

Karen Gainey: Hi! How are you?

Participant 1: I'm good. Can you hear me? Okay.

Karen Gainey: Yeah, it was a bit soft. But I think that was my volume. Yeah, that's better. That's great.

Karen Gainey: It looks like the transcripts working, too. It's my 1st time using Zoom transcript. So that's awesome.

Participant 1: But I haven't tried it actually. So let me know if it's good.

Karen Gainey: Yeah, I'm looking at it. And it's looking like it's picking up the words really. Well, I had to switch over. It's in the settings that you set? That you just click a box to like you would for

Karen Gainey: What is it to

Karen Gainey: Record.

Participant 1: Oh, yeah.

Karen Gainey: Sessions. It's in one of those, and it's because I have word for Mac

Karen Gainey: word, for Mac no longer has the option to transcribe.

Participant 1: That's fine!

Karen Gainey: Couple of years ago when I did my other call study, but they've removed the feature, so I may.

Participant 1: Lots of people using zoom so hopefully it will be good.

Karen Gainey: Yeah. Looks good. So how are things with you?

Karen Gainey: Good thanks, Jay. Good.

Participant 1: Doing the usual grant, writing.

Karen Gainey: Yeah, I thought that was an start of the year. Kind of thing.

Participant 1: This seems to never really stop. Actually, we were.

Karen Gainey: We're doing you.

Participant 1: Yeah, no, it's alright. In a way, I actually don't mind it, because it sort of helps you think through what you want to do next?

Participant 1: You just have to.

Karen Gainey: Hi.

Participant 1: And I have to put it in like 10 times before it gets funded.

Karen Gainey: Really that much.

Participant 1: Well depends, but.

Karen Gainey: Sounds like an ethics. Proposal.

Participant 1: Yeah.

Karen Gainey: Alright! Please let me know if we're if you're kind of of time. This I've done a couple of practices and timed it to be just a a bit over an hour. But let me know if you're kind of running short for time, and we can make sure we we don't

Karen Gainey: make sure we get through it all.

Participant 1: Yeah, no, we should be. We should be fine.

Karen Gainey: All right likewise let me know if you want to break at all as well, or if something kind of comes up at your end.

Participant 1: I might just grab some water.

Karen Gainey: Yeah, yeah.

Participant 1: Oh, good!

Karen Gainey: Terrific.

Karen Gainey: So thank you. You're my 1st live, real interview.

Karen Gainey: So this is super exciting.

Karen Gainey: I've so I'm going to treat this

Karen Gainey: properly, but I guess if you can just bear with me that I'm still, I guess, learning my questions and getting to grips with

Karen Gainey: how best to order and manage my questions, so I really appreciate. If you have any feedback at the end, please don't hesitate to tell me how I might improve

Karen Gainey: or part way through it open to that. So I just have a couple of demographic questions, if you wouldn't mind. I've put in ethics to put them now as a qualtrics survey, but that's still pending approval. So if you wouldn't mind, I'll record them and then shred that and just put it in my spreadsheet. If it's okay, I run through them quickly. There's only 5.

Karen Gainey: Just what?

Karen Gainey: So it just asks about your gender.

00:04:15.830 --> 00:04:16.760

Participant 1: A female.

00:04:16.760 --> 00:04:20.330

Karen Gainey: Budget device. Yep, age range

Karen Gainey: 18 to 30, 30 to 45,

Karen Gainey: 45 to 60, 60 plus.

Participant 1: 30 to 45.

Karen Gainey: So thinking of your editorial role. What would be the closest job title, editor-in-chief, associate, editor.

Participant 1: Editor in chief.

Karen Gainey: Indigent chief. Yep, how many years have you spent in that current in that position?

Participant 1: Let's see.

Karen Gainey: So the year one to 3.

Participant 1: Oh, one to 3.

Karen Gainey: One to 3. Sorry, I said 3. This might be a tricky one. How many editorial decisions for your journal do you think you might make each week.

Karen Gainey: I understand it's not your total focus.

Participant 1: It's a good question.

Karen Gainey: And one of the options is so I've got less than 5, 5 to 1010 to 2050, plus. It varies or unsure.

Participant 1: Might have to say it varies, is it?

Participant 1: If it? If you wanna have a it's probably less than 5 on average. But some weeks. So.

Karen Gainey: Yeah, as.

Participant 1: As well.

Karen Gainey: Yeah, I should say, on average, that's a good.

Participant 1: It's quite a new journal. So we're not at the stage of having like hundreds every week or anything.

Karen Gainey: Okay, yeah, actually, that's a good point.

00:05:54.620 --> 00:06:01.270

Karen Gainey: A box to say, why, new journal, yeah, that's great.

Karen Gainey: How's the journal going.

Participant 1: Yeah, pretty good. Actually.

Karen Gainey: Interesting.

Participant 1: Like this.

Participant 1: Yeah, we're really like, happy with sort of the international reach that we've got. And we're not even entirely sure how we've got that, because to start off with, it was really Australia focus. Because that's our networks. But

Participant 1: yeah, it actually seems to have

Participant 1: the words got out there, so it seems to be going pretty great.

Karen Gainey: Oh, awesome!

Karen Gainey: I should have pointed out. We are recording this session, as you would have seen in the consent form.

Participant 1: That's nice.

Karen Gainey: Just a reminder. This is just going to be audio recorded for the purposes of transcribing and data analysis. So no identifying information will be collected

Karen Gainey: all right. So the

Karen Gainey: The purpose of of the study. Oh, I guess to start off. Did you have any questions you wanted to ask about the interview

Karen Gainey: or what we're doing. Okay?

Karen Gainey: So really, what are the questions I'm going to ask? Are all around getting a better understanding of the decision processes that go into publishing plain language summaries. And I'll shorten that to pls, if that's okay. To understand those decision making processes, looking at any

Karen Gainey: different attitudes or perspectives you might have about pls in your position, and think of any barriers to publishing pls. And this could relate to your current position or any other editorial positions you've had, and also barriers or facilitators to implementing pls.

Karen Gainey: So

Karen Gainey: just thinking of. If you can just tell me a little bit more about your role as a journal editor.

Karen Gainey: and experiences you might have had with PIs to date.

00:08:14.449 --> 00:08:22.240

Participant 1: Yeah. So our channel started last year. So last year we just had a pretty standard kind of format for

Participant 1: (Publisher)journals. So our our journal is published by (Publisher), and they have kind of standardized systems and standardized sections and standardized kind of article types in the back end that we kind of have to link into

Participant 1: so after the 1st year, we did want to introduce plain language summaries as a requirement in the author guidelines and they were quite supportive of that they did. It wasn't a standard thing for them, at least not at that time.

Karen Gainey: Okay.

Participant 1: And so I guess

Participant 1: they worked out a place we could put it like, basically underneath the abstract but they didn't have established processes like a form they could activate, which is where you put the plain language summary or anything like that. So they kind of had to

Participant 1: find a way for us to do it in the system.

Participant 1: which they did, and we changed the author guidelines.

Participant 1: so we've just implemented that sort of softly this year. And just so we are requiring authors to do that in their second submission. But we don't.

Participant 1: you know, send it back if they don't have it in their 1st one. We're also not editing. We weren't editing them. So we're getting the authors to just do it. They just asked to do a hundred words. Plain language, summary

Participant 1: There's some suggestions for aiming for grade 8, and that sort of thing.

Participant 1: but we're not enforcing it. But next year, because

Participant 1: quite often they will just sort of do it as a bit of an afterthought, I think, and they'll just do it to get through the requirements. But they're not really thinking about. Is this understandable for

Participant 1: an average person? And some of them, I guess that's not really familiar to them, because we don't only publish publish X papers. We also publish just X papers.

Participant 1: So we are thinking about next year, maybe we'll start to try to work with the authors a bit more, or like, introduce

Participant 1: a little bit more stringent standards for getting it to at least maybe a grade 10 reading level. I just looked at one this week, which was grade 16. So, although it's a shorter summary than the abstract, is not going to really help

Participant 1: the average person understand it. That much. So

Participant 1: that's kind of where we're at, I guess. Also, as we're a new journal.

Participant 1: we're still kind of working out all of our systems and processes, and where we want to kind of influence things. But that is a direction that we. I think we'll go more into next.

00:10:44.630 --> 00:10:48.379

Karen Gainey: Hmm, wow! It sounds like you put a lot of thought into it.

Participant 1: Yeah. Well, at the end.

Karen Gainey: A bit.

Participant 1: We need to. I need to read your thesis to know how to do it at a higher quality, I think. But yeah.

Karen Gainey: Oh, thank you.

Karen Gainey: If there's anything I can help with, I'd be I'd be real really thrilled to but it's so it sounds if I can understand if I'm understanding correctly. When you 1st started out, you weren't, including plain language summaries at all, and after a year or after a little while introduce them? So when?

Karen Gainey: So I just want to understand when you introduce them. Were they mandatory from the start?

Karen Gainey: Or was that process.

Participant 1: No, yeah. So it's just a conversation that we had with our (Publisher) representative about whether we could even do it because.

Karen Gainey: Okay.

Participant 1: Wasn't a standard part of their paper format and then once they said that we could, we just implemented it straight away from them. So there's like a bit of a delay while they like update the website or the guidelines.

Karen Gainey: Oh, that's something they did for you. You don't.

Participant 1: Yeah.

Karen Gainey: Cool.

00:12:02.450 --> 00:12:09.500

Participant 1: So we don't have much control over. I mean, different journals operate differently. So if you have like a journal that's been

Participant 1: kind of built from the ground up from an organization they might have more control, whereas we I was approached by (Publisher) to start this journal. So we kind of have to fit into their processes.

Participant 1: so yeah, once we made the decision, we had to have that conversation. We had to wait for the website to be updated, and then it was implemented from from them.

Karen Gainey: Right that makes sense. So it was something that they sought out. And it was

Karen Gainey: so something that that yeah, and and they put under their banner. So that makes sense.

Karen Gainey: And so it sounds like it's been a little bit of bouncing back and forth between

Karen Gainey: you as an editor and the publisher X, in terms of decision making. So it sounds like the decision to make the pls mandatory from. If I'm understanding came from yourself.

Karen Gainey: What was behind that decision.

Participant 1: Well, because our journal is about (subject). So it's called (journal name).

Participant 1: yeah, I guess it was just something that we thought about for the second year, like, what did we? The 1st year was kind of just setting up and seeing if we would even get any submissions and setting up our editorial board. So it was all very practical stuff we were kind of focused on, and for the second year we just had a bit of time, I guess, to reflect on. What did we want to do differently in this journal, compared to other journals that we had previously been involved in

Participant 1: Have been on the editorial board for another journal as well.

Participant 1: Where they didn't have a plain language summary, but their target is kind of policy makers. So it wasn't didn't make as much sense in that context. But for our context, because we have this health literacy con focus.

Participant 1: I guess. And we're just so aware of issues around readability and accessibility. Yeah, I guess it was just something that we decided

Participant 1: we wanted our journal to kind of modeled.

Karen Gainey: Yeah, no. Great. And did you have any? Any? Oh, guess what? When you suggested that to (Publisher), what was their response when you said you wanted to implement pls and make them mandatory.

00:14:38.286 --> 00:14:46.030

Participant 1: They were actually very supportive. They've been very supportive of us, kind of deciding how we want to shape the journal from the start. So it wasn't

Participant 1: an unusual request for us to ask, yeah, need to be changed.

Participant 1: it's just that they didn't have yeah a standard process for it. But yeah, there was no resistance on their part.

Karen Gainey: So it sounds more just the logistical side working out how to fit it in in the template and that sort of side of things, and you mentioned that you'd looked at some recently, and they measured grade a grade. 16. How did you measure the readability.

Participant 1: Yeah, that was one of our associate editors did it actually. And she flagged that it was like really high on readability. So the Australia. The editorial board is about half Australian, half international, so most of the Australian ones are aware of and use the shell editor, which I was also involved in developing. So I'm very familiar with that.

Karen Gainey: Yeah, that's interesting that they're using it.

Participant 1: Yeah, yeah. So we haven't asked the authors to use a tool like that yet, but I think it might be something that we do next year?

Participant 1: but yeah, I was like, it was just a good reminder. It was something that's been on my mind to address for next year. But there's so many other things that we have to think about for running the journal that it kind of been a bit down the list. But

Participant 1: oh, I'll play.

Karen Gainey: Summaries aren't a priority. Is that what you're telling me.

Participant 1: Well, our priority is getting indexed is our priority.

Karen Gainey: No, no, no, of that is a huge priority.

Participant 1: Yeah, cause otherwise. So we've got a big change coming where we're gonna go from an open access free period. While we were setting up to charging an open access fee. So we don't know what's going to happen there. It's probably gonna make our submissions drop off and then we have to sort of maintain regular submissions enough that we can get indexed, and then people can get their fee.

Karen Gainey: Yes.

Participant 1: Thankful by the organization. So that's kind of our high level issue at the moment.

Participant 1: But it was a good reminder. So I haven't actually gone through our plain language summaries on our papers this year to we check that. They're there.

00:16:54.960 --> 00:17:06.740

Participant 1: And you know I've used the readability calculators enough to know that some of them look too high. But when we decided that initially we weren't going to kind of enforce it to a grade reading level.

Participant 1: but we will need to think about next year, like, if we did want to improve the quality of the plain language summaries, how would it? We actually do that, because there's a lot of.

Karen Gainey: Hmm.

Participant 1: Work involved in getting the manuscript up to standard and then in line with the Journal. And so we'd have to work out who is going to do that? Is it going to be the associate editor? Is it going to be the editor in chief? Is it going to be someone at (Publisher). So that's something that would need to be worked out.

Karen Gainey: Yes, and things might have changed at (Publisher) since you 1st set up the journal.

Participant 1: Yeah. And they do seem to be recognizing consumer kind of

Participant 1: written things more as we go. So our our journal sits in a Humanities Section, not a health or medical section. So I think they're not

Participant 1: maybe as familiar with sort of consumer involvement principles as the health sector sometimes is.

Participant 1: but it does seem like they're starting to think about like having kind of consumer versions of paper.

Participant 1: Just a short summary. So we.

Karen Gainey: Hmm.

Participant 1: Included that that article type in our journal yet, but it does look like

Participant 1: as a company. They're starting to think about that a bit more.

Karen Gainey: Yeah, so that's sort of thinking about the audience. And yeah, and I guess.

Participant 1: Is like, not every paper we get actually necessarily needs to be at a low grade reading level, because they're not really things that are, gonna get into the media. They're very like technical or they're about, you know, assessing hospital documents, which is more an issue for like the hospital administrators. So

Participant 1: I'd not. Every paper we get is actually necessarily going to be read by members of the public or by patients.

00:18:57.320 --> 00:19:08.209

Participant 1: so I guess what that might be a way that we can sort of prioritize working with the authors is if we see there's a paper that actually, this has. This has real appeal for the general public. Maybe they're the ones that will

Participant 1: start to spend a bit more time with the authors to refine those plain languages.

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

Karen Gainey: right? That's an yeah. But is, do you think that's because you've got the kind of dual approaches of X & Y, because you've got.

Participant 1: Central.

Karen Gainey: Broad scope. You're getting a range of different papers.

Participant 1: Yeah, it is reasonably broad in terms of like, who would want to read the paper like, who does it matter for

Participant 1: So I mean, I've worked across those 2 fields for ages, and probably about half of what I do would never get into the general media, but it might get into the policy media or the health professional media, as which is where you want to write it in a little bit more plain language, I suppose?

Participant 1: So yeah, we probably get a mix.

Participant 1: Yeah, I guess if it's involving communication with patients, there'd always be a group of patients who would be interested. But often it's kind of more X which are probably less interesting to

Participant 1: to the general public.

Karen Gainey: Yeah, no, that that kind of makes sense, and it's it's a tricky one. And I've seen it in with my scoping review. My 1st paper looking at the author guidelines for a range of health health journals. The guidelines were really varied, and

Karen Gainey: even when the audience was the same, the general public or consumers. They vary quite a lot. So guidelines are something I'm really interested in and want to understand a lot more as particularly how it relates to the audience for a journal. So

Karen Gainey: I want to kind of understand.

Karen Gainey: because you're in a somewhat unique situation where your audience really could be quite a range. It's not like, say, a journal autism research where it'll be clinicians involved in that particular. It's quite a specified cohort. In other words, yours could be

Karen Gainey: quite, quite broad. When

00:21:28.510 --> 00:21:51.010

Karen Gainey: either yourself, with the other editors or (Publisher) set up the guidelines. Do you have a sense of whether there was thought in the guidelines about the audience, and who would be reading the. So when I talk about the guidelines, the guidelines with the plain language summaries is the audience reflected in the guidelines to.

Participant 1: To God.

Karen Gainey: The authors.

Participant 1: A good question. I'm gonna have to look at what we actually wrote.

Participant 1: Cause. At that time we didn't know who our audience would be because we didn't have many papers yet. We had sort of 5.

Karen Gainey: Fair enough.

Participant 1: At that time, so we didn't really. We probably will be in a much better position next year to have an idea of like what proportion of papers are actually kind of relevant to the general public. So let me just have a look

Participant 1: actually written, because we just kind of put it in when we were making a whole heap of other changes to the author guidelines.

Participant 1: And we didn't really, I guess, think about specifying the audience at that time, but that's definitely something that we could do.

Participant 1: I mean, the other thing that we do is we sort of have a format, free submission policy. So for the 1st version.

Participant 1: they can just basically submit it in any format. And we're not very strict on on the inclusion at that that time. So.

Participant 1: From all the papers that we get. It's only a subset that are actually going to end up being published, and need to have the.

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

Participant 1: Main language summary. So we don't. Wanna yeah. Hop on it, too, specifically at the start, I guess.

Participant 1: Yeah, you you mentioned.

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

Karen Gainey: Are you looking at the guidelines?

Participant 1: Yeah.

Karen Gainey: I have looked at them.

00:23:17.010 --> 00:23:21.480

Participant 1: You probably know better than me, cause we put this in like a year ago. Now.

Karen Gainey: No, that's it. Sounds like they're they're going to be reviewed next year. So knowing well, I know from from looking at getting together a list of possible participants for this study.

Karen Gainey: a lot of (Publisher) journals now publish what they call plain language summaries of publications. So things are really changing with (Publisher).

Participant 1: Okay, yeah, we should have a discussion with our representative. Okay, I found it now, because it's like just one little thing amongst like a bullet point list. Yeah. So we didn't say much at all. We just said our plain language summary of less than 100 words, aim for grade 8,

Participant 1: and definitely, the workers are not doing grade 8. But we did say aim.

Karen Gainey: I? Yeah, yep, yep.

Karen Gainey: yeah, I'll be. It'll be interesting to see. Yeah. What what you come up with in your review?

Participant 1: Yeah, it'll we'll definitely be adding that to our. So we sort of have

Participant 1: once a year. I kind of like year in review process where we kind of see where we're at. So the next one of those will be like April next year, and that'd be the point where we sort of have that discussion with the editorial board and see if we wanna give a bit more guidance on that

Participant 1: and then work out. Who would actually be the one doing that because it's all volunteer. So where we can, we try to, I suppose, get support with things that we want to do from (Publisher), but sometimes it's just up to the time of the editorial board.

Karen Gainey: Awesome.

Karen Gainey: That's really helpful. So

Karen Gainey: just thinking you may not, may not know, because this may be at the publisher end.

Karen Gainey: But

Karen Gainey: Do you know if any end users were consulted in developing the guidelines.

Participant 1: My voice.

Karen Gainey: That's something you would think about.

Participant 1: Yeah,

00:25:38.850 --> 00:25:46.469

Participant 1: again, we'd have to think about who our end users are. And what, whether we'd want to have nuanced kind of

Participant 1: guidance for the different, the different potential audiences, and whether we want the authors to actually specify that as well.

Participant 1: Because in reality people don't read the author guidelines.

Participant 1: So that's why we often get the the 1st versions without having a plain language summary at all. They often don't have meet all the other requirements as well.

Participant 1: So I guess we have to think about.

Karen Gainey: Sting.

Participant 1: Yeah, who would decide who the audience is? Is it the author, or is it?

Participant 1: Yeah, I guess the associate editor wouldn't they.

Karen Gainey: So do you.

Karen Gainey: So do you mean to say, Carissa, that

Karen Gainey: authors, when they submit papers, don't read the general author guidelines

Karen Gainey: not just pls. Author. Guidelines, author guidelines.

Participant 1: No, they don't read the guidelines at all.

Karen Gainey: You do have no idea how seriously I take all the guidelines.

Participant 1: Yeah, we got yeah.

Karen Gainey: Those strictly.

Participant 1: Researchers. So I mean, definitely, some of them do because we are getting. We are starting to get more that have the pain language summary from the start, probably more from the health literacy researchers than the health communication research, because they get them more aware.

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

Participant 1: But yeah, I would say.

Participant 1: maybe half of the ones we get like they're not actually in the format in the required format for the 1st submission.

Karen Gainey: That's so interesting. Okay, yeah, thank you for that. Any other insights like that. That's so valuable that because that's such

00:27:21.800 --> 00:27:24.569

Karen Gainey: that's that's something I didn't know.

Participant 1: Oh, okay. Yeah.

Karen Gainey: I assumed, I think I definitely assumed.

Participant 1: One is diligent, and also you can tell when people have I think the other time that happens is when it's sort of being

Participant 1: a rejection from another journal, and so they just submit it to another journal, and they haven't really tailored it for the journal.

Karen Gainey: Yes.

Karen Gainey: Wow, wow, okay.

Participant 1: But yeah, I think if your your goal is to implement plain language summaries in journals, it's not. One thing is having, like a good guideline, and I guess more than a a single line like what we have. But even then there's still gonna be these implementation barriers depending on.

Participant 1: is there someone who like checks for that before it even goes to review? Or is it, then up to the associate editors? And then

Participant 1: then it depends on. I guess how how consistently the.

Karen Gainey: Yes.

Participant 1: Recommendations are kind of implemented across the editorial board.

Karen Gainey: That's exactly what I want to talk about now.

Karen Gainey: looking at guidelines, and whether they're adhered to or not, and you touched on it a little bit before that. You're not enforcing guidelines for the pls. And that's fair enough. You've got a lot that you're you're working on at the moment. So more thinking, I guess not so much what you've done in the past so much, but thinking, perhaps to the future is

Karen Gainey: thinking of

Karen Gainey: And if you're looking to, perhaps expand what you put in the Pls guidelines in conjunction with (Publisher).

Karen Gainey: So I want to kind of look at a couple of different aspects, just to understand the flow of things, I guess, in the submission process. So I know every journal or every

Karen Gainey: (publisher) is different.

00:29:35.790 --> 00:29:52.730

Karen Gainey: So I guess one part of it is so. If we think of an author that does submit a pls, whether it's it's something you've asked for in that second submission, or they freely do it.

Karen Gainey: Would you look to check that against your guidelines at any stage?

Karen Gainey: And would that be something? So I'll leave it at that.

Participant 1: Yeah, I mean, I guess, as I said, that's something we might think about for our next kind of year of review. So our 1st priority is indexing we. And to get to that, we need to have consistent paper. So that's kind of.

Karen Gainey: Hmm.

Participant 1: 1st thing that we look at

Participant 1: the second part. Also, part of the indexing strategy is to make sure we're getting like diversity across countries. So we're sort of looking for 7 things.

Karen Gainey: Oh no!

Participant 1: We're also like restructuring our board a little bit to make it a bit smoother for people to be able to find reviewers in a timely way. So there's those sort of things are kind of the priority. And then we.

Participant 1: I guess, have also been working towards increasing the quality of the papers being a new journal. So the 1st

Participant 1: thank you.

Participant 1: We were sending everything out to review, no matter how poorly written it was. And some of them we wouldn't send out to review now, so we sort of increased our desk projections.

Participant 1: So we're sort of looking at all of that stuff at these yearly meetings. But then

Participant 1: there's a few things where the patient, summary guideline might come up. So usually, when we're reviewing kind of what are the article types that we want to offer? Do we need to change that is it working? What we've said? So we sort of as an example, we often get requests from qualitative authors to have a longer word count. So we'd be discussing now we do. We want to allow a longer word, count, or do we want to keep it a bit shorter?

Participant 1: we don't. I haven't had any queries from authors about the plain language summary. So that would really be, I guess, an editorial board

Participant 1: decision about like, do we think this is important enough for us to spend extra time with the authors to get it up to standard and check it against the specific things that we say. So at the moment we kept it quite general.

00:31:56.980 --> 00:31:57.590

Karen Gainey: Hmm.

Participant 1: Yeah.

Participant 1: that would be something we would discuss at an editorial board meeting about whether we want to make it more specific. But then we have to work out. How do we prioritize the papers where we really want to make sure there's a good plain language summary. So that would probably be more

Participant 1: papers that we think are going to get cited a lot potentially get media

Participant 1: and again, that's a little bit part of indexing strategy as well to sort of build, build the profile of the journal. So

Participant 1: because I all volunteer

Participant 1: it's probably not something we would look at enforcing for every single paper. It would probably be certain priority papers, and that would probably be at the editor in chief level rather than the associate editor level.

Karen Gainey: Yep.

Participant 1: Yes.

Participant 1: where we say, oh, this actually looks like a really important paper, if it has consumer kind of relevance.

Participant 1: And what I'm thinking of there is. Could it? Could an article be published in mainstream media about this topic?

Karen Gainey: That makes sense. Yes.

Participant 1: You would want to make sure there's like

Participant 1: a good plain language summary, because otherwise it slows down our whole process. Because if we're sending the paper back for a minor amendment just to work on the plain language summary.

Participant 1: That's potentially delaying the publication of that paper, and we might be in a month where we haven't had any publications, and we really need one published to again work towards that indexing target.

Karen Gainey: That. Okay, that's really helpful. Because again it comes, seems to come back so much to prioritization and thinking of what's the topic of the paper, and how newsworthy it is. And that's also thinking of what's the intended audience, but also thinking of what's the value of that paper in terms of getting it just out there.

00:33:56.528 --> 00:34:07.199

Karen Gainey: So it's it sounds like it's a weighing up of timeliness versus adding this extra feature of a plain language, summary.

Participant 1: Yeah. And I think at this point we kind of

Participant 1: we're happy to check. It's there at the same time as we check, lots of other things are there. But for us to kind of.

Participant 1: you know, it doesn't sound like much, but to copy paste that paragraph into some sort of editing tool, and then to feed back to the authors what they need to do to change it.

Participant 1: This is a job we do unpaid on top of all our other jobs as academics, so to do that for like 5 papers a week, or however many we have.

Participant 1: and that's not many compared to well established journals, it would actually add a significant amount of time.

Participant 1: and then depending on how well the authors are writing.

Participant 1: and if they've had any experience writing in plain language it could take, like several back and forth with the author, because we can't just write it for them. We need them to edit it.

Participant 1: I mean, I guess potentially we could write it for them, and then we would. But we we'd sort of have to put it in manually. Put the suggestion into the letter to them email that to them and then wait for them to respond. So.

Karen Gainey: Hmm.

Participant 1: We do it as a kind of standard email template. Well, we're also working on our email templates. So we have the standard (Publisher)ones at the moment. But it is something that we want to do to put into this, like the invitation to resubmit. So when you make a decision, for, like a minor or major revision, the email that goes out to the authors, I always edit that to say, make sure your resubmission has a plain language summary.

Participant 1: and I refer them to the author guideline, then.

Participant 1: but I'm just trying to think. At what point would I actually check it if I had detailed information in that guideline.

Participant 1: I guess you'd be checking it when it's basically been accepted by the reviewers accepted by the associate editor. And you're doing like a final proof. Read.

00:36:08.570 --> 00:36:18.679

Participant 1: But by that time you're like almost there. So you don't want to like send it back to the author again, just for that. So I guess, for it to be workable. It's got to sort of fit into

Participant 1: the other things that you need to check.

Karen Gainey: Yeah, it. It sounds like it's a logistical

Karen Gainey: dilemma in a way of trying to work it into the workflow.

Participant 1: Hmm! And.

Karen Gainey: And I've I've done, maybe now, maybe 5 or 6 peer reviews and

Karen Gainey: submitted a couple of papers, so I don't have an in-depth understanding of that process, and not having been an editor. But I do understand the delay involved in you get so many. You get a deadline, and it's usually 3 to 4 weeks at each end, and it could blow out to months quite easily, particularly if one party asks for an extension

Karen Gainey: and so if if the deadline, if all you're waiting for is a hundred words, and the literature suggests that authors don't really like writing plain language summaries and find it difficult, then it's possibly a task that will be procrastinated on. I can see from an editorial point of view, that

Karen Gainey: from a that becomes a difficult decision of is that worth waiting for.

Participant 1: Yeah, and it would be

Participant 1: it. I think it would actually take more than one go as well. So sometimes, if they haven't put it in. They didn't have the plain language summary at all in the 1st submission, and then revising a whole heap of comments, and adding the plain language summary into their second version. So then it potentially adds, like a whole 3rd round of revision.

Participant 1: And I mean, sometimes we do send it back for that 3rd round for another minor revision, especially if they haven't got an ethics statement, and the associate editor missed that or something like that.

Participant 1: so there's definitely opportunities where you could like give them more feedback. But

Participant 1: it depends a bit on the week. So if you have like 10 papers that you have to respond to that week which does happen you know you'll you'll be less inclined to spend extra time editing the email template like, you might just want to say, please address these minor revisions. And then the the reviewer comments, and the associate editor comments just come in. So you, as an editor in chief, I don't necessarily revise the email template. I often do, but not always, and less so

00:38:46.520 --> 00:38:48.799

Participant 1: busy. And there's a bit of a banglogue.

Karen Gainey: No, that's actually really helpful, because that's what I want to understand. What goes. What are some of the barriers and your work workload in other aspects of your academic life is a barrier, and that's that's real. So I appreciate you. Sharing that. And I should have said up front that

Karen Gainey: hope you feel free to share anything.

Karen Gainey: any. Every bit of perspective is valuable, positive, and negative. And just because this is my subject area, I take no offense

Karen Gainey: negative that said on on this topic whatsoever. I need to learn more about it, to understand it in more depth. And that's the purpose of these interviews.

Karen Gainey: So I want to just delve just a little bit further in, whether

Karen Gainey: in the peer review process with manuscripts, and if an author submits a pls, whether that goes to peer review with the main manuscript.

Karen Gainey: because I've never seen a plain language summary. But I'm now realizing I've never actually checked. If that journal publishes pls, so I'm just wondering how that works and whether it's part of that package you get.

Participant 1: Yeah, it is. Well again, it depends if they include it in the 1st version. So.

Karen Gainey: Right.

Participant 1: And it depends on the decision. So if it was.

Karen Gainey: Sorry, can I? Just when you say 1st version, you mean the initial submission.

Participant 1: Yeah, into the mail.

Karen Gainey: Portal. Right? Okay?

Participant 1: So if it's in there in the 1st one, it will show up in the Pdf. That the reviewer gets under the abstract.

Participant 1: So sometimes it does get peer reviewed. But we don't.

Participant 1: I can't actually recall a peer reviewer ever actually commenting on the plain language summary. But sometimes the associate editors do like the example that I gave you.

Participant 1: that the grade? 16 one. So oh, yeah, if it

Participant 1: in that 1st submission, it will be there in that kind.

Karen Gainey: No.

00:41:09.220 --> 00:41:11.390

Participant 1: Put together all the files. Pdf.

Karen Gainey: But if it's not there.

Participant 1: Yeah, there's different ways. It can go. So it's not always peer reviewed, because sometimes.

Karen Gainey: We just.

Participant 1: Ask for it to be added on after the reviewers are happy with the main paper.

Karen Gainey: Hmm.

Participant 1: So sometimes it might be just. The editor in chief sees it sometimes it might be the editor in chief and the associate editor. Sometimes it might be the reviewers as well, but it will vary, depending on

Participant 1: which kind of direction the paper goes.

Karen Gainey: Yeah, yeah.

Karen Gainey: Do you have guidelines for peer review, viewer, journal.

Participant 1: There's just general ones. So that (Publisher)has general ones. And we don't have any that are specific for our journal. We have

Participant 1: thought about that as well. But it's not something that we've implemented yet.

Karen Gainey: Okay.

Karen Gainey: so would I be right in saying, would pls be included in those journals? Do you know, in those guidelines from (Publisher).

Participant 1: Oh, yeah, I don't think they would be in the (Publisher)ones. So there's like

Participant 1: on our website. It just has like a link to

Participant 1: like a general kind of understanding the peer review process.

Participant 1: yeah, I haven't actually looked at those in detail.

Participant 1: and we do get very variable peer review. So some of them are really detailed. Some of them are less detailed. If we get

Participant 1: 2 really not detailed ones, we tend to add a 3rd reviewer, what? Rather than communicating back to those reviewers, can you write the review in this certain way?

00:43:01.139 --> 00:43:08.070

Participant 1: But yeah, that's actually something that I haven't thought about that much having peer review guidelines

Participant 1: that are specific to the journal.

Participant 1: but it is something that we could. We could do.

Karen Gainey: Hmm!

Karen Gainey: Maybe maybe for the future. As a as an idea.

Karen Gainey: All right. This is great. We're we're almost.

Karen Gainey: We're almost there.

Karen Gainey: So that's given me a really good idea of, I guess how things are operating or have been operating since you've been in operation.

Karen Gainey: Oh, I just want to touch on something. We we've spoken a little bit, but I want to delve a little bit more into access.

Karen Gainey: So, thinking of making pls. She was speaking about how your pls

Karen Gainey: and and the articles for your journal could

Karen Gainey: be targeted at quite a range of different audiences. So policymakers, health practitioners, the general public, and so forth.

Karen Gainey: So thinking of the idea of pls as being accessible to to readers. So you mentioned you're completely open access at the moment so, or any pls published would be open access.

Karen Gainey: And you're mentioning down the down the track. Once you're indexed moving to a more subscription based model.

Participant 1: No, it will. It will stay open access. But.

Karen Gainey: Stay over next.

Participant 1: The way that authors would pay, the fee might change, so.

Karen Gainey: Right.

Participant 1: Yeah, there's kind of a bit of a shift in how open access works at the moment. So.

Karen Gainey: Okay.

Participant 1: It used to be that individual authors just had to find the money somewhere. Sometimes the institutions would might give it to them. Sometimes they might pay it out of grants. But now it's sort of shifting to having like an institutional agreement. So the University of Sydney has that full list.

00:45:18.460 --> 00:45:18.980

Karen Gainey: Hmm.

Participant 1: Where, you know, we cover all of these journals. Sometimes they cover a whole publisher. So, (Publisher). So if there's organizations that cover all of (Publisher). That will include our journal. So that's just what I meant by subscription model is like more organizational ones.

Karen Gainey: Gotcha. So does that mean? The papers and pls would still be open access.

Karen Gainey: Gotcha. Okay, cool.

Karen Gainey: So I'm just thinking when you're mentioning the possible delays in the submission process. For example, if an author doesn't write a pls and thinking about the content of a paper that discussion we were having about timeliness and maybe prioritizing an

Karen Gainey: getting out a paper that might be really relevant for the media, or just wanting to get it out there and available, and it doesn't have a pls attached making the editorial decision to not wait for a pls or send it back just for a pls.

Karen Gainey: What? What some

Karen Gainey: publishers have done. I'm pretty sure it's done sorry, Sage. Have on some journals is a separate

Karen Gainey: section on the web page for just pls, and it's searchable if you're familiar with the Cochrane database of systematic reviews where you can search their pls with keywords. And such. What are your thoughts on that system that might

Karen Gainey: be useful for just housing pls in a separate section?

Participant 1: Yeah, I think that's it's not something I've thought about for our journal. But I have found that really useful for the Cochrane Reviews, cause. I

Participant 1: especially during Covid people, knew I worked in public health, and I was getting asked a lot just by my friends and family about like information on certain things, so I was often actually sending them the plain language version of the Cochrane Reviews.

Karen Gainey: Oh, great!

Participant 1: And so that's actually something that I have used in my like, I guess more personal life.

Participant 1: where I've been wanting to help someone understand an issue. So I think that would be actually, really useful.

00:47:51.480 --> 00:47:54.029

Participant 1: Yeah, yeah, I think that's a good idea.

Karen Gainey: Thinking of that pls potentially being able to be written at a later date to the manuscript itself.

Karen Gainey: So it being separate to not hindering the publication of the main.

Participant 1: Manuscript.

Participant 1: So as part.

Participant 1: I guess you just have to work. I don't know how that works with Cochrane like if the authors have to approve it? Or do you know.

Karen Gainey: I haven't done a Cochrane systematic review.

Karen Gainey: I've only peer reviewed, so I'm not

Karen Gainey: sure but I think if they do.

Participant 1: Yeah. So I guess it would just be. It would be an option to sort of go back to the authors at the end of the year or something and say, thanks for publishing with us. We'd like to make a

Participant 1: a plain language version available. That's like, potentially longer than what they would have written. Yeah.

Karen Gainey: When you.

Participant 1: Another option to actually have. Again, it depends on resources and time. So if it was something that a publisher felt strongly about, they might potentially resource that for their journals and say, we're gonna identify the 5 most public relevant papers from the journal for the year and write plain language summaries of that, and then try to get media that links back to the original article. And then I'm not sure what the

Participant 1: I guess it would depend on the contract that the authors sign whether they would have to approve it or not.

Karen Gainey: Yeah, that's an interesting point, because it speaks to a few things. And

Karen Gainey: I'm not sure if this is what you meant. But I wasn't suggesting using a Cochrane template or writing a pls as long as Cochrane, but still using your guidelines, but just not having it hold up the publication of your.

Participant 1: Oh, my goodness, yeah, yeah.

00:49:47.860 --> 00:49:52.090

Karen Gainey: But actually be able to do that instead of getting the authors to do it.

Participant 1: Yes.

Karen Gainey: Still the authors, but it could be

Karen Gainey: done in a way that's more time effective or not having to be restricted by the time.

Karen Gainey: If if you know what I mean getting them.

Participant 1: At the time of the paper.

Karen Gainey: To that. Yeah, and

Karen Gainey: fit in to a different timescale. That's maybe a quieter time, or, as you say.

Karen Gainey: a certain time of year a couple of times a year.

Karen Gainey: do do a bunch. But also the thought of have you given any thought to using pls? Now, I'm thinking, obviously a lot of your papers are media

Karen Gainey: attractive of, or have any authors that you know of, use their pls and put them on social media? Or do you see any sort of area for the use of pls?

Participant 1: Yes, sir, I Hi!

Participant 1: Actually, I do use it for that. So I run the social media accounts for the journal at the moment, although we're about to get a social media manager, so I will be happy.

Karen Gainey: Okay.

Participant 1: We're gonna have discussions in them about it. Better. I do use the plain language summary for that. So I use that instead of the abstract and usually they're still well, they're still too long, for, like an X or Twitter post, we're still sort of working out what platforms we're going to use to promote the journal, because X is a bit weird now, but.

Karen Gainey: Yeah, right.

Participant 1: But I use like LinkedIn, for like a lot of academic stuff, but not the journal yet. But we might.

Karen Gainey: Yep.

Participant 1: Do do that in future where there's a bit more space. Because in a LinkedIn post me

Participant 1: the 100 word summary quite easily.

Participant 1: So yeah, I definitely have used them for social media.

00:51:52.800 --> 00:51:54.240

Participant 1: As a way to.

Karen Gainey: Good.

Participant 1: Tweet.

Participant 1: I mean, because it's a new journal. And we were just using X. It doesn't have like a huge following. It's not too bad for a new journal, but it's not exactly like the most exciting account for people to follow, so usually I promote it on there and then I repost it on my academic account. If.

Karen Gainey: Okay.

Participant 1: Only if it's kind of relevant to my own research area. So I don't re promote every single one.

Participant 1: But yeah, I definitely have found that it's useful as a kind of shortcut for writing the social media post, because it's already in plainer language than an abstract.

Participant 1: at least to some extent. And it's kind of usually written in a way that's kinda easy to break up into a few posts. If you've got a a word count limit.

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

Participant 1: Yes, that is actually the main thing. I have used them for.

Karen Gainey: Great. Do you know if any of the authors have done that.

Participant 1: No, I haven't

Participant 1: again, cause we've just been sort of all doing this as volunteers. So far we haven't.

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

Participant 1: You know, gone to the effort of trying to find the authors on the social media accounts often can't find them. I do usually search for the corresponding author. But often it's not obvious which one it is if they're even on it.

Participant 1: But when we've got a little bit more support for social media. That's probably

Participant 1: we would do to like tag the author in, and then hopefully, they could reuse it.

Karen Gainey: Fantastic. Yeah, no. I just thought they might have tagged you in.

Participant 1: Yeah, not yet. They might not be even be on Twitter. I don't know.

Karen Gainey: Yeah, who knows? All right. No, that's great.

Karen Gainey: I correct me if I'm wrong. But I don't think your journal offers any any other formats other than tech space at the moment for pls is like graphical or video is that that's right?

00:53:42.996 --> 00:53:47.660

Participant 1: Actually. So the (Publisher)submission

Participant 1: system does have a default thing for graphical, abstract, graphical. I think it's graphic.

Participant 1: Yeah.

Karen Gainey: Yeah, you've got me on that

Participant 1: But I we've never had a submission with it.

Karen Gainey: Okay.

Participant 1: You could. Yeah.

Karen Gainey: You could. Okay, but you haven't.

Participant 1: Had anything else?

Karen Gainey: Yeah, I.

Participant 1: And from an author perspective. So I know, like Jmir, the E Health Journal.

Participant 1: they like require an image.

Participant 1: and I think they also even require like a social media or a post might be optional. I can't remember, but the image is really annoying, because by the time you, as an author. You're like, Yeah, it's finally published. And you do the copy editing.

Participant 1: You just want to publish. You don't want to necessarily spend time like finding a copyright free image, and then filling out the form. To confirm that you have the rights to use the image. So I often at that point would just be like, you can just use whatever image you want, and sometimes I haven't liked the image that they've chosen, which was

Participant 1: my fault for not taking the time. But I feel like that's how the authors often approach those kind of extra things like it's a lower priority.

Participant 1: and probably the same with the plain language. Summary is just as you said, like an annoying extra thing. They have to do that they're not very good at, and it takes time.

Karen Gainey: Yeah, yeah. I mean, I know, Wiley offer outsourcing options for

Karen Gainey: writing pls. So rather than something. And it's across most of their journals that when you go to their author guidelines, they don't have their own internal guidelines. They have a link to like editing services and proofreading services. One of them is that you can pay a couple \$100 for someone to write your pls.

00:55:46.138 --> 00:55:54.031

Karen Gainey: And I can't see what guidelines they use, because you have to pay first, st but assuming it's standardized

Karen Gainey: and I don't know how it works, whether they get your at what stage manuscript they base it on the final or the initial submission, and how that all works. But is that something you would consider for your journal, or a 3rd party.

Participant 1: Yeah, I mean, (Publisher)does offer editing services which are usually pre submission. So I'm just having a look now. So they have

Participant 1: so they have that for English language editing, and we have on occasion suggested that authors use that

Participant 1: And then it says they also can create research promotion materials. So that includes infographics, video abstracts, lay summaries and graphical abstracts. So they do actually have (Publisher)offers that service across the board.

Participant 1: How much it's used I would have no idea.

Participant 1: but it does have that on our on our website.

Karen Gainey: Yeah, okay.

Karen Gainey: I must have missed that.

Participant 1: Yeah, if you go into the.

Karen Gainey: Think, that.

Participant 1: Yeah, I can put it in the chat. So it's in our.

Karen Gainey: Right.

Participant 1: It is in our kind of instructions for authors, and there's a link.

Karen Gainey: Saying that I apologise.

Participant 1: It comes down.

Karen Gainey: Useful.

Participant 1: I'll just put the link to the actual.

Participant 1: But this is our journal's author guidelines

Participant 1: And then the link to the is quite far down. So it's like.

00:57:30.550 --> 00:57:35.739

Participant 1: after it talks about format free submission. Then it talks about editing services

Participant 1: with a link to another website. That kind of go. I guess that would give you the pricing and stuff. If you wanna look at that.

Karen Gainey: Right. Thanks. Carissa.

Participant 1: No worries. So yeah, I actually haven't even looked at that in detail before, like I knew that they did the English language editing.

Karen Gainey: Hmm, yeah.

Participant 1: I wouldn't imagine that many authors would take that up unless they had a really high profile paper that they wanted to kind of promote in.

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

Participant 1: Yeah.

Karen Gainey: Yeah, I've not spoken to anyone who's used any any service like that. So I was interested. If you'd come. Had anything come back through that.

Participant 1: Awesome.

Karen Gainey: Or whether you'd know.

Participant 1: Also because our journal is new, it's not gonna get like there are

Participant 1: really big papers at this point.

Participant 1: It's getting better the quality over time. But

Participant 1: It's not the sort of thing. It's not the sort of journal where you would pay extra to do lots of media promotion. I don't think, because if you had a really big media worthy study, you'd probably be trying for a higher impact journal or an indexed journal.

Karen Gainey: I think in 5 years you're going to be huge.

Participant 1: Maybe we'll see.

Karen Gainey: So because.

Participant 1: Summaries.

Karen Gainey: The target and plain language summaries will be the key.

Participant 1: No.

Karen Gainey: Be your differentiator.

Participant 1: Well they could be. It'll be interesting to see actually what this asset the new social media role.

00:58:56.410 --> 00:58:57.319

Karen Gainey: Yeah. That'll be.

Participant 1: They might come up with some other formats to try to make it understandable as well. So.

Karen Gainey: Yeah, yeah, yeah, I'll be following it really in with a lot of interest. So I know we're we're

Karen Gainey: at the end. I've I've just got a couple more questions looking to the future. If you've got another 5 min or so.

Participant 1: Yeah, that sounds okay.

Karen Gainey: Yeah, I just want to talk more to the future and

Karen Gainey: to where pls might go. And one of the hot topics is the use of AI tools? Is that? Yeah? I just want to hear your thoughts on the use of AI tools with pls, if that's something you've thought about.

Participant 1: It's not something I've thought about, but it is well, I have thought about it in relation to other things, but not in relation to plain language summaries.

Participant 1: but I think it's quite good at doing that. So if you put a clinical sort of abstract in and say, rewrite this for a kid in grade 8. It actually does a pretty good job like you obviously have to check it for accuracy.

Participant 1: But in terms we. I've been thinking about this in terms of the Shell editor, because we're working.

Karen Gainey: Yes.

Participant 1: Show editor next. And when Chat Gpt came out, we thought, Oh, okay, this is gonna become obsolete because I can basically do this for you. Now.

Participant 1: In a way that's a good thing for plain language summaries in that. If authors have to do it, they probably are going to increasingly. Just be using AI to quickly write it for them, and it's probably going to be a lot better than what they would have written themselves if they haven't done it before.

Participant 1: So yeah, actually, that would be a really, I had not even thought of that, but that

Participant 1: I just have to check.

Participant 1: So if you were to put the abstract into an AI tool, that's not the final published abstract. Technically.

01:00:54.990 --> 01:01:01.029

Participant 1: you don't own that yet. If you're the editor, so it would have to be the author that doesn't.

Karen Gainey: Yes, yeah, that's that's right. It would depend. At what stage of the submission process?

Participant 1: Sweet.

Karen Gainey: Can we.

Participant 1: If the if so, if the publisher owns the copyright for the final version, I guess the publisher could then use that the published version

Participant 1: to come up with like a plain language version using AI, and I guess the other way that could go is that the AI tools are getting better at doing images. They're still pretty bad, but

Karen Gainey: Bye.

Participant 1: You could potentially use it to create like a supporting image in the future as well.

Karen Gainey: That's an interesting idea.

Karen Gainey: So maybe so, I guess that my follow up question was which which is mute. But but maybe something to think about is

Karen Gainey: is guidelines, is writing guidelines. I have seen in some general author guidelines mainly around citations using AI and needing to cite it correctly. So I'm wondering how author guidelines might develop in general and with pls specifically, if AI tools are going to be may or are likely to be used

Karen Gainey: either, as a suggestion to use an AI tool to prompt authors to include an AI tool like we would a readability

Karen Gainey: tool.

Participant 1: Hmm.

Karen Gainey: Or in another way, having them in there.

Participant 1: Yeah, like the publishers all have their policies around ais as authors, so I guess it would also depend, if the plain language summary counts

Participant 1: as part of the paper, or it's a separate thing, because basically, if they to do the same language summary, and it's part of their submission.

01:02:55.030 --> 01:02:55.350

Karen Gainey: I know.

Participant 1: We do need to acknowledge the AI tool has been used which they

Participant 1: may or may not want to do for the rest of their paper. So

Participant 1: yeah, I'm not sure how. What type of that makes sense?

Participant 1: This would say about that but it would be.

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

Participant 1: Something that we could.

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

Participant 1: With them and see see what their policy is, because I'm sure they're discussing it a lot, or the publishers.

Karen Gainey: Yeah, it's it's something. I often wonder

Karen Gainey: will the tools emerge before the guidelines?

Karen Gainey: which often happens? So that's just why I'm curious. If if you'd heard any about it.

Participant 1: More in relation to whether people were using AI to write the paper itself. I haven't heard of anyone.

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

Participant 1: Any issues around sign language summaries, specifically.

Karen Gainey: There was a lot of talk last year at I was around October last year at Cochrane, the colloquium about AI as a tool to write summaries like this. Just to get them out there,

Karen Gainey: and people for and against, but

Karen Gainey: a lot of 4, in the sense that at least it's going to increase the the productivity.

Participant 1: No.

Karen Gainey: As you've said before, it still needs real person, probably author or editorial input just to check it

Karen Gainey: useful. So it's an interesting area. So I guess, just wrapping up. What do you think is the future for plain language? Summaries in health and medical publishing.

01:04:42.690 --> 01:04:44.721

Participant 1: Yes, that's the question, isn't it?

Karen Gainey: Either in general or for your journal in particular.

Karen Gainey: Yeah, I mean, you've given me really a lot to think about, because there definitely things that well, sorry.

Participant 1: Well, I'll add it to our list of things. But

Participant 1: yeah, I think you'll find, especially if you're dealing with editors who don't have as much experience with health literacy and consumers that it's just going to be way down the list of other things that they have to do. So, anything that can automate that process such as using AI or doing like those post production processes so that won't slow down. The actual paper.

Participant 1: Publication, I think, is probably the way to go to try to come up with like systems to do it. That don't

Participant 1: put more time burden on voluntary editorial boards. Basically.

Karen Gainey: Yeah, yeah.

Karen Gainey: yeah, I feel like, that's something you've really helped highlight for me. Because in my world, plain language, summaries are just so super super important, and they be all and end all. But you've really helped me understand where they fit from an editorial point of view. So I really appreciate that that's super helpful, and the decisions that

Karen Gainey: come into play and the barriers that exist.

Karen Gainey: So that's been really helpful.

Karen Gainey: is there anything else you wanted to cover anything we might have missed in terms of barriers or facilitators around the publishing or dissemination of pls.

Participant 1: Yeah, I guess just the only other thing is, oh, you've sort of touched on this actually is like just the authors skills to do. It is probably not there, for most fields.

Karen Gainey: Hmm.

Participant 1: But also the associate also the editorial board. So not many editorial boards have

Participant 1: developed health efficacy, editing tools. So I think.

Karen Gainey: Right gotcha.

Participant 1: Is probably in a bit of a unique position in.

Karen Gainey: Oh, man!

01:06:43.310 --> 01:06:46.919

Participant 1: We know quite a lot about this. So it is.

Participant 1: Think about in more detail, because we've got the actual expertise to do it. Well, we just have to prioritize it and fit it into these bigger systems. But I think also, the the your big target is actually the publishers, even more so, maybe, than the editorial boards, because they have

Participant 1: access to those the systems that run the journals, because if they put it in as a standard thing, and they are doing the AI integration in a way that's really easy. They could really speed up that process a lot.

Karen Gainey: Yeah, it sounds like.

Karen Gainey: And that's 1 of the things I wanted to understand is how many decisions are made at the publishing level versus the journal level.

Karen Gainey: And I assume it's going to vary between publishers and between journals. But it's just kind of understanding those nuances, and also what decisions are made, and how much autonomy journals are given, and on what sort of topics, and how often things are reviewed, and that sort of thing. So you've been really helpful.

Karen Gainey: In that area.

Karen Gainey: So.

Participant 1: Good. Well, good luck with your

Participant 1: actually very interesting topic. I'm gonna think about this a lot. So thank you. I'll probably come back to you at some point.