:09.760

Participant 16: No, this was very very interesting, and I think it's about everything I could think of.