

10

00:03:07.760 --> 00:03:16.049

Karen Gainey: Okay. Terrific. Well, thank you for agreeing to be part of the study. I really appreciate it.

11

00:03:17.350 --> 00:03:35.310

Karen Gainey: I'm really interested in your journal in particular. So there's a few aspects that I'd really love to hear about. So I've really been looking forward to this interview. So I know it's a little while since you replied to the

12

00:03:35.500 --> 00:04:02.929

Karen Gainey: to the materials. So I just wanted to. Well, I guess first, st before we we jump in, I just wanted to as a reminder. We're recording this interview and only saving the audio and I've got Zoom automatically transcribing the interview for me. But I won't be saving anything from the chat. If there's anything in there or any video

13

00:04:03.040 --> 00:04:03.600

Karen Gainey: today.

14

00:04:03.600 --> 00:04:04.489

Participant 3: No worries just fine.

15

00:04:04.490 --> 00:04:09.590

Karen Gainey: Audio, and I'll de-identify everything as well.

16

00:04:09.890 --> 00:04:10.920

Participant 3: Okay. Sounds good.

17

00:04:11.542 --> 00:04:13.408

Karen Gainey: Including your journal,

18

00:04:14.160 --> 00:04:34.200

Karen Gainey: and anything else, and as well give you an opportunity at the end. If you'd like to have a look at the Transcript and make any comments, or, if you feel anything, might need some clarification, you're welcome to get a copy of the Transcript and return that to me as well.

19

00:04:34.400 --> 00:04:37.790

Participant 3: Sure that's fine. I I don't think I'll need to, but that's fine. Yeah.

20

00:04:38.080 --> 00:04:47.378

Karen Gainey: Yeah, no trouble at all. So I just just wanted to quickly run over. Why, I'm conducting the interviews and what the study's about

21

00:04:47.910 --> 00:05:06.999

Karen Gainey: So I'm really just looking for your perspectives on the aeroplane language summaries or similar. This is the last study in my Phd. And my previous studies, I guess, have all built to this point. I've looked at the guidelines from

22

00:05:07.140 --> 00:05:31.190

Karen Gainey: health and medical journals to see what is out there for authors to use. And my recent study that's just been submitted has been, was a series of semi-structured interviews with consumers who read plain language summaries to get their thoughts on what they like, don't like what they think works, or would be the ideal.

23

00:05:31.190 --> 00:05:31.710

Participant 3: Interesting.

24

00:05:31.710 --> 00:05:32.640

Karen Gainey: Link, summary.

25

00:05:33.385 --> 00:05:34.130

Participant 3: Hmm.

26

00:05:34.130 --> 00:05:53.339

Karen Gainey: That was super interesting and revealing. So I've taken all of that and developed a series of, I guess topics and some questions. So I want to kind of get an idea of. We know what's out there. We know what people want. Now, we want to get a sense of what's realistic, and how things work at the journal level

27

00:05:53.340 --> 00:06:05.500

Karen Gainey: to understand the decisions, what are the factors that go into those decisions? Any barriers, facilitators in the publication or dissemination of

28

00:06:05.500 --> 00:06:11.549

Karen Gainey: of summaries for a general audience, and and those sort of things from your perspective.

29

00:06:11.750 --> 00:06:16.990

Karen Gainey: So it could be for the journal you're with. Or

30

00:06:17.200 --> 00:06:24.029

Karen Gainey: previous experience doesn't have to be just limited to the

31

00:06:25.050 --> 00:06:27.530

Karen Gainey: to the (journal) could be.

32

00:06:27.530 --> 00:06:32.879

Participant 3: Yeah, yeah, well, I do have experience. When I worked at (journal Y), we kind of.

33

00:06:32.880 --> 00:06:33.750

Karen Gainey: Oh, great!

34

00:06:33.750 --> 00:06:43.820

Participant 3: Right there, so I can. I can talk. That's probably where I have the most experience. But that was that was from a while back, so I can definitely kind of tell you why we did that and what the process was, etc.

35

00:06:44.220 --> 00:06:49.749

Karen Gainey: Brilliant. Yeah, great. All right. Did you have any questions or concerns.

36

00:06:49.750 --> 00:06:53.879

Participant 3: Oh, no, it's not just no sounds great, really interested in the project. So yeah.

37

00:06:54.260 --> 00:07:11.390

Karen Gainey: All right. We'll kick it off all right, just if we can just start. I want to just get an idea about your role as an editor. So if you just tell me a little bit about your role and your experience with plain language, summaries, or similar.

38

00:07:11.670 --> 00:07:37.277

Participant 3: Yeah. Well, I'll give you a quick summary of my background. So I trained as a doctor originally long time ago, and then I did a Phd. And then I ended up in publishing work. I worked at the (journal Z) for about 5 years, and then went to work at plus medicine. So I was one of the editors that started (journal) back in 2,004, and one of the things we actually did there was to have a specific

39

00:07:37.620 --> 00:07:49.914

Participant 3: project for what we call we call them editors summaries at the time. Now they've changed, now they're not, and they were written by in-house editors like me. And that was a really cool part of of what we did early on

40

00:07:50.290 --> 00:08:15.629

Participant 3: Since then I worked at plus for about 10 years. Then I've been in pub. I worked in open access policy after I moved to Australia, and now I'm at the (journal). Which I've been there for just under 2 years, and we have we do have a we have a box which I wouldn't kind of go as far as saying it's really it's not what I would like to see as a plain language, you know, kind of extensive, plain language summary, but it does kind.

41

00:08:15.630 --> 00:08:15.970

Karen Gainey: And have.

42

00:08:15.970 --> 00:08:36.709

Participant 3: Highlights. So yeah, so those are the 2 journals where I've had most experience, the (journal Z) where I was. I don't believe we ever had anything equivalent to that, certainly, back when I was working there. So my experience starts at plus medicine. And then, you know, we are actually looking at what we might do at the (journal). But we haven't made any changes since I started.

43

00:08:37.490 --> 00:08:45.939

Karen Gainey: Okay. Oh, that'd be. It'll be interesting. Yeah, I noticed you've got I think it's called a summary box with questions to answer.

44

00:08:45.940 --> 00:08:47.940

Participant 3: That's right. Yeah, yeah.

45

00:08:48.310 --> 00:08:49.454

Karen Gainey: Terrific.

46

00:08:50.880 --> 00:08:58.680

Karen Gainey: so that's 1 of the reasons I was interested in talking to you, because it's not a say traditional, plain language, summary as such.

47

00:08:59.800 --> 00:09:15.699

Karen Gainey: and the audience seems to be quite varied. So I want to trying to drill down into the factors that might lead to if if well, what I'm trying to understand. I think it seemed to vary between journals is the relationship between the journal and the publisher.

48

00:09:16.370 --> 00:09:17.989

Participant 3: Okay, well, maybe.

49

00:09:17.990 --> 00:09:20.270

Karen Gainey: Well, and and how that works is.

50

00:09:20.270 --> 00:09:38.404

Participant 3: Yeah. Well, maybe I can tell you a bit about the (journal), because actually, that's probably relevant to this. So so the (journal) is owned by the (Association). We're their

journal, but they have no, they have absolutely no input into the content of the journal editorial decision making. We?

51

00:09:38.780 --> 00:10:05.129

Participant 3: we're published by and all we we sit within a publishing company called the X Publishing Company, which really only publishes the (journal) plus has a data arm, and again, has no input into what we do. But our distributor is (Publisher). And again, but basically we're not a (Publisher) journal, as it were, that we. They provide publishing services to us. And we have a contract with them. So we're not owned by them.

52

00:10:05.230 --> 00:10:23.660

Participant 3: They don't have any rights over our content. They don't have any rights over what goes into the journal. They're purely a distributor. They're a bit like a you know. You know they're a distributor. Basically, they're not have they provide. They provide distribution services for us, and they do

53

00:10:23.981 --> 00:10:37.820

Participant 3: the typesetting, for example. But they don't do any copy editing. They don't provide any input into the content of all the language of the journal. So any decisions that our decision around the plain language summary is purely at the (journal) level.

54

00:10:39.130 --> 00:10:49.117

Karen Gainey: That's great. I'm glad you clarified that cause. I I did note that there was a connection with (Publisher), but I did also know you were connected to the society.

55

00:10:49.910 --> 00:10:52.600

Karen Gainey: so I wasn't sure what that relationship.

56

00:10:53.047 --> 00:10:57.070

Participant 3: It's not obvious at all. So that's what. Yeah.

57

00:10:57.070 --> 00:11:13.870

Karen Gainey: And that's, I think, really important, because that seems to have been speaking to other people. Last person I spoke to had a similar similar relationship with (Publisher) and it seems to have a bigger big impact. The nature of that relationship with the public.

58

00:11:13.870 --> 00:11:14.990

Karen Gainey: Yeah, I'll watch.

59

00:11:15.340 --> 00:11:36.300

Participant 3: You do it. Very much depends on what the relationship with. So though I mean so, for example, these big publishers, some of them they some of these journals? They own some of them. They you know, have quite a lot of involvement in this sort of how the processes happen, and then some like us, they simply provide, you know, a distribution service.

60

00:11:36.900 --> 00:11:47.030

Karen Gainey: Yeah, yeah, great. That's that's good to know. I didn't realize it was such a a commonplace occurrence that that relationship.

61

00:11:47.030 --> 00:11:47.490

Participant 3: Yeah.

62

00:11:47.490 --> 00:11:51.768

Karen Gainey: Yeah, that's really helpful. Appreciate that.

63

00:11:52.510 --> 00:11:58.090

Karen Gainey: So apologies if I use the word pls or plain language summary, I do

64

00:11:58.860 --> 00:12:10.964

Karen Gainey: the type that you have. But I guess, knowing that you worked at a plus thinking of of their variation as well. So I kind of use that term generically, if that's okay. Yeah.

65

00:12:11.450 --> 00:12:25.539

Karen Gainey: So I guess just wanting to understand when it comes to the decisions. If I know you run only at the (journal) for a couple of years. But do you know.

66

00:12:26.560 --> 00:12:28.469

Karen Gainey: just thinking of

67

00:12:28.880 --> 00:12:44.680

Karen Gainey: the decisions, or who where the decisions might have come in, how it's structured? You know the format, the content, the length, and those sort of aspects.

68

00:12:44.680 --> 00:12:58.899

Participant 3: Yeah. So I think I mean, I actually haven't looked back to see how long the (journal) has had these kind of this sort of summary box, for it predates me by quite some time the discussion around

69

00:12:58.900 --> 00:13:19.969

Participant 3: so we have quite strict guidelines for how it should be written. But one of our one of the things I would say that we know is that actually, authors are really bad at writing these things. And when I worked at plus. We knew that extremely well. So actually, maybe just want, I'll take one step back. I think there are 2 critical parts to the sort of the I guess the

70

00:13:20.420 --> 00:13:38.840

Participant 3: the most important parts, I think, for the public for the journal are the abstract and the plain language summary, and I've always been very strong on structured abstracts. I think they are incredibly important. And when they're done well, actually, they can almost serve like a plain language, summary to some extent if they're written

71

00:13:39.200 --> 00:14:05.190

Participant 3: tightly and correctly, and you know, in language that is kind of accessible, but the same. But what we do know is that people get quite put off by just numbers and sort of stats in in abstracts. And so that's that's the function that I think the plain language survey structure, that plain language, summary kind of provides, but at the same time it has to be written written tightly. It has to be kind of has to be sort of.

72

00:14:05.190 --> 00:14:29.660

Participant 3: you know, not technical language, but has to be correct language. And the problem, of course, that we really have is that it is even the plain language summaries that we do. We've and we've discussed this are still aimed at, and will still target an audience that is probably, you know, higher than the average reading age of most Australians, for example. And I don't think there's very much that we can do about that

73

00:14:29.770 --> 00:14:42.140

Participant 3: in the context that we write them at the moment, so we have discussed them since I started quite a few times, and you know I had. I have a team under me, and we had the discussion like, what do we think about these? Do we think they're valuable?

74

00:14:42.500 --> 00:15:09.120

Participant 3: The people who primarily get them into their final form are our structural editors. So we have a team of structural editors, and they find that they nearly always have to rewrite them quite substantially, because the authors, you know, they provide us with one, but it's often, you know, not very well written, or it kind of is too technical. So we, one of our team will rewrite it into a form that we think is kind of the most accessible.

75

00:15:09.568 --> 00:15:13.891

Participant 3: Do are the headings that we have there the right ones? I don't know. But

76

00:15:14.290 --> 00:15:22.820

Participant 3: you know, we've got a whole. I've got a whole process of things that I'm doing at the moment, and this serves a function. So we've decided to leave them as they are at the moment.

77

00:15:24.310 --> 00:15:25.150

Participant 3: What what

78

00:15:25.610 --> 00:15:33.789

Participant 3: tell you is, how many people read that as opposed to other parts of the article, I mean. I wish I could, but I don't know that yet.

79

00:15:33.790 --> 00:15:35.600

Karen Gainey: That would be so interesting, wouldn't it?

80

00:15:35.600 --> 00:15:54.890

Participant 3: Yeah. Yeah. And look, I mean, whilst I'm talking to you, one of the things that we have considered is like, how do we distribute these, the articles on social media. For example, you could imagine that perhaps a box with that with the summary, and it might actually be quite useful little social media tile. But we don't use. We don't do that routinely. At this point.

81

00:15:55.390 --> 00:15:59.770

Karen Gainey: Yeah, yep, understood. But you're thinking, is that something you're thinking about?

82

00:15:59.770 --> 00:16:00.090

Participant 3: Yeah.

83

00:16:00.090 --> 00:16:00.480

Karen Gainey: This, call.

84

00:16:00.480 --> 00:16:29.409

Participant 3: Yeah. So we're going through a process at the journal where we're rethinking our entire web presence. I would really like us to move to even having to having, you know, video summaries to having visual summaries like the (journal). So the (journal Z). Does for their for their articles, which I think are great, but you know, for all of these things, it takes time to do them, and this is one of the things I learned when I was at plus medicine we haven't. We had an idea we had 3 very experienced editors.

85

00:16:29.410 --> 00:16:39.559

Participant 3: and we thought, how hard can these be to write? They're really hard to write. I estimate it took us. It could take anything from 3 to 5 h to write one. Well.

86

00:16:40.162 --> 00:16:44.870

Participant 3: and sometimes you know, a lot longer. So they're not trivial to do.

87

00:16:45.810 --> 00:16:48.995

Karen Gainey: Yeah, I think you've hit on the

88

00:16:49.780 --> 00:16:57.210

Karen Gainey: the common thread. I'm finding that the challenges are with what the journal is getting from the authors.

89

00:16:57.210 --> 00:16:57.550

Participant 3: Yeah.

90

00:16:57.550 --> 00:17:14.700

Karen Gainey: And then it's just decision what to do with that product. You're getting. So it sounds like you're at your end. You're doing quite a lot. What are the main issues that the copy editors do? You have a sense of the main issues they're finding with

91

00:17:14.700 --> 00:17:31.619

Karen Gainey: the summaries they're getting from authors. Is it just too much jargon? Are they just not suitable language in general? Too much, I guess. Too much medical jargon, or just the complex, too much complex language, or just.

92

00:17:32.790 --> 00:17:33.110

Participant 3: Yes.

93

00:17:33.110 --> 00:17:36.460

Karen Gainey: The way they're presented. The information is useful.

94

00:17:36.650 --> 00:18:02.250

Participant 3: Well, we give them the headings. So in our author instructions, we say, these are the headings you have to use, and people do usually use those. I would say it's usually too much complex language, but also sometimes it's not not picking out the critical point. So

you know, one of the things that our structural editors do, and they do more than just correcting typos and such like. They do. Quite extensive editing of the papers

95

00:18:02.250 --> 00:18:17.490

Participant 3: is, they will also make sure that, for example, the abstract fully reflects the content of the paper, and the same is true for the plain language, so have they, you know. If, for example, the authors I mean, you hope they don't have, they're not going to point out mistakes, but what they're not going to.

96

00:18:17.490 --> 00:18:29.639

Participant 3: You hope that you hope there isn't a mistake in the plain language summary, but, for example, they might not. You know, say what the the key finding is. And so that's something that the structural editors will often change.

97

00:18:30.560 --> 00:18:42.900

Karen Gainey: Gotcha. Okay, that's that's really interesting. That's actually, when I spoke to people, that was one of the things they said, though they really wanted was the kind of what's in it for me or the bottom line that.

98

00:18:42.900 --> 00:18:43.889

Participant 3: Not yet. Yeah.

99

00:18:43.890 --> 00:18:44.700

Karen Gainey: Information,

100

00:18:46.060 --> 00:19:09.120

Participant 3: That's interesting, because that's 1 of the things I have thought about is that you know we have the headings we have now is the known, the new, and the implications. And we have considered, like the last picture, what does it mean for a patient? But the problem that we have is that we have papers where that they have no relevance to patients, for example, that there'll be policy papers or whatever. So you have to think

101

00:19:09.840 --> 00:19:16.050

Participant 3: just for ease. The headings have to cover a whole range of scenarios.

102

00:19:16.510 --> 00:19:26.930

Karen Gainey: Yeah. Yeah. And that's yeah. One of the challenges, isn't it? So are they? Are they mandatory this summer?

103

00:19:26.930 --> 00:19:28.940

Participant 3: Research papers for research papers.

104

00:19:28.940 --> 00:19:30.350

Karen Gainey: For research, like original.

105

00:19:30.350 --> 00:19:39.870

Participant 3: Not for non research papers. And that's an interesting question. Which is that, should we have them for non research papers now? And that's something we're looking at. Yeah.

106

00:19:39.870 --> 00:19:49.500

Karen Gainey: Yep, yep. Do. Do you find? I guess. Just trying to understand. The submission process in the portal is do you?

107

00:19:49.670 --> 00:20:07.279

Karen Gainey: Is it like when? You, because I haven't submitted to your journal? Obviously do you find? Is there a part of the the submission process where it can't continue without the provision of this summary.

108

00:20:07.280 --> 00:20:08.110

Participant 3: It it just.

109

00:20:08.110 --> 00:20:08.570

Karen Gainey: So does it.

110

00:20:08.570 --> 00:20:10.030

Participant 3: Then it's just it's right

111

00:20:10.070 --> 00:20:38.009

Participant 3: with word document that the main script has. Yeah. And so, for example, you know, we get way. More submissions than we can publish. We get about, I mean, last year we got about 1,700 submissions. So, for example, if somebody didn't include that when they 1st submitted a paper, we wouldn't go back to them and say, you've got to write this

because, you know, we only need it at the point of publication. But it's just part of the word, Doc. Most people do do it. Most people do provide one.

112

00:20:38.670 --> 00:20:40.350

Karen Gainey: I'll do that. Yeah. Okay.

113

00:20:40.480 --> 00:20:55.279

Karen Gainey: yeah. That was my next question. So does it. So assuming they they included would it go through to the then the Peer Review. It would have been included in Peer review.

114

00:20:55.280 --> 00:21:13.390

Participant 3: It's included in. So we do the process that we have for (journal). We have anonymous peer review. So the paper is anonymized so that the reviewers don't know who the authors are. The authors don't know who the reviewers are, but usually that doesn't really matter for the summary box, but it will be included in the text that goes to the Peer reviewers for review.

115

00:21:13.810 --> 00:21:14.460

Karen Gainey: Yep.

116

00:21:14.700 --> 00:21:20.030

Karen Gainey: Did you get any tend to get comments back on that summary box?

117

00:21:20.030 --> 00:21:41.720

Participant 3: Not really because it's not not really a question that we're asking the reviewers. We're the reviewers we're asking about the you know, the comp the the methodological soundness, and whether it's it's relevance to the (journal) and sort of its wider relevance. So occasionally people do go through and make comments like that. But it's not not usually, and we don't. We don't ask them to specifically.

118

00:21:42.300 --> 00:21:44.890

Karen Gainey: Yeah, understood, all right.

119

00:21:45.210 --> 00:21:50.310

Karen Gainey: Oh, that's that's great. Do you get any comments

120

00:21:50.490 --> 00:21:56.690

Karen Gainey: from authors or the public? About

121

00:21:57.516 --> 00:22:00.000

Karen Gainey: the summary box in general?

122

00:22:00.280 --> 00:22:09.211

Participant 3: No, I wish we I wish we would actually, but I think we don't do much to promote it. I mean, I suspect that I bet that the (journal X). Get a lot of comments on their

123

00:22:09.570 --> 00:22:38.910

Participant 3: on their you know their graphical summaries. By the way, I don't. Do you know that there is a actually a guideline for for producing graphical summaries. Have you come across that? That one Tammy Hoffman and Co. Yeah. So Tammy mentioned that to me because I was thinking about this when we were. I was talking to her about what we might do with our plain language summaries, and it occurred to me. We don't have any. We don't really have guidelines for people and writing them. And so I was really interested in the fact that they'd come up with guidelines for the graphical summaries, because.

124

00:22:38.910 --> 00:22:39.910

Participant 3: of course.

125

00:22:39.920 --> 00:22:47.633

Participant 3: if if that's the only piece that people read which it, you know might well be, then, obviously, it's really important that it properly reflects the

126

00:22:48.400 --> 00:22:55.109

Participant 3: properly reflects what's in the paper itself. And I hadn't even it hadn't occurred to me that was an important thing to be specific about.

127

00:22:55.780 --> 00:23:04.629

Karen Gainey: Yeah, yeah, definitely, when I did my scoping review, that was my 1st paper. I initially was looking at all forms graphical video.

128

00:23:05.370 --> 00:23:09.159

Karen Gainey: but then had to narrow it down to text based only.

129

00:23:09.310 --> 00:23:25.720

Karen Gainey: but a lot of journals. Particularly I think it was the L. Sevia ones, and maybe spring in nature. Don't quote me on that. I think. Elsevia, though were, did have an option

130

00:23:25.910 --> 00:23:27.600

Karen Gainey: for a graphical or video.

131

00:23:27.600 --> 00:23:28.050

Participant 3: Right.

132

00:23:28.050 --> 00:23:33.419

Karen Gainey: One publishing group that did offer it, but it was an optional extra.

133

00:23:33.550 --> 00:23:38.910

Karen Gainey: but they had very extensive instructions in the author. Guidelines.

134

00:23:38.910 --> 00:23:40.420

Participant 3: Right? Interesting. Okay.

135

00:23:40.420 --> 00:23:44.399

Karen Gainey: All the yeah, very, very detailed. And I mean

136

00:23:45.350 --> 00:23:59.320

Karen Gainey: on the screen, more than a screen's worth. Yeah, yeah. Very detailed. Which was good, because but then then I kind of thought, wow! You've really. It struck me as needing to know what you're doing.

137

00:24:00.180 --> 00:24:04.600

Participant 3: Well, that's right. So these were for people, for authors doing their own graphical abstracts.

138

00:24:04.600 --> 00:24:05.310

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

139

00:24:05.480 --> 00:24:07.259

Participant 3: Yeah, yeah, we're talking.

140

00:24:07.260 --> 00:24:08.690

Karen Gainey: About at the journal level.

141

00:24:08.690 --> 00:24:11.230

Participant 3: I think the (journal X) does their own yeah.

142

00:24:12.000 --> 00:24:18.249

Participant 3: in house. That's my understanding, because they're. I think they must do, because they're all very much to the same formula.

143

00:24:19.760 --> 00:24:23.559

Karen Gainey: Gotcha. No? Well, I'm not familiar with the ones you mentioned. Then.

144

00:24:23.990 --> 00:24:26.378

Participant 3: Hmm, yeah. So I I think that

145

00:24:27.370 --> 00:24:50.069

Participant 3: it comes back to this tension between what the journal produces and what the authors produce. And you know. So it's interesting when I look back at look at plus now, plus medicine. Now, they now have what they call the author's summary. So it's clearly written by the authors as opposed to when we did it. It was written by the editors, but I suspect that's just, for you know, work, workflow or work, you know.

146

00:24:50.210 --> 00:24:54.189

Participant 3: You know they don't don't have the kind of capacity to write them in house anymore.

147

00:24:54.820 --> 00:25:09.840

Karen Gainey: Yeah, that makes sense. So one of the things I was gonna ask you which might be moot now. But I know (Publisher) have an outs sourcing service paid service for writing plain language summaries.

148

00:25:09.840 --> 00:25:10.460

Participant 3: Oh, it does!

149

00:25:10.460 --> 00:25:10.950

Karen Gainey: Something.

150

00:25:10.950 --> 00:25:12.269

Participant 3: Interesting. I didn't know that.

151

00:25:12.420 --> 00:25:21.280

Karen Gainey: Because yeah, so I don't know whether there's even a link from your journal to that.

152

00:25:21.280 --> 00:25:23.760

Participant 3: No, there isn't. That's interesting. Okay.

153

00:25:23.760 --> 00:25:31.570

Karen Gainey: Yeah, yeah. Yes. I just wanted to explore. Whether you'd.

154

00:25:31.810 --> 00:25:36.039

Karen Gainey: I guess, thought of that or like, what do you think of that kind of idea.

155

00:25:38.200 --> 00:25:41.090

Karen Gainey: I don't know the cost, because yeah, no.

156

00:25:41.430 --> 00:25:47.630

Participant 3: Yeah, no, that's really interesting. I didn't know anything about that, you know. If you've got the link I'd be, I'd be keen to explore it, because I do want.

157

00:25:47.630 --> 00:25:48.970

Karen Gainey: Send you a link.

158

00:25:48.970 --> 00:25:51.010

Participant 3: Use it, for example.

159

00:25:51.010 --> 00:25:51.540

Karen Gainey: Yep.

160

00:25:55.090 --> 00:25:57.650

Participant 3: Yeah. So I suspect what that's

161

00:25:59.910 --> 00:26:04.489

Participant 3: I suspect what that's for is for people who who were English isn't their 1st language. I would imagine.

162

00:26:04.490 --> 00:26:05.030

Karen Gainey: Gotcha.

163

00:26:05.030 --> 00:26:19.270

Participant 3: And I think, for example, quite a lot of the editing services that these big publishers provide. Pre-acceptance is when you're preparing. Your manuscript is around for people who don't have English as their 1st language.

164

00:26:19.270 --> 00:26:39.360

Participant 3: whereas we're an Australian journal, and we very, very rarely publish any papers from authors who are based outside of Australia. I mean, we have a lot of authors who, you know, not necessarily native English speakers, but they would work with native English speakers, so I don't think that would be a high priority for the authors that we have.

165

00:26:39.580 --> 00:26:45.529

Karen Gainey: Yeah, that makes sense. That makes sense. Yeah, I'll send you. Oh, made a note. I'll send you that.

166

00:26:45.940 --> 00:26:50.560

Karen Gainey: Yeah, for sure. Yeah, all right.

167

00:26:50.660 --> 00:26:54.590

Karen Gainey: So just wanting to.

168

00:26:54.760 --> 00:27:08.810

Karen Gainey: So one of the things I found when talking I was talking to people who read these these summaries was they were talking a lot about the importance of the label or the the name given to these

169

00:27:08.810 --> 00:27:10.360

Karen Gainey: of summaries. Yeah. Yeah.

170

00:27:10.360 --> 00:27:29.909

Karen Gainey: And one of the things they said was, sometimes they will either read or not read the rest of the summary based on the label the off-putting or encouraging. So I just wanted, and it seemed to be. Possibly

171

00:27:30.360 --> 00:27:36.680

Karen Gainey: some, like some labels, seem to very much reflect the audience as in

172

00:27:36.920 --> 00:27:55.500

Karen Gainey: as or or the the purpose, as you said, Author summary that's clearly written by the author or summaries for patients. So I'm just wondering if you've got any sense of why the the term summary box might have been chosen or.

173

00:27:56.620 --> 00:28:03.320

Participant 3: Yeah, no, that's that's really interesting. So it actually doesn't even say summary box on our paper. It just has.

174

00:28:03.320 --> 00:28:03.830

Karen Gainey: As I.

175

00:28:03.830 --> 00:28:24.660

Participant 3: It's just a box. I'm looking at one of them now. When I was thinking about this beforehand, I went and went back in to look at a few. And essentially all it says is just, it's just a box. It doesn't say doesn't call it anything. When I was at plus medicine. We thought a lot about this. We had many endless discussions about what we should call this, you know. Should it be a lay summary, should it be a patient.

176

00:28:25.520 --> 00:28:30.190

Participant 3: and we decided lay sounded a bit patronising. So we didn't call it that

177

00:28:30.470 --> 00:28:54.720

Participant 3: also because the other thing actually, one thing we do know from plus medicine, which I don't know from the (journal). Is that was that journalists told us. They read that first.st They found that an incredibly useful resource they started with the editor's summary that we wrote for our research papers, and then they went to look at the rest of the paper, if it was interesting. So so we got that specific feedback from quite a lot of journalists.

178

00:28:55.497 --> 00:28:57.999

Participant 3: So and then we thought, Well.

179

00:28:58.580 --> 00:29:07.499

Participant 3: what we decided to do was it in the end, because we were writing it as editors. We called it the Editor Summary, because it was written by us, and, in fact, if you look back@thefirstst

180

00:29:08.030 --> 00:29:17.259

Participant 3: I think the 1st editorial that we wrote we talked about writing that because one of the things that we were very keen of was that, you know, open access was really important

181

00:29:17.430 --> 00:29:42.899

Participant 3: to research. But actually, it's no good making research accessible if it can't be understandable. So that was the part of the reason editor Summary there at the beginning. So we had a we were very deliberative about it, and, for example, plus biology, which was the journal that started before us. They didn't have editor summaries at that time. I'm not quite sure what they're doing now. So it was very much something that we kind of thought about from the point of view of a journal.

182

00:29:46.340 --> 00:30:15.010

Participant 3: So so that was so. We called it the editor Summary, because we thought that was kind of mostly what it was. It wasn't. And again, we had a wide range of papers, you know, if you called it patient, summary, or papers on policy. Well, that's not really relevant for patients, etc. So that was the most neutral term that we came up with. We don't call anything at the (journal). And that's probably a problem. I guess we need to think about what we should call it. So I'd be curious to know what you think, what your people thought was what they wanted it to be called. What's the most useful kind of name.

183

00:30:15.620 --> 00:30:25.060

Karen Gainey: Yeah, it really varied. But it's interesting. Some of the things you've said were reflected in the comments I got. There was a lot of.

184

00:30:26.210 --> 00:30:29.419

Karen Gainey: I would say negative comments about the word lay

185

00:30:30.457 --> 00:30:38.129

Karen Gainey: everything from it was patronizing to it reminds me of chickens.

186

00:30:39.096 --> 00:30:41.030

Participant 3: Yeah, yeah.

187

00:30:41.412 --> 00:30:50.979

Karen Gainey: Or it's it were it had. There were certain words they said, like lay or consumer, or patience that seemed to have like dual meanings.

188

00:30:50.980 --> 00:30:58.040

Karen Gainey: But yeah, yeah, maybe not so much patience. But lay could be have a religious connotation.

189

00:30:58.220 --> 00:30:59.480

Participant 3: Yep. Yep.

190

00:30:59.480 --> 00:31:06.040

Karen Gainey: For some people and so they didn't kind of. They thought that was quite nonspecific.

191

00:31:07.064 --> 00:31:11.820

Karen Gainey: They liked plain English or sorry plain language

192

00:31:13.440 --> 00:31:22.880

Karen Gainey: from not from plain English, because they felt that was excluding non English speakers.

193

00:31:23.110 --> 00:31:23.570

Participant 3: Yeah, yeah.

194

00:31:23.570 --> 00:31:28.429

Karen Gainey: So they're very adamant on that. So they liked a descriptive summary.

195

00:31:28.810 --> 00:31:30.970

Karen Gainey: I'm sorry. A descriptive term.

196

00:31:30.970 --> 00:31:31.540

Participant 3: Prescriptive.

197

00:31:33.240 --> 00:31:48.900

Karen Gainey: That made it clear it was for them, because one of the things they said they were using it for was to see if they wanted. So we we only talked to people who had chronic medical conditions because they tend to be high uses of health information.

198

00:31:48.900 --> 00:31:49.929

Participant 3: Yeah, yeah.

199

00:31:50.281 --> 00:32:00.819

Karen Gainey: And and particularly journals. And so we've and they often use plain language summaries for one to find out if they want to read the rest of the the article.

200

00:32:02.220 --> 00:32:08.479

Participant 3: To them might be a new diabetes, medication, or therapy.

201

00:32:09.250 --> 00:32:19.819

Karen Gainey: Or to use it as something they can take to a treating medical practitioner and start a conversation. So it was really important to

202

00:32:20.540 --> 00:32:25.819

Karen Gainey: to make them feel, I guess, that it was

203

00:32:27.010 --> 00:32:36.639

Karen Gainey: speaking to them. But we felt but one of the themes actually, that I reported on was that fine line between informing and patronizing.

204

00:32:36.640 --> 00:32:38.220

Participant 3: Yeah, yeah, yeah.

205

00:32:38.430 --> 00:32:53.320

Karen Gainey: Because we did find that whilst we didn't measure health literacy using a standardized questionnaire, and I wish I had. They would be what I'd call an informed public

206

00:32:53.830 --> 00:32:54.410

Karen Gainey: that.

207

00:32:54.410 --> 00:32:55.530

Participant 3: For sure. Yeah, yeah.

208

00:32:55.530 --> 00:32:56.220

Karen Gainey: Hi! How are you?

209

00:32:56.846 --> 00:32:58.099

Participant 3: Yeah, yeah.

210

00:32:58.100 --> 00:33:06.170

Karen Gainey: Yeah. And and one of the things I wrote about was that we should reconsider our stringent

211

00:33:06.730 --> 00:33:18.220

Karen Gainey: adherence to maybe reading levels of grade 8 that that can potentially limit the content.

212

00:33:19.750 --> 00:33:28.530

Karen Gainey: too much. And one of the things they said they didn't mind a bit of medical jargon because they were quite familiar terms. When it related to their own

213

00:33:28.810 --> 00:33:31.970

Karen Gainey: health condition, they actually understood

214

00:33:32.240 --> 00:33:39.819

Karen Gainey: some of the terms, so their some inclusion of terms was acceptable, and they felt

215

00:33:39.950 --> 00:33:47.180

Karen Gainey: that they were being acknowledged as having that information. So it was again very fine line.

216

00:33:47.180 --> 00:33:47.846

Participant 3: Yeah, yeah.

217

00:33:48.180 --> 00:33:57.030

Karen Gainey: Difficult to navigate, but just feeling that the authors or the journal was understanding and appreciating that was important.

218

00:33:57.280 --> 00:33:57.900

Participant 3: Yeah.

219

00:33:58.040 --> 00:34:01.249

Karen Gainey: So I can't give you a definite answer.

220

00:34:02.690 --> 00:34:11.100

Karen Gainey: but because some some like patient, the word patient, some really had a problem with it, same with the word consumer.

221

00:34:11.100 --> 00:34:15.269

Participant 3: I know it's very yeah. You you get completely different views from

222

00:34:15.469 --> 00:34:20.889

Participant 3: from whoever you talk to. Yeah, there's no, it's not easy to use a term that everybody likes.

223

00:34:21.360 --> 00:34:45.609

Karen Gainey: No, and I think it really comes down to. I was speaking to somebody from Europe last week, and they had a different take on it, so it seems it might be a geographical situation where language is seen very differently. Yes, he was telling me that in his part of the world. They don't have that. The term plain language isn't common.

224

00:34:45.830 --> 00:34:46.590

Participant 3: Right.

225

00:34:47.190 --> 00:34:52.049

Karen Gainey: So they didn't use the word plain language summaries. They used patient summaries.

226

00:34:52.050 --> 00:34:57.736

Karen Gainey: And then that scene is a really, really, that's really well accepted. Right?

227

00:34:58.360 --> 00:34:58.950

Participant 3: Yeah.

228

00:34:59.230 --> 00:35:03.870

Karen Gainey: Yeah. So I guess it depends. If you've got a sense of geographically where your audience is, that helps.

229

00:35:05.670 --> 00:35:10.189

Participant 3: Yeah, no, it's it's worth thinking about. I'll read your previous, your paper, actually, because I I do think

230

00:35:10.920 --> 00:35:15.799

Participant 3: it's going to help inform what we do. Because the other, I mean, just

231

00:35:15.800 --> 00:35:41.570

Participant 3: with regard to these summaries, the other group that we know uses them is non non specialist doctors actually to be honest. So you know, we know that a lot of our audience are GPs, or they're reading. You know the point of a general medical journalist. We publish stuff in a whole range of different specialties, and if you're I don't know you're you're a kind of a cardiologist. You might not be familiar with dermatology, or whatever you know, there might.

232

00:35:41.570 --> 00:35:41.900

Karen Gainey: Yes.

233

00:35:41.900 --> 00:35:49.879

Participant 3: That you don't understand. You don't. You're not that familiar with. So there is a it doesn't. It does. A range of has a range of purposes. These summaries.

234

00:35:50.700 --> 00:35:57.760

Karen Gainey: Yeah, yeah 100%. And that's

235

00:35:59.260 --> 00:36:02.815

Karen Gainey: I think that that's that's quite common, that

236

00:36:04.580 --> 00:36:07.679

Karen Gainey: and and not necessarily a a bad thing at all.

237

00:36:07.680 --> 00:36:09.069

Participant 3: I know for sure. Yeah, yeah.

238

00:36:09.070 --> 00:36:12.121

Karen Gainey: Yeah, it's just more more readership.

239

00:36:12.630 --> 00:36:22.669

Participant 3: I remember one paper that my colleague wrote on when I was at plus medicine, and, to be honest, I didn't understand the paper fully until she wrote the plain language summary. It was quite.

240

00:36:22.670 --> 00:36:23.420

Karen Gainey: That's funny.

241

00:36:24.053 --> 00:36:29.150

Karen Gainey: Yeah, there you go. Yeah, that's brilliant. That's a great example.

242

00:36:30.620 --> 00:36:31.665

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

243

00:36:33.470 --> 00:36:35.109

Karen Gainey: So one of my

244

00:36:35.760 --> 00:37:00.460

Karen Gainey: My previous project was looking at, comparing the guidelines from a series of health and medical journals, and essentially doing a compliance check to compare yours wasn't included. But looking at the journals and the plain language summaries published by them, to see how well they conformed.

245

00:37:00.460 --> 00:37:01.000

Participant 3: Okay.

246

00:37:01.410 --> 00:37:19.470

Karen Gainey: And found quite interesting results quite varied results. Do you have any sense of how well the summaries that you're getting from authors comply to the instructions. I think we've kind of touched on it.

247

00:37:21.640 --> 00:37:24.870

Participant 3: We generally do. So we just have the 3 headings. And we say, this is what.

248

00:37:24.870 --> 00:37:25.380

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

249

00:37:25.740 --> 00:37:35.509

Participant 3: But we quite extensively edit those after after the papers finally accepted. So I mean, sometimes you know, what's originally submitted

250

00:37:35.690 --> 00:37:45.970

Participant 3: may change quite substantially, or may need to change substantially after peer review. So I would say that people make a go at it. But that may not be the final version that we publish.

251

00:37:46.510 --> 00:37:54.179

Karen Gainey: Yeah. So do you think if for the changes that are made, is it more that they're

252

00:37:54.830 --> 00:38:02.089

Karen Gainey: I'm trying to understand? Is it that they're not answering the questions or just not answering them. Well, for the audience.

253

00:38:02.370 --> 00:38:11.640

Participant 3: They're probably just not answering them. Well, yeah. And they have. They've you maybe use 2 technical language, or they haven't kind of, as I said, pulled out the main point of interest.

254

00:38:11.820 --> 00:38:13.310

Karen Gainey: Right, right.

255

00:38:13.310 --> 00:38:34.919

Participant 3: Or sometimes try to overstate it. I mean, that's what we know happens in abstracts. For example, people. Often, you know, the conclusions will be much more dramatic than the actual findings. That's a pretty common thing. So making sure that actually what they say, you know what the study means is, you know, kind of reflected by it from it actually reflects what they found.

256

00:38:35.600 --> 00:38:38.307

Karen Gainey: Yes. Gotcha. Okay.

257

00:38:40.020 --> 00:38:42.461

Karen Gainey: Sounds like it. Journals. The

258

00:38:43.910 --> 00:38:47.616

Karen Gainey: I forget the name of the the editor.

259

00:38:48.350 --> 00:38:52.000

Karen Gainey: the structural editor. Yeah. Do a really thorough job.

260

00:38:52.000 --> 00:39:02.520

Participant 3: They do. They do a very thorough job. Yeah, they do. That's right. It's definitely not just the copy editing side of it is looking at the whole paper and seeing, you know, kind of making sure that it's well presented.

261

00:39:03.000 --> 00:39:04.440

Karen Gainey: Yeah, yeah.

262

00:39:07.190 --> 00:39:15.609

Karen Gainey: Are they? I've looked at your your guidelines and and your journal quite a lot.

263

00:39:15.770 --> 00:39:21.219

Karen Gainey: but I can't quite remember if if it's open access.

264

00:39:21.640 --> 00:39:25.150

Participant 3: Well, we're hybrid journal. So that means, okay, yeah.

265

00:39:25.150 --> 00:39:38.609

Participant 3: this is actually one of the other things that we have from (Publisher) is, we're part of the read and publish deal from (Publisher) has with calls. So if you're at a institution in Australia that covered by that, you can, you can publish open access.

266

00:39:38.610 --> 00:39:38.950

Participant 3: Good night

267

00:39:38.950 --> 00:39:48.820

Participant 3: to you. So yeah. So our aim is to become fully open access. But at the moment we're hybrid, the other thing that we do have, though, is, for example, all of our

268

00:39:49.290 --> 00:40:18.960

Participant 3: all of our papers on indigenous health. Those are always free to access, at least, if not open access. So, in fact, quite a lot of our content is free anyway. The other thing, actually, that's kind of a bit more complicated at the (Journal) is, we have 2 websites. So we have the (journal).com itself, which is our website. We host. And then we also have our content distributed via (Publisher) online via their publishing platform. So we have 2 places where our content is. But it's the same content. It's exactly the same content.

269

00:40:19.870 --> 00:40:23.689

Karen Gainey: Yeah, okay, that makes sense. I think.

270

00:40:28.120 --> 00:40:31.270

Karen Gainey: with. I've noticed with with

271

00:40:31.520 --> 00:40:49.120

Karen Gainey: some journals. I want to just get your thoughts on this, they've started to use an approach to overcome the issue of access. So one of the things that people said said to us that was really important was access.

272

00:40:49.260 --> 00:40:53.189

Karen Gainey: because, as you know, most members of the public don't have subscriptions.

273

00:40:53.190 --> 00:40:53.860

Participant 3: Yeah, yeah.

274

00:40:55.340 --> 00:41:09.109

Karen Gainey: Some journals have started to do something similar to you know how Cochrane, their database of systematic reviews, have a separate section for the plain language summaries that searchable by keyword.

275

00:41:09.520 --> 00:41:17.450

Participant 3: Yeah, I we don't have anything like that. And I I must admit I've again. We don't really have the capacity on our current.

276

00:41:17.450 --> 00:41:17.790

Karen Gainey: Looks like.

277

00:41:17.790 --> 00:41:27.923

Participant 3: To do anything like that. I think that's a really interesting Cochrane obviously puts a lot of effort into their plain language summaries much more than we would do, I would say,

278

00:41:28.930 --> 00:41:50.539

Participant 3: yeah, that's a really interesting thought we have. You know, we don't, for example, even have something like, you know if you're a patient start here, or if you're a journalist, start here that kind of stuff. We we had that at plus medicine we have. Certainly when I was there we had like a different portal, or that would help people navigate it. But right now it's the same access for everybody, so there's no.

279

00:41:50.540 --> 00:41:51.110

Karen Gainey: Yep.

280

00:41:51.110 --> 00:41:55.620

Participant 3: Searchable way of doing it. That's an interesting thought, actually, of how to do that. Yeah.

281

00:41:55.620 --> 00:42:00.988

Karen Gainey: Yeah, okay, just just kind of thinking,

282

00:42:01.930 --> 00:42:05.230

Karen Gainey: of kind of the future. And

283

00:42:05.490 --> 00:42:09.009

Karen Gainey: because one of the things people said to us was

284

00:42:09.070 --> 00:42:37.079

Karen Gainey: or got us thinking about was just other ways in which they can get access to these sort of summaries or ways they can utilize them, considering different levels of accessibility. So we've mentioned different formats was one different ways of getting access to them on the website was another one. But just sort of thinking to the

285

00:42:37.300 --> 00:42:52.139

Karen Gainey: it's going even further, thinking to the future or not even the future. It's kind of here. What are your thoughts on the use of of tools like AI, tools for writing plain language summaries.

286

00:42:53.110 --> 00:42:53.620

Karen Gainey: If you.

287

00:42:53.620 --> 00:42:54.100

Participant 3: Yes.

288

00:42:54.100 --> 00:42:59.639

Karen Gainey: Something that's come up with your journal, or have you thought about it yourself, and have an opinion.

289

00:43:00.311 --> 00:43:09.489

Participant 3: It. Ha! It hasn't. Well, we know that people are using AI. We we can see that in some of the papers that are being submitted to us, mostly ones from overseas. To be honest, which we don't.

290

00:43:10.130 --> 00:43:12.650

Participant 3: you can just see they're written by A. They have a very.

291

00:43:12.650 --> 00:43:13.450

Karen Gainey: I mean.

292

00:43:13.450 --> 00:43:16.169

Participant 3: Kind of generic. Not very

293

00:43:17.480 --> 00:43:25.414

Participant 3: They're not, you know. They just kind of have a feel to them. They're not really written, not by anybody who has understanding of the topic.

294

00:43:26.240 --> 00:43:39.309

Participant 3: I don't know. I mean I I haven't tried to do that. I mean it. It's kind of an interesting thought that, you know, for it. Could it could be potentially something that was a useful tool of AI if you trained it sufficiently well.

295

00:43:39.755 --> 00:43:46.809

Participant 3: I I wouldn't be at all surprised if the wily services are heavily using AI. I I know that they are.

296

00:43:46.810 --> 00:43:47.160

Karen Gainey: Excuse me.

297

00:43:48.221 --> 00:43:51.839

Participant 3: I don't know. Actually, I don't know what they're doing, but I wouldn't be surprised if that was.

298

00:43:51.840 --> 00:43:52.190

Karen Gainey: Something.

299

00:43:52.410 --> 00:43:53.330

Participant 3: Exploring.

300

00:43:53.440 --> 00:44:14.799

Participant 3: I mean, I know people who are using AI. I know authors have told me they're using AI to generate infographics of their their content. And again, you know, given how hard it is to, you know, do develop nice infographics. I could see that that's actually possibly quite a useful tool of use. Use of it. So I I think there are.

301

00:44:15.600 --> 00:44:23.199

Participant 3: I mean, obviously, there's always gonna have to be human intervention in it. But I don't. I don't think it's the kind of thing where it would be wrong to explore using it.

302

00:44:23.950 --> 00:44:30.060

Karen Gainey: Yeah, yeah, I think. One of the.

303

00:44:30.460 --> 00:44:41.389

Karen Gainey: I guess some of the the thoughts that have come up is that balance between getting more content out versus the quality of the content.

304

00:44:41.390 --> 00:44:42.949

Participant 3: Quality of the content. Yeah.

305

00:44:42.950 --> 00:44:47.790

Karen Gainey: And then at your end the journal end.

306

00:44:50.690 --> 00:44:55.780

Karen Gainey: The speed of getting submissions through.

307

00:44:56.120 --> 00:44:56.580

Participant 3: Yeah.

308

00:44:56.580 --> 00:45:00.420

Karen Gainey: Process as well, and just balancing all of those priorities.

309

00:45:01.060 --> 00:45:10.162

Participant 3: Yeah, I wouldn't say that. I mean, I don't think writing, you know, editing the plain language summaries is, that's not a kind of hold up for us at this point I would say,

310

00:45:11.080 --> 00:45:29.190

Participant 3: the one thing that I would say, obviously, we just need to be really careful about with AI is, we know, all these biases that we have. There are within the training programs for AI. We know that they, you know, they underrepresent. You know, certain populations, they underrepresent certain parts of the population as well. So I think that

311

00:45:29.360 --> 00:45:32.299

Participant 3: using AI in a way that is kind of mindful

312

00:45:32.500 --> 00:45:35.930

Participant 3: is probably fine. But we do need to understand what his biases are.

313

00:45:36.990 --> 00:45:44.651

Karen Gainey: Yeah, I guess. Yeah, I haven't. It's interesting. You've noticed

314

00:45:45.380 --> 00:45:49.390

Karen Gainey: summaries come in that you suspect are.

315

00:45:49.390 --> 00:45:53.650

Karen Gainey: or whole papers, not not just wholes, not just summaries, whole papers. Yeah, yeah.

316

00:45:53.650 --> 00:45:54.640

Karen Gainey: Oh, I see.

317

00:45:54.950 --> 00:45:58.826

Participant 3: And you it you often. The way you see it is that

318

00:45:59.370 --> 00:46:14.859

Participant 3: just the way that it's written with the introduction is very generic. It's, you know, kind of, and there's often certain phrases that kind of, I think, seem to pop up in these. Al. I'm sure, as they get better. It'll be harder to spot. But at the moment

319

00:46:15.372 --> 00:46:19.750

Participant 3: I think I'm quite good at spotting stuff that comes in this AI generated.

320

00:46:20.260 --> 00:46:22.270

Karen Gainey: Why, okay, I misunderstood.

321

00:46:22.380 --> 00:46:26.059

Karen Gainey: Right? Do you have guidelines for how to deal.

322

00:46:26.060 --> 00:46:54.420

Participant 3: Yeah, absolutely. We say, you can't do this unless you tell us. Yeah, absolutely. So. (Publisher) has been quite helpful in this, because they've been doing a fair bit of thinking about this. So yes, we have it in our guidelines that you can't use. If you use AI tools, you must tell us. And again, it's not necessarily wrong to do that. And there are guidelines for how you acknowledge the use of AI but it has to be very specifically done, and you know, kind of not. You can't try and pretend that it's a human writing when it's not.

323

00:46:55.390 --> 00:47:01.290

Karen Gainey: Right. Yep, yep. Have you had anyone? Then, therefore, acknowledge the use of an AI tool?

324

00:47:01.290 --> 00:47:04.262

Participant 3: No, we haven't not enough in our papers. I have.

325

00:47:04.790 --> 00:47:10.119

Participant 3: I have seen it done elsewhere, but I haven't. I haven't seen it on in any of our papers.

326

00:47:10.460 --> 00:47:12.660

Participant 3: not in any of them, for sure.

327

00:47:13.130 --> 00:47:15.290

Karen Gainey: Right? Okay, that's interesting.

328

00:47:16.396 --> 00:47:20.630

Karen Gainey: Thinking about, I guess, beyond

329

00:47:21.160 --> 00:47:33.480

Karen Gainey: what's happening. Now, what do you think might be the future for plain language summaries, either at your journal or elsewhere. What would you like to be the future.

330

00:47:33.930 --> 00:48:01.119

Participant 3: Well, I think it's really important that they have a place. So I think that's the 1st thing to say, which is that I think quite a few journals. I don't know how many journals you've looked at, but I suspect that, for example, a lot of specialty journals which are run on a shoestring don't have the capacity to even generate plain language summaries. So they're not even able to get to the 1st point. So, and I and I know that when again, when I worked at plus medicine, we had a lot of conversations about, do we have the time to do this? How are we going to do this? Who's going to do this?

331

00:48:01.120 --> 00:48:09.739

Participant 3: And so it happened because the editors believed passionately it was really important. We took it on ourselves to do it. And you know we ended up writing writing them.

332

00:48:10.130 --> 00:48:14.810

Participant 3: You know, over and above what our normal job was. So that was.

333

00:48:14.940 --> 00:48:19.945

Participant 3: I think, that was the 1st thing is, you have to understand their believe in their importance.

334

00:48:21.500 --> 00:48:39.030

Participant 3: I'm having a similar conversation at the (journal), because, you know, they do cause extra stuff that has to happen. And you know we did discuss last year, you know, do we keep them? Do we not keep them? And we decided, actually, they have a role. We just don't think we've quite got them right yet. So we carry. We'll carry on with what we're doing.

335

00:48:39.400 --> 00:48:59.870

Participant 3: I think there's an issue around. I mean again, I'm very much around, very passionate about open access, but access also in a way that people can use the information. So that's where the plain language summaries come in. It also comes in things like this accessibility of the website itself. I mean, that's 1 thing that I suspect that matters to, you know, patients

336

00:48:59.890 --> 00:49:13.310

Participant 3: and consumers is that, you know, if if they've got, you know, is the website also easy to navigate and such like. So that's 1 of the things that we're also aware that the you know, the plain language summaries that we have are not particularly accessible technically.

337

00:49:13.980 --> 00:49:15.579

Participant 3: And that's a, that's a problem.

338

00:49:16.854 --> 00:49:23.660

Participant 3: I, I think we need to be thinking about videos. I, we have a few people, you know, we can.

339

00:49:23.810 --> 00:49:41.180

Participant 3: We can accommodate them on our wily platform. We can't accommodate on the (journal). Platform at the moment. That's a problem. And I'd like to see visual abstracts, because I think those are really powerful. But again, I haven't. We haven't spent any time exploring them yet, because we haven't quite figured out how we would host them on the website.

340

00:49:41.320 --> 00:49:53.359

Participant 3: So that's I think that's where I think that we should be going. I mean, we know that people are consuming information in so many different ways. I actually also believe, for example, that you know, social media is a very powerful

341

00:49:53.590 --> 00:49:56.470

Participant 3: tool for sharing information. And you know.

342

00:49:57.431 --> 00:50:13.740

Participant 3: You know, once we get what we used to find a lot of patient engagement at plus medicine on Twitter when it was back, when it was a useful place, a lot of engagement that obviously is kind of gone now from Twitter. But we're we're exploring blue sky. And you know, maybe we need to think about.

343

00:50:14.030 --> 00:50:23.565

Participant 3: you know, how do we? How do we present stuff on Facebook, where you know a certain part of the population still is not the younger population. But you know older people that are on Facebook.

344

00:50:24.430 --> 00:50:36.000

Participant 3: It's, I think, plain languages. Summaries have to be considered as part of a general dissemination strategy. They're not just a thing on their own. That's where I'd like us to be thinking about them.

345

00:50:37.670 --> 00:50:41.839

Karen Gainey: Absolutely brilliant. I'm excited that you're so excited about them.

346

00:50:41.850 --> 00:51:02.070

Participant 3: Yeah. Well, it was great to talk about it, because actually, I hadn't thought about them for a while. And so it's good to be reminded how important people find them, because in the end, you know, the journal is there to disseminate information to people that

need it. And you know the patients, consumers, people who are not medical experts are the ones who, you know, they're a really important part of our audience.

347

00:51:03.050 --> 00:51:11.919

Karen Gainey: Yeah. And one of the things I meant to say from the people we spoke to was we spoke to people with and and

348

00:51:12.240 --> 00:51:35.580

Karen Gainey: took note of their medical conditions, and some of the things they said was the way they consume or process. Information is very different, depending on the type of medical condition. Even people with brain or neurological dysfunction, even migraine to brain cancer or something like

349

00:51:36.040 --> 00:51:41.259

Karen Gainey: Ms or just any altered neurological function

350

00:51:41.370 --> 00:51:57.085

Karen Gainey: changes the way they're processing information. So they'd like a variety of options for how to consume the information. And so it's that's a different way of looking at access, not just physical access, but cognitive access.

351

00:51:58.380 --> 00:52:03.840

Karen Gainey: and hear visual or hearing impaired

352

00:52:04.260 --> 00:52:11.450

Karen Gainey: love, the idea of podcasts and audio material. They can or something that they can just

353

00:52:13.060 --> 00:52:16.950

Karen Gainey: take in, or even a video with an audio component.

354

00:52:16.950 --> 00:52:17.679

Participant 3: Yeah, yeah.

355

00:52:17.680 --> 00:52:26.679

Karen Gainey: They can take in whenever they sort of more on on on their terms.

356

00:52:26.680 --> 00:52:30.105

Karen Gainey: Yes, it makes sense at their convenience.

357

00:52:32.100 --> 00:52:35.130

Karen Gainey: So that was just some of the feedback. If that's that's useful.

358

00:52:35.130 --> 00:53:03.399

Participant 3: No, that's really helpful. And I I agree. I mean, it's the same like, if you want to get a message out, you have to do it in multiple medium. You can't just assume that people you have to go to where people are rather than you know them coming to you. I was going

to ask one question, which is that with plain language? Is it primarily for only for research papers? Or did you have? You have? Do you have some information on people using it, for you know, non technical. Well, not. But you know, I guess non research papers sort of

359

00:53:03.540 --> 00:53:06.600

Participant 3: do. They? Does anyone do that very much.

360

00:53:07.615 --> 00:53:09.510

Karen Gainey: When you say non research papers.

361

00:53:09.510 --> 00:53:18.849

Participant 3: So. We are things like we publish perspectives and reviews and guideline papers. We don't do plain language summaries for any of those.

362

00:53:19.670 --> 00:53:48.949

Karen Gainey: Yeah, no, I understand. When I did my scoping review and then my follow up compliance study. I did limit it just to original research papers just to get a consistency. But I did note when I was going through the author guidelines, that. Well, that was the other. The other thing I found when I did an initial look, the one thing that was consistent in author guidelines for most journals was.

363

00:53:48.950 --> 00:53:56.459

Karen Gainey: they might ask for a plain language, summary for original research articles, but not for other types.

364

00:53:56.460 --> 00:53:57.050

Participant 3: Yeah, yeah.

365

00:53:57.468 --> 00:54:12.940

Karen Gainey: So it it did seem to vary particularly for shorter, you know. State of the art reviews, or other type of short articles. As the article. I type, I guess, got shorter and more specific.

366

00:54:13.400 --> 00:54:13.940

Participant 3: Yeah.

367

00:54:14.398 --> 00:54:17.149

Karen Gainey: It was less likely they would.

368

00:54:17.150 --> 00:54:19.329

Participant 3: Yeah, no, I can understand.

369

00:54:19.650 --> 00:54:20.400

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

370

00:54:20.670 --> 00:54:34.930

Karen Gainey: And we did exclude Cochrane because they only publish systematic reviews and meta-analyses. So that was quite specific. And they're of course they're quite long, so their plain language summaries are very long.

371

00:54:34.930 --> 00:54:37.499

Participant 3: They are long, that's what they're not sure.

372

00:54:37.760 --> 00:54:40.320

Karen Gainey: Apples to apples.

373

00:54:40.640 --> 00:54:43.613

Karen Gainey: But yeah, that's

374

00:54:44.810 --> 00:54:50.160

Karen Gainey: So I'm only kind of very familiar with with the

375

00:54:50.500 --> 00:54:52.719

Karen Gainey: original research articles. If that makes.

376

00:54:52.720 --> 00:54:56.080

Participant 3: I suspect that's most most people are using.

377

00:54:56.080 --> 00:54:56.630

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

378

00:54:56.630 --> 00:54:58.359

Participant 3: Just for for research.

379

00:54:59.210 --> 00:55:07.530

Karen Gainey: Yeah. And the the people we spoke to those are the type of articles they're mainly reading as well. Yeah, yeah. Yeah.

380

00:55:10.460 --> 00:55:25.079

Karen Gainey: I I did. Oh, I did want to ask you if you're aware of any end users, or you know, consumers or patients have been involved in any aspect of the summaries with the journals, either reviewing or.

381

00:55:25.610 --> 00:55:33.739

Participant 3: No, we don't even have a we don't even have any consumers on our advisory group. We're we're looking at our advisory group at the moment. And

382

00:55:34.720 --> 00:55:42.879

Participant 3: you know that's a that's a big missing gap, so no, they don't at the moment. Oh, well, I will say that we have a few papers which we're publishing.

383

00:55:43.900 --> 00:55:49.350

Participant 3: which do have patients as part of the authorship. But.

384

00:55:49.350 --> 00:55:49.800

Karen Gainey: Okay.

385

00:55:50.840 --> 00:55:56.220

Participant 3: Probably not for original research. So I, if there's any, it's a very small number. Yeah.

386

00:55:56.780 --> 00:55:58.880

Karen Gainey: So you mean more in the co-design.

387

00:55:59.430 --> 00:56:07.410

Participant 3: Yeah, we've had papers where, you know, we've had patients, part of the co-design, but not so much for original research, more for other types of papers. I would say.

388

00:56:07.880 --> 00:56:12.870

Karen Gainey: Yeah, okay, what are your thoughts on

389

00:56:13.630 --> 00:56:18.059

Karen Gainey: the consumer? Involvement pros and cons.

390

00:56:18.670 --> 00:56:19.270

Participant 3: Yeah.

391

00:56:19.270 --> 00:56:19.760

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

392

00:56:19.760 --> 00:56:26.769

Participant 3: I think I think it's essential for medical journals. It's just that the problems that we all have is that 1st off, you know.

393

00:56:27.080 --> 00:56:27.800

Participant 3: of

394

00:56:27.940 --> 00:56:36.609

Participant 3: consumers who are kind of willing to do this are a very precious group of people. They're often, you know, they've got often really hard to find people that have the time.

395

00:56:36.975 --> 00:56:57.194

Participant 3: and capacity to do it. To do it meaningfully is really important. And I, you know, I you know, for example, there's no point just having one person. I I've I've heard this conversation quite a few times. They say, well, if you're gonna do it, you need to do. It needs to be 2 or 3 people, so they don't feel like they're just the the token person in a group who's just to take a box.

396

00:56:57.450 --> 00:56:57.950

Karen Gainey: Yep.

397

00:56:57.950 --> 00:57:08.269

Participant 3: Then you have to have a strategy for how you involve them and all of that kind of thing. And it's a body of work that needs to happen, and we just haven't. We've never really done it. I mean.

398

00:57:08.640 --> 00:57:09.250

Karen Gainey: Yep.

399

00:57:09.450 --> 00:57:34.660

Participant 3: The piece of work that I'm doing right now is, how do we ensure that we have proper engagement with indigenous health researchers? And again. That's a similar thing. It has to be done meaningfully. You have to kind of have a whole process around it. So we just haven't done it, and it's something that. But it's something I'm aware of. I've been to a few conferences, and I've talked to some consumer representatives about what they'd like to see, but I haven't been able to progress it yet. I think that I don't want to do it half heartedly.

400

00:57:35.490 --> 00:57:43.209

Karen Gainey: Yeah. And so I want to delve into what? When you say meaningfully, what does that mean from your your perspective?

401

00:57:44.040 --> 00:58:04.880

Participant 3: Well, you know, we have an advisory group. So I mean non meaningfully, would be just putting that person on the advisory group, and you know, sending them an email every so often about what we're up to, I mean, meaningful, be actually getting their feedback, or that, you know not not just their feedback help saying saying to them, for example, if we're gonna write plain language summaries.

402

00:58:05.000 --> 00:58:13.023

Participant 3: what what do you think we should be doing rather than saying, here's what we've done. What do you reckon it has to be co-designed from the beginning?

403

00:58:13.500 --> 00:58:20.900

Participant 3: we don't some journals. I know the (journal). Actually does this again, they have a group of patients that they use as peer reviewers, and those

404

00:58:21.040 --> 00:58:46.449

Participant 3: peer reviewers are paid, the patient ones consumer ones. So we don't have any. We haven't even put any thought into that structure for doing that. So I think it's around not just sort of tacking them onto your kind of current processes and expecting them to get involved. But actually, you know, really meaningfully involving them in all the relevant parts of the processes and part of that is also, you know, way of onboarding them. So you know.

405

00:58:47.230 --> 00:59:07.790

Participant 3: I've talked with a lot of patients, I mean, I've got a couple of family members who've got chronic illnesses, who are not doctors, and even they, you know, they're highly literate. But they don't understand some of the real basics about, say how a journal functions, for example. So you can't just assume because they're an expert in their area. They can become an expert in the journal without giving them sufficient support to do that.

406

00:59:09.320 --> 00:59:16.379

Participant 3: So I'm keen to. I'm I'm think. You know I have been thinking about it, but it's just something we don't kind of currently have capacity to do well at the moment.

407

00:59:17.010 --> 00:59:21.336

Karen Gainey: Yeah. And as as you say, you're working on the indigenous

408

00:59:24.557 --> 00:59:33.440

Karen Gainey: project, which is obviously that's not insubstantial. So it's and you're wanting to do that very deliberately and meaningfully.

409

00:59:33.440 --> 00:59:37.740

Participant 3: Yeah. Doing it deliberately, I think, is the right way to say is that you? You can't just.

410

00:59:37.910 --> 00:59:40.469

Participant 3: you know, you've got to think through the whole process properly.

411

00:59:40.960 --> 00:59:54.849

Karen Gainey: Well, that's one of the things another big theme that came through when we asked people was they didn't want to see consumer involvement in plain language, summaries as tokenistic.

412

00:59:54.850 --> 00:59:55.530

Participant 3: Yeah, yeah.

413

00:59:56.190 --> 00:59:59.490

Karen Gainey: They wanted it to be meaningful. Yeah.

414

00:59:59.590 --> 01:00:05.440

Karen Gainey: though, you're on the the right track. And they really appreciated being.

415

01:00:06.150 --> 01:00:14.129

Karen Gainey: take it taken seriously and not just a tick. The box, as someone said, a ticket.
The box exercise. So

416

01:00:14.630 --> 01:00:22.119

Karen Gainey: it's was something. I think the sentiment was get it right.

417

01:00:22.340 --> 01:00:22.660

Participant 3: Yes.

418

01:00:22.660 --> 01:00:26.109

Karen Gainey: Don't just do it for the sake of it. Do it properly.

419

01:00:26.110 --> 01:00:27.700

Participant 3: That's good to know.

420

01:00:27.700 --> 01:00:48.649

Karen Gainey: Yeah, yeah, so you're not. It's not like you're not doing the right thing. You're thinking of thinking about it. And yeah, no, I thank you so much. Is there any anything else you can think of? We haven't covered. That you think is important, either from your previous experience or current, or for the future.

421

01:00:48.650 --> 01:00:50.070

Participant 3: No, the only the only other thing.

422

01:00:50.070 --> 01:00:50.590

Karen Gainey: No problem.

423

01:00:50.960 --> 01:00:53.579

Participant 3: Well, that relates to this we've been thinking about is some

424

01:00:54.060 --> 01:01:04.379

Participant 3: I don't know. If you saw this we published a supplement at the end. Oh, my God! Was the end of last year! I can't remember now. Which was looking at the involved participation of young people in, you know, health.

425

01:01:04.972 --> 01:01:09.959

Participant 3: conversations, and such like. And I just wondered whether that was an aspect that you

426

01:01:10.160 --> 01:01:12.843

Participant 3: considered in lay summaries, because

427

01:01:14.040 --> 01:01:24.589

Participant 3: that obviously, you know, younger people with health diseases have a have a whole different set of needs, and I don't know whether that's something that's come up at all in your discussions.

428

01:01:24.590 --> 01:01:26.307

Karen Gainey: No, it hasn't.

429

01:01:27.420 --> 01:01:29.550

Karen Gainey: Are you able to send that to me?

430

01:01:29.550 --> 01:01:32.310

Participant 3: Yeah, I'll send you. I'll send you the supplement. It's it's.

431

01:01:32.310 --> 01:01:33.010

Karen Gainey: Be great.

432

01:01:33.010 --> 01:02:00.709

Participant 3: It's around policy. But I mean, for example, one of the things we did there, quite, you know, meaningfully, was to have this one paper that's written by a group of young people that's around the important suggestion that we reduce the voting age of. And you know, and they make their case. And there's a couple of there's another paper within a group of indigenous health researchers which have again have how they worked with an adolescent group. And obviously, that's another group that you know needs meaningful

433

01:02:01.650 --> 01:02:06.340

Participant 3: collaboration with rather than just sort of ticking the box. So yeah, I'll send that to you. And you can see whether

434

01:02:06.460 --> 01:02:08.009

Participant 3: that has any relevance.

435

01:02:08.520 --> 01:02:33.939

Karen Gainey: Yeah, that'd be great. Well, I'm part of the I don't know if you're aware, part of the Sydney Health Literacy lab at Sydney University, and one of the other Phd. Students is doing her Phd. She's at the final stages as well on digital health, literacy, social media with young adolescents and young people.

436

01:02:34.130 --> 01:02:38.299

Karen Gainey: so it might be of use to her as well. Yes.

437

01:02:38.480 --> 01:02:40.790

Karen Gainey: yeah. So that'd that'd be great.

438

01:02:40.790 --> 01:02:41.200

Participant 3: Yeah.

439

01:02:41.200 --> 01:02:47.780

Karen Gainey: But I think that is definitely a cohort that I don't see come up in this conversation.

440

01:02:47.940 --> 01:02:48.660

Participant 3: Right.

441

01:02:48.980 --> 01:02:51.319

Karen Gainey: So that that'd be really good, because.

442

01:02:51.320 --> 01:02:52.859

Participant 3: Okay. Well, I'll send that to you.

443

01:02:53.130 --> 01:03:02.820

Karen Gainey: That'd be brilliant, and I'll definitely send that link to (Publisher). And when my paper's published this qualitative one, I'll definitely.

444

01:03:02.820 --> 01:03:21.220

Participant 3: Yeah, please do send it. I'd be really interested. And look the other thing just to say, I always say this when I talk. If there's any other, any opportunities where you think it'd be useful for the (journal). To come and speak with your group or with our researchers, just let me know. I'm very keen to you know. Kind of talk to them about what we do, and kind of get feedback on what they'd like.

445

01:03:21.220 --> 01:03:21.700

Karen Gainey: Great.

446

01:03:21.920 --> 01:03:23.719

Participant 3: So please bear that in mind, and I can't.

447

01:03:23.720 --> 01:03:25.509

Karen Gainey: Thank you. I'll pass that on.

448

01:03:25.870 --> 01:03:32.147

Karen Gainey: Yeah, I will definitely pass that on. That could be a great interest.

449

01:03:33.190 --> 01:03:41.410

Karen Gainey: and I should ask you, if do you know of any other editors that might be interested in sharing their thoughts.

450

01:03:41.410 --> 01:03:44.390

Participant 3: Have you spoken to in the Uk? Have you spoken to the (journal).

451

01:03:46.730 --> 01:03:49.939

Karen Gainey: You're the only person at your journal.

452

01:03:49.940 --> 01:03:53.380

Participant 3: Sorry have you spoken to the people at the (journal X).

453

01:03:53.380 --> 01:03:59.139

Karen Gainey: (journal). I'm speaking to Juan Franco in February.

454

01:03:59.330 --> 01:03:59.750

Participant 3: Oh, okay.

455

01:03:59.750 --> 01:04:03.429

Karen Gainey: Is it the (journal Y).

456

01:04:03.860 --> 01:04:07.210

Participant 3: Okay, you probably should try and talk to somebody at the (journal X).

457

01:04:07.780 --> 01:04:08.940

Karen Gainey: I have.

458

01:04:08.940 --> 01:04:10.089

Participant 3: Oh, you have. All right. Okay.

459

01:04:10.090 --> 01:04:10.850

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

460

01:04:10.850 --> 01:04:11.605

Participant 3: Okay.

461

01:04:14.260 --> 01:04:18.859

Participant 3: no, I can't think of anyone else comes to mind a lot of people I've been working with.

462

01:04:19.190 --> 01:04:22.539

Participant 3: Yeah, nothing. I mean, if I if somebody does come to mind, I'll let you know.

463

01:04:22.690 --> 01:04:25.960

Karen Gainey: Yeah, that'd be great. Appreciate it.

464

01:04:26.320 --> 01:04:32.400

Karen Gainey: all right. Well, I'll let you go. But if there's anything else you think of.

465

01:04:32.860 --> 01:04:37.199

Karen Gainey: if you can let me know. But I really genuinely appreciate your time today.

466

01:04:37.200 --> 01:04:44.050

Participant 3: No, it was very useful for me, so thank you for thank you for the work you're doing. It's it's really good to see this being done.