

00:03:08.200 --> 00:03:36.219

Karen Gainey: That's alright. We, you know, more than I do. But I thought just before we get going I'll just maybe give you a snapshot of sort of why, I'm doing these interviews. If that helps. But I want to. Just as a reminder I'm recording these sessions, but just the audio and zoom is transcribing the audio

Karen Gainey: as well. But I won't be using any identifying information, including that you're affiliated with X.

Karen Gainey: or any publishing information. Anything else like that?

Karen Gainey: so so basically, as you might remember, I started off with a scoping review on the author instructions for plain language summaries, and you helped me with that. That was when you were updating the ones for (journal).

Karen Gainey: Oh.

Karen Gainey: and following, I followed that up with a kind of a compliance audit to see which which I excluded (journal) from, because I only looked at original research articles to see what the level of compliance was between the instructions and the plain language summaries right? And that was recently published, and very interesting results, very, very varied results.

Karen Gainey: And I've just got being reviewed at the moment. Some qualitative interviews I did with people who read plain language summaries

Karen Gainey: from the general public people with chronic health conditions, asking them what they think of plain language summaries from a range of different sources, and (journal) came up. What they think is important, what they like, what they don't like, and just their range of perspectives. So I've taken all of that information

Karen Gainey: and put together a series of questions or topic areas that are what then? I'm asking editors or people involved in the behind the scenes. Side of plain language summaries to find out. Well, we know what's out there. We know what the end. Users

Karen Gainey: are thinking now we want to sort of find out from the practical publishing side and measured.

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

Karen Gainey: and find out really what goes into the decision making process. When it comes to publishing plain language summaries the instructions. The relationship with publishers.

Karen Gainey: how things developed the future, where you see that going.

Karen Gainey: The above.

Karen Gainey: And what you think's important.

Karen Gainey: So yeah, with that in mind, do you have any questions for me before we kind of get going.

Participant 4: I don't think so. Let's if I have any questions as we go on, though I'll ask them if that's alright.

Karen Gainey: Just jump in.

Participant 4: Yeah. And I just want to say as well.

Participant 4: I don't know. I feel like I'm a bit here under false pretences, because, although my job title is editor, I'm really a copy editor, so I don't have much say in what's actually published, you know, in in the overall sense of things I am. I see the reviews when they're finished. And obviously I had a lot of input into the guidance. And when we did the project. But now everything is just kind of carrying on. So I see the finished reviews. I copy. Edit them. I press the button to say, Yeah, that's fine, and and off it goes, so I don't have an awful lot to do with it now, but I will do my best to.

Karen Gainey: Right, all right.

Karen Gainey: No, I I understood your role, and I think (journal)'s always a little bit different to regular journals, and knowing what your role is, and the nature of what (journal) does and their plain language summaries. I think you might still be up to, to maybe fill in some gaps or add a different perspective. So I think it's still an important aspect to explore. But I appreciate you saying.

Karen Gainey: Okay,

Karen Gainey: yeah. But also, I guess what I've said to other people is this isn't limited to your current position, either. If you want to reflect on any other

Karen Gainey: even personal thoughts on plain language summaries or experiences you've had prior to (journal), that's all relevant, relevant to so can be quite, quite

Karen Gainey: yeah.

Karen Gainey: Alright. So I think just wanting to get an understanding. I guess if I could.

Karen Gainey: One thing I don't quite understand with (journal) is the relationship because I understand. Correct me if I'm wrong. But the it's really the relationship with. I think it's why Publisher X, publisher. So I know with some journals or

Karen Gainey: So I guess that's the 1st question do with. I know it's called (journal) But is it

Karen Gainey: the way how it's published, is it still considered a journal as such?

Participant 4: Yeah, it is.

Karen Gainey: So yeah, it's a journal. Yes, yeah. Yeah.

Participant 4: Yeah, so Publisher X, are the publishers. Obviously, we have a contract with Publisher X, who pay us a certain amount of money to publish some reviews. It's not a specific number, but they have to feel that the reviews we're publishing are important enough to justify the money that they pay us.

Karen Gainey: Yep.

Participant 4: So I think, unless it's for things like sort of open access. You know that those sorts of concerns I don't think that that bothered about things like plain language summaries, although I think they do use them in their publicity.

Karen Gainey: Yes, yes, they've got and I think it's under editing services or

Karen Gainey: other services. A service where it's essentially outsourced. You can.

Participant 4: Okay.

Karen Gainey: Someone to write your language. Summary. Yeah.

Participant 4: Oh, do they?

Karen Gainey: Yeah. Yeah.

Participant 4: Interesting. I'll write that down.

Karen Gainey: Yeah, yeah.

Karen Gainey: one of the few that do that.

Karen Gainey: And so it's it's generally in the author instructions. They'll they'll kind of recommend plain language summaries and and.

Participant 4: If you want.

Karen Gainey: To that service.

Participant 4: Well, that's interesting. Yeah.

Karen Gainey: Because you have to investigate or inquire to get.

Karen Gainey: so I don't know the sense, but it's an it's the author that would pay.

Participant 4: Yeah. Yeah. Well, that makes that makes sense. Yes. So we don't.

Participant 4: One of the things we were considering after the plain language summary project was to have a team of plain language, summary writers, or at least one person or 2 people, maybe, who would focus on high profile reviews particularly important topics, and write the plain language summaries for those, but that that never materialized. So we have, we have the guidance, we have the template. It's in the Handbook. It's mandatory, and you

know the authors are supposed to just complete the template now, so we don't have that facility, although a few people did ask us, after the project, whether somebody could write it for them.

Karen Gainey: Oh, okay.

Participant 4: Yeah.

Karen Gainey: What is it? What are the kind of barriers, or what was the.

Participant 4: Well, it's all to do with money and resources, Karen. We thought again with the project. We thought that would be stage one. So we'd we'd set up the template, people would start using it. Eventually. All this would come through in the reviews. We'd have a decent number of people to ask what they thought about it, and to carry out some more research on as you did. You know qualitative interviews, and looking at things like the level of language, the smog readings, you know that kind of thing, but we had lots of change at (journal), and that never materialized. So we are there. I'm really pushing hard to get that second phase going, because I think it could be improved. But I'm not sure whether that will happen.

Karen Gainey: I've actually reviewed, reviewed a few (journal) systematic reviews as a consumer, and

Karen Gainey: on the plain language summary. So yeah, no, it's just interesting. When you said a few people had commented, what sort of feedback have you gotten on the new template?

Karen Gainey: Anything.

Participant 4: Well, we we're not gathering feedback on the template in particular. We did before it was published in the Handbook. We did, and you know we made changes to it. We tweaked it according to what people said. At the end of the project there was an awful lot of research. We employed an external company to do market sort of market research. So they did lots of interviews with lots of different people, and we incorporated their feedback. We spoke to the (journal) translation teams, and we incorporated their feedback. But more of this was in 2020 21.

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

Participant 4: The end of the project to produce the 1st template. So the kind of things they wanted were for them all to follow the same format all to have headings, you know. They like question headings better than just plain headings they liked. Obviously they like simple language, and they like them to be as short as possible, but also to include everything. So you know, that's a challenge. So we took a lot of that on board, as well as having to give a proper representation of the review and the results of the review, which is difficult when you can't use any technical language like you can't talk about risk of bias or certainty of evidence,

and that kind of thing. So, yeah, so we took all of that on board, and all of that is included in the current template and guidance.

Karen Gainey: It's an amazing document.

Participant 4: Oh, well, thank you.

Karen Gainey: It's so thorough it's what 20 odd pages.

Participant 4: Yeah. Yeah. And there's a sort of a shorter version as well. If you look, just look at the template. It gives you sort of short bits of guidance, and then links back to the full document. I don't know if anybody really reads it, but you know, I think that all of the ones that I see now a lot better than they used to be.

Karen Gainey: That's yeah. That's great.

Participant 4: Hmm.

Karen Gainey: Yeah, that's encouraging. Encouraging. Yeah, yeah.

Karen Gainey: So when people. So I haven't done a (journal) systematic review. So apologies for my ignorance.

Participant 4: No.

Karen Gainey: When people do one. Given that the pls is mandatory, is that something they submit with the systematic review? Or is that a separate.

Participant 4: No, it's part of the review. When you write a review you get the, it comes up in Revman.

Karen Gainey: Yep.

Participant 4: Which is the program we use to write them, and it has all the headings. And one of those is plain language summary in the focus format, which is a new shortened format of the (journal) Review. That's just come in. It's set out in the review, I think, as part of the Revman document that you open to write your review in. So in the long format reviews, you have to put the headings in yourself, but I think it's all set up for you in the focused review format.

Karen Gainey: Gotcha. Yep, that makes sense.

Participant 4: Yeah.

Karen Gainey: Oh, cool

Karen Gainey: alright. So what's the process? When? Somebody because I've only seen it, I guess, at the final end, when.

Karen Gainey: They're put on task, engage and ask for the consumer. Feedback.

Participant 4: Yeah.

Karen Gainey: What's the process in between that? When a thematic group or somebody submits a systematic review, they've got the plain language summary. Does it go somewhere else before

Karen Gainey: It's sent out for consumer input.

Participant 4: I think what would happen generally is that the author team would submit their review to the editorial service for acceptance, and once it's accepted. It is looked at by managing editor who will check that. It complies with everything that it needs to the methods, editors, and the qualitative sorry. The quality assurance people will check that. The methods are all right and everything is fine. And then there's several goes with it, from editorial going back to the authors, and so on. But when they submit the review, it has everything in it, so they will have written their plain language, summary, and their abstract and everything, and ideally we will have had the protocol first, so that will also have been checked. So everything should follow through to the review, and should all be, you know, should all be fine. Yeah. So when they submit, they submit it all. they will have written the plain language summary. So Central Editorial service will make recommendations, I think, to the author on how they can change it. They're allowed to actually make any changes once it's been submitted, and it goes to a sign off editor. It goes to Peer Review, a sign off editor, and then it's signed off for publication, and then it comes through to copy edit. And then we copy, edit it. Send it back for checking to the authors for a last check, and then it comes back to copy edit. And we go, yeah, okay, fine. Press the button, and it's published.

Karen Gainey: Right.

Karen Gainey: And are all of them that end up in the library published through Publisher X.

Karen Gainey: or at least select it. Yeah, okay, yep.

Karen Gainey: Great. Oh, that's really good. That's some of the things I've often wondered and wasn't sure. Because I know you, I get the new newsletters, and the output is is substantial.

Participant 4: Hmm, yeah.

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

Karen Gainey: What?

Karen Gainey: When you were doing the instructions, or even before that. What? What are your thoughts on with the plain language summary. What? What do you think is the audience for that? For the who reads the (journal).

Participant 4: Everybody reads the plain language summary. I know that's a really hard thing to.

Karen Gainey: Hmm.

Participant 4: You know, as a communicator, or certainly as somebody. My background is marketing, and it's very difficult to just write it for everybody. You want something specific for a specific audience. But the plain language summary. We found that it's for consumers. It's for people who are caring for somebody with a problem for the person with a health issue. It's for hospital managers. It's for people making guideline decisions. It's for people everywhere. And we've even found, apparently, that people like the World Health Organization and clinicians in hospitals, anybody who's busy or who might be tired, or, you know, just needs quickly to get an answer. They don't want to plough through even the abstract. It's too much. So they just want a really brief summary of something that is easy to read and really simple to take in the information, and they might just read the key messages at the top, apparently. So it needs to be short and succinct. But I think the key is because it's written in plain language. Everybody can read it, and it's really accessible, whereas even clinicians, if they're busy or they're tired, or you know, they just don't want to think about it. They find even the abstract, just perhaps a bit too challenging in certain circumstances.

Right. That's something I hadn't thought of, because that's I'm finding there's 2 different types of audiences, one that is specifically say, patients or consumer groups, and by consumers. Usually people with chronic medical conditions and.

Karen Gainey: Forth, and the other is the more general, which is non researchers from other fields. The clinicians.

Participant 4: Yeah.

Karen Gainey: The makers, media.

Participant 4: Yeah, journalists.

Karen Gainey: Yep, a whole range. Obviously, there's no right or wrong. It's just a different approach. So just wondering, trying to understand what if or if there's any if the decisions around

Karen Gainey: thinking the audience is deliberate, or if it's evolved over time. If Sense of that.

Participant 4: Yeah. I well, from my understanding, plain language summaries were always initially aimed at consumers. So people with the condition or their carers who were not clinicians and didn't have any expert knowledge. So (journal) reviews as a whole are meant to be relatively accessible. They're meant to be written in such a way that an educated layperson could understand them. But the plain language summary takes it step further, and is always written as simply as possible, so that somebody with absolutely no medical

knowledge and no systematic review knowledge can read and understand it, and that was always the idea. But it it came to light, I think, when we were doing the research, that there is an awful lot of people who look at the plain language summary first, st just to get a picture, you know including, as I said, people like doctors, or you know people you would expect to go for the more heavy hitting stuff.

Participant 4: Simple, but first.st

Karen Gainey: Yeah. And it's interesting. You mentioned doctors who might be a bit tired. Yeah, that's not something I'd heard before. But that's

Karen Gainey: I can understand that. And that's.

Participant 4: Yeah, I only have anecdotal evidence of that.

Karen Gainey: I don't have.

Participant 4: You know, don't have any research to back it up. Yeah.

215

00:22:10.240 --> 00:22:13.089

Karen Gainey: Yeah, but that does make sense.

216

00:22:13.620 --> 00:22:26.299

Participant 4: Yeah. You just think, oh, God, I can't cope with that. I'm just gonna I'm just gonna read the easy bit. It's like flicking through a magazine and looking at the pictures, you know it's that it's that sort of thing, you know. You just. You can't cope with it. So you.

217

00:22:26.300 --> 00:22:27.760

Karen Gainey: Oh, yeah. Time. Floor.

218

00:22:27.760 --> 00:22:30.030

Participant 4: Yeah, absolutely.

219

00:22:30.030 --> 00:22:31.260

Karen Gainey: Still want something.

220

00:22:31.470 --> 00:22:32.250

Participant 4: Yeah.

221

00:22:32.250 --> 00:22:45.889

Karen Gainey: Yeah. One of the things that when I was talking to people, they mentioned that the label, or the term that designate these summaries had a big impact on how they thought about it, and whether they.

222

00:22:45.890 --> 00:22:46.760

Participant 4: Rewrite it.

223

00:22:46.760 --> 00:22:47.290

Karen Gainey: Or not.

224

00:22:48.420 --> 00:22:55.459

Karen Gainey: And so I know yours is called plain language summaries. Have they always been called that? Do you know.

225

00:22:55.460 --> 00:22:57.560

Participant 4: Yeah, I think they. I think they have. Yes.

226

00:22:57.560 --> 00:22:58.210

Karen Gainey: Yeah, I think.

227

00:22:58.210 --> 00:22:59.950

Participant 4: I have. What do people like best.

228

00:23:00.800 --> 00:23:23.889

Karen Gainey: Well, it's funny. It was really mixed, and I spoke to people. About half of them were from Australia, and about of the other half. It was mixed between Europe and the Us. And so we had people who didn't like the word lay. So the word lay wasn't popular.

229

00:23:23.890 --> 00:23:24.390

Participant 4: Yeah.

230

00:23:24.657 --> 00:23:27.060

Karen Gainey: Some people said, oh, it reminds me of chickens.

231

00:23:28.190 --> 00:23:29.080

Participant 4: Yes.

232

00:23:29.533 --> 00:23:31.349

Karen Gainey: It has religious connotations.

233

00:23:31.350 --> 00:23:33.580

Participant 4: Going to say. It always makes me think of a lay preacher.

234

00:23:33.580 --> 00:23:37.729

Karen Gainey: Yeah, yeah, or it just sounds vague.

235

00:23:37.870 --> 00:23:51.609

Karen Gainey: Yeah, they didn't like the word patient, because that seemed patronizing. Didn't mind the word consumer. But plain language summary was the most consistently popular.

236

00:23:51.720 --> 00:23:53.060

Participant 4: Oh, that's good!

237

00:23:53.250 --> 00:24:03.539

Karen Gainey: They made they did specify. They didn't like plain English summary, because I felt that was exclusive, inclusive to people with.

238

00:24:03.540 --> 00:24:03.990

Participant 4: Hmm.

239

00:24:03.990 --> 00:24:10.589

Karen Gainey: Other languages. But speaking with an editor a few weeks ago from Europe.

240

00:24:10.700 --> 00:24:14.499

Karen Gainey: he said, the word in Europe there's not

241

00:24:15.296 --> 00:24:20.030

Karen Gainey: the term. Plain language isn't common in their vernacular

242

00:24:20.979 --> 00:24:27.209

Karen Gainey: and the plane, or or that they use patient summary. So it's

243

00:24:28.720 --> 00:24:35.290

Karen Gainey: and that's not something I've come across before, so it seems very very

244

00:24:35.940 --> 00:24:40.770

Karen Gainey: mixed and a little bit subjective.

245

00:24:42.590 --> 00:24:44.580

Participant 4: Yeah, I think it's all subjective.

246

00:24:44.580 --> 00:24:47.570

Karen Gainey: Yeah, but it's well if they had an impact, no.

247

00:24:47.830 --> 00:24:50.850

Karen Gainey: on whether people would even read further.

248

00:24:52.750 --> 00:24:58.620

Karen Gainey: Yeah. Oh, well, yeah, it either turn people off or makes them feel like, Hey, this is for me.

249

00:24:58.810 --> 00:25:03.579

Karen Gainey: So it was all about language or words that made them feel, this is written for me.

250

00:25:03.940 --> 00:25:04.800

Participant 4: Yeah.

251

00:25:04.800 --> 00:25:10.360

Karen Gainey: So they talked about some of the ones from other journals that were a little bit more.

252

00:25:10.620 --> 00:25:17.340

Karen Gainey: They just had words that were things like highlights, key messages.

253

00:25:17.480 --> 00:25:17.930

Participant 4: Okay.

254

00:25:18.485 --> 00:25:26.819

Karen Gainey: Messages, key points that were descriptive but weren't necessarily involving the audience in the label.

255

00:25:28.040 --> 00:25:28.390

Participant 4: That's good.

256

00:25:28.390 --> 00:25:30.430

Karen Gainey: Less powerful and useful.

257

00:25:31.350 --> 00:25:34.259

Karen Gainey: And didn't speak to the audience as much.

258

00:25:34.620 --> 00:25:37.869

Karen Gainey: and they made them think, Well, is this for me or not?

259

00:25:38.830 --> 00:25:39.560

Karen Gainey: So.

260

00:25:39.560 --> 00:25:40.140

Participant 4: Yeah.

261

00:25:40.310 --> 00:25:43.540

Karen Gainey: Yeah, that was hmm.

262

00:25:43.540 --> 00:25:49.960

Participant 4: That's interesting. So they're all called plain language summaries. And each one of them obviously has a title that

263

00:25:50.590 --> 00:25:55.594

Participant 4: is, represents the the review title. In a way, it's sort of

264

00:25:57.020 --> 00:26:05.370

Participant 4: rephrases the review title in plain language, but as a question, so that people know that we're aiming to answer a question.

265

00:26:05.760 --> 00:26:09.014

Karen Gainey: Yeah, yeah, yeah, I noticed that that.

266

00:26:09.720 --> 00:26:19.562

Karen Gainey: yeah, that would that. Yeah. Cause one of the things they they said as well. They really like the the kind of the because I use it often in

267

00:26:20.300 --> 00:26:25.020

Karen Gainey: kind of the shared decision making aspect. They like to take

268

00:26:25.580 --> 00:26:34.560

Karen Gainey: either either take an actual plain language summary or just look at it to either. See if they want to read the full article.

269

00:26:34.750 --> 00:26:44.420

Karen Gainey: and this is could be (journal) or another one, and say, Well, say they have diabetes, and this is a new therapy. Is this something that.

270

00:26:44.420 --> 00:26:44.860

Participant 4: Okay.

271

00:26:44.860 --> 00:26:46.090

Karen Gainey: Useful for me.

272

00:26:46.280 --> 00:26:57.639

Karen Gainey: And so they're looking to just get the actionable points or the relevant points that are for them. So they're not so much interested in the background. The methods. It's the.

273

00:26:57.640 --> 00:26:58.170

Participant 4: Yep.

274

00:26:58.550 --> 00:27:00.420

Karen Gainey: The what's in it for me sort of stuff.

275

00:27:00.420 --> 00:27:01.150

Participant 4: Yes.

276

00:27:01.500 --> 00:27:01.910

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

277

00:27:01.910 --> 00:27:12.039

Participant 4: That's what we try and do with the key messages at the top. There should be sort of 2 or 3 bullet points that just sum up the main results. Obviously the key messages. So.

278

00:27:12.040 --> 00:27:12.380

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

279

00:27:12.380 --> 00:27:19.259

Participant 4: Yes, this is suitable for you. If you are like this, this and this we find, this is this, this is this, and you know what we need in the future is

280

00:27:19.490 --> 00:27:24.280

Participant 4: more research on this or less research on this. So that's what we try and do.

281

00:27:25.130 --> 00:27:31.810

Participant 4: and I hope that all of the plain language summaries now should have key messages at the top.

282

00:27:32.850 --> 00:27:34.760

Karen Gainey: And is that why they're at the top? Is that.

283

00:27:35.020 --> 00:27:40.589

Participant 4: That's absolutely they're at the top. That's the 1st and possibly the only thing that people read. So.

284

00:27:40.590 --> 00:27:41.390

Karen Gainey: Right.

285

00:27:41.390 --> 00:27:42.479

Participant 4: They need to.

286

00:27:43.320 --> 00:27:48.370

Participant 4: they need to sum it, sum it up. And then the other thing that we do, because people don't read

287

00:27:48.800 --> 00:28:03.409

Participant 4: everything is when we give the results. We don't say oh! We found that such and such affected this and such and such affected this, but the evidence was very uncertain. We have a word

288

00:28:03.410 --> 00:28:20.819

Participant 4: at the beginning that gives the impression that there is some uncertainty. If there is uncertainty, so we say it may do this, or it probably does this, and that's that's really key. So that was that was done before we started. That was (journal), (Country).

289

00:28:22.110 --> 00:28:27.747

Participant 4: They sort of invented that that sort of phraseology, the narrative

290

00:28:28.600 --> 00:28:51.090

Participant 4: results, if you like, and and that's it's not perfect, because I think those words sometimes hard to translate, but as long as it gives the impression immediately that the

results are not certain, that you know there is some limitations in the evidence that makes you think not quite sure about that. So you don't say this is the result. But you say it might do.

291

00:28:51.530 --> 00:28:53.220

Karen Gainey: Yes, yes.

292

00:28:53.830 --> 00:29:14.529

Karen Gainey: yeah. And it's I guess there's 1 of the the big themes that came out was, you know, the the way people use health information, and misinformation, or the way people use information when they're in crisis or under stress. And or

293

00:29:15.020 --> 00:29:24.110

Karen Gainey: people pointed out that when they have cognitive challenges, or which might even be just brain fog or neurological.

294

00:29:25.040 --> 00:29:31.089

Karen Gainey: Challenges chronic the way they process information will be very different.

295

00:29:31.450 --> 00:29:31.779

Participant 4: Oh, my God!

296

00:29:31.780 --> 00:29:38.989

Karen Gainey: Myself. So having something that's tries to get through that ambiguity.

297

00:29:41.110 --> 00:29:50.300

Karen Gainey: Without conflating the results, presenting it it clearly, and accurately, is what I'm trying to say.

298

00:29:50.300 --> 00:29:51.070

Participant 4: Site.

299

00:29:51.070 --> 00:29:53.529

Karen Gainey: Sounds like what you're trying to achieve if I'm.

300

00:29:53.530 --> 00:29:58.580

Participant 4: That's exactly what we're trying to achieve. Exactly. Exactly. So, Karen, yeah.

301

00:29:58.580 --> 00:29:59.909

Karen Gainey: Yeah, that makes sense.

302

00:30:00.530 --> 00:30:01.010

Participant 4: Hmm.

303

00:30:01.010 --> 00:30:02.100

Karen Gainey: Cool.

304

00:30:05.290 --> 00:30:09.933

Karen Gainey: So that doesn't. I was gonna so just looking at my questions,

305

00:30:10.320 --> 00:30:12.469

Participant 4: I've probably messed up the order of things.

306

00:30:12.470 --> 00:30:13.679

Karen Gainey: No, you haven't at all.

307

00:30:13.680 --> 00:30:14.250

Karen Gainey: Okay.

308

00:30:14.250 --> 00:30:24.902

Karen Gainey: not at all. Because I'm just looking at that. And it's like that doesn't apply because it's about access, and everything you've got is completely open, access and accessible.

309

00:30:25.270 --> 00:30:26.650

Participant 4: Language summaries are. Yes.

310

00:30:26.890 --> 00:30:27.879

Karen Gainey: And then your summary side. Yeah.

311

00:30:27.880 --> 00:30:41.110

Participant 4: Yeah. And they're translated. So the abstract, the plain language summary, and the summary findings. Tables are the summary versions of the review, and certainly the abstract and the plain language summary are freely available to everybody, and they're translated.

312

00:30:41.490 --> 00:30:42.150

Karen Gainey: Yep.

313

00:30:42.790 --> 00:30:53.034

Karen Gainey: actually thinking of access in a different way. Which may only be possible with (journal). Are they? Do they come up on

314

00:30:54.617 --> 00:30:56.770

Karen Gainey: The search engines.

315

00:30:57.160 --> 00:30:58.780

Participant 4: They should do.

316

00:30:58.940 --> 00:31:01.470

Participant 4: I can't say that they do or not. I don't know.

317

00:31:01.930 --> 00:31:03.929

Participant 4: But I think if you searched.

318

00:31:04.690 --> 00:31:10.089

Participant 4: if you search for a term, that you and you found a (journal) Review, it might take you to the library, in which case.

319

00:31:10.090 --> 00:31:10.600

Karen Gainey: Except.

320

00:31:10.600 --> 00:31:15.610

Participant 4: You could, you'd probably see the whole review, but the plain language summary would be near the top.

321

00:31:17.930 --> 00:31:19.889

Participant 4: But I know they're published separately.

322

00:31:20.750 --> 00:31:23.719

Participant 4: Honestly, I don't know, so I don't know how you would.

323

00:31:23.930 --> 00:31:34.400

Participant 4: I don't know how that would work, and we do say, as part of the guidance that in the title you should use terms that people understand and are likely to search for so.

324

00:31:34.400 --> 00:31:35.600

Karen Gainey: Okay, right?

325

00:31:36.290 --> 00:31:40.420

Participant 4: For the title of the Review, but also especially for the plain language. Summary.

326

00:31:40.580 --> 00:31:42.010

Karen Gainey: Oh, that's interesting!

327

00:31:42.210 --> 00:31:42.890

Participant 4: Hmm.

328

00:31:43.398 --> 00:31:48.051

Karen Gainey: Do you find anyone shares them on social media like the authors?

329

00:31:48.410 --> 00:31:53.390

Participant 4: I think some people do to be honest again, Karen. It's not really my area. I don't really know.

330

00:31:53.390 --> 00:31:54.369

Karen Gainey: Yeah, no fair enough.

331

00:31:54.370 --> 00:31:58.849

Participant 4: I think some of them do. But I don't have anything really to do with that.

332

00:31:59.150 --> 00:32:00.100

Karen Gainey: That's okay.

333

00:32:04.610 --> 00:32:06.860

Karen Gainey: that's we've talked about that.

334

00:32:07.060 --> 00:32:13.426

Karen Gainey: We talked about that. Yeah. So just wanna kind of talk about

335

00:32:14.780 --> 00:32:19.876

Karen Gainey: As far as I'm I'm aware, and I might be wrong.

336

00:32:20.660 --> 00:32:24.189

Karen Gainey: All of the plain language summaries. Are they all just text-based?

337

00:32:24.710 --> 00:32:25.360

Participant 4: Yeah.

338

00:32:25.550 --> 00:32:26.250

Karen Gainey: Yeah,

339

00:32:27.740 --> 00:32:36.059

Karen Gainey: so there is there any kind of thought, as far as you're aware, to offer any sort of graphical or video, or any other format.

340

00:32:36.060 --> 00:32:37.339

Participant 4: That it's a dream.

341

00:32:37.510 --> 00:32:38.080

Karen Gainey: A dream.

342

00:32:38.080 --> 00:32:41.990

Participant 4: As a dream. Yeah, at the moment we can't, because Revman won't do that.

343

00:32:42.560 --> 00:32:43.290

Karen Gainey: Oh!

344

00:32:43.290 --> 00:32:48.850

Participant 4: In the in the the focus format. We can have bulleted lists.

345

00:32:49.680 --> 00:32:50.480

Karen Gainey: Okay.

346

00:32:50.730 --> 00:32:52.130

Participant 4: That's as far as we've got.

347

00:32:52.380 --> 00:32:52.950

Karen Gainey: Yep.

348

00:32:52.950 --> 00:32:58.850

Participant 4: So I think you can have we're working on, perhaps having different size headings.

349

00:32:59.070 --> 00:33:09.909

Participant 4: So they're not just text. That's bold. And I think we've got the ability to have proper formatted bulleted lists. So the text doesn't go back to the beginning under the bullet point. It's actually a proper.

350

00:33:14.700 --> 00:33:17.869

Karen Gainey: oh, you've just frozen. Oh, there you go! Yep, that you're, right.

351

00:33:18.625 --> 00:33:25.550

Participant 4: So yeah, we we would love to be able to have sort of infographics or.

352

00:33:26.480 --> 00:33:32.289

Participant 4: Or something like that. If those are available, and then they'll be available somewhere else on the (journal) website.

353

00:33:32.630 --> 00:33:33.200

Karen Gainey: Gotcha.

354

00:33:33.200 --> 00:33:35.409

Participant 4: And (journal).org somewhere like that.

355

00:33:35.410 --> 00:33:36.240

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

356

00:33:36.380 --> 00:33:43.419

Karen Gainey: would that be something you'd imagine authors would put together? Or would there be a dedicated team at (journal)

357

00:33:43.590 --> 00:33:44.240

Karen Gainey: or.

358

00:33:44.535 --> 00:33:50.440

Participant 4: I think that's the kind of thing that you get a team of enthusiastic students to do for you.

359

00:33:51.281 --> 00:33:52.990

Karen Gainey: I think that's what happened.

360

00:33:52.990 --> 00:33:53.690

Participant 4: Happened.

361

00:33:53.850 --> 00:33:55.409

Karen Gainey: The evidently (journal).

362

00:33:55.760 --> 00:33:59.100

Participant 4: Yeah, that kind. Well, yes, again, that's that's another thing. That's kind of.

363

00:33:59.100 --> 00:34:00.170

Karen Gainey: Project, yeah.

364

00:34:00.170 --> 00:34:00.840

Participant 4: Golden.

365

00:34:01.070 --> 00:34:07.499

Karen Gainey: Yeah, so have you had people ask about that sort of format or.

366

00:34:08.230 --> 00:34:09.050

Karen Gainey: Want that.

367

00:34:09.550 --> 00:34:18.526

Karen Gainey: Yes, we did. We did have that when we did the project there was quite a lot of feedback saying it'd be really good if we could have. I don't know. Traffic lights or

368

00:34:18.989 --> 00:34:25.610

Participant 4: Diagrams, or you know, something more visual, not just text. But we. We can't do that.

369

00:34:25.920 --> 00:34:26.649

Karen Gainey: Right? Okay.

370

00:34:26.650 --> 00:34:29.509

Participant 4: Something that we would very much like to do. But we can't.

371

00:34:29.670 --> 00:34:35.649

Karen Gainey: Yeah, so there's been a demand for it. So if you're able to.

372

00:34:35.659 --> 00:34:43.329

Participant 4: Yeah, there, there was a demand. I don't know quite how much it was, and I don't know whether people still, probably they would still like that. Yeah.

373

00:34:43.330 --> 00:34:49.649

Karen Gainey: Hmm, yeah. Okay, so thinking about. So that's how

374

00:34:50.040 --> 00:34:59.449

Karen Gainey: that's where things are. And I know you've there's barriers and resources and funding is a big one. But

375

00:34:59.590 --> 00:35:01.459

Karen Gainey: if we could dream a little bit more.

376

00:35:02.570 --> 00:35:11.349

Karen Gainey: what? What do you think's the future? For plain language summaries at (journal), or what would you like to be? The future.

377

00:35:11.350 --> 00:35:23.006

Participant 4: Well, I I would like to see, as I said, something like, you know, traffic lights or infographics. That kind of thing embedded in the plain language summaries, I think that would be really helpful.

378

00:35:23.330 --> 00:35:27.609

Karen Gainey: Tell me how that might work, how, when you say traffic lights.

379

00:35:27.610 --> 00:35:28.663

Participant 4: I think

380

00:35:29.660 --> 00:35:48.658

Participant 4: for, say, in in the key messages, if there was something that worked well, you could have a green light, something that wasn't so good. You could have an amber light if it was something that caused an unwanted effect. You could have a red light. Perhaps. I don't know it's not even been investigated, because it's just so impossible, you know, and that's, I suppose, that kind of thing.

381

00:35:48.930 --> 00:35:50.050

Karen Gainey: Coding kind of.

382

00:35:50.050 --> 00:35:55.470

Participant 4: Yeah, that? Yes, I suppose so. We have a whole series of a

383

00:35:56.220 --> 00:36:07.330

Participant 4: of really really good sort of cartoony sort of animated videos that have been absolutely brilliant. But we we're not doing those anymore. I don't think because the person who did them is gone.

384

00:36:07.680 --> 00:36:29.883

Participant 4: Yeah. So those were well, certainly, a few years ago we had a series of those which were, for example, explaining what a diagnostic test tax accuracy review is, or you know those kind of things which really really good. So linking, being able to link to things like that from the plain language summary and and vice versa, I think is is very useful. Yeah,

385

00:36:31.590 --> 00:36:43.470

Participant 4: we we had in the summer last year we had a data scientist in looking at AI for writing plain language summaries, and he spent quite a lot of time trying to

386

00:36:43.680 --> 00:36:54.710

Participant 4: trying to get it to produce something that was good. I think the results were sort of promising, but they would need an awful lot of work afterwards. So I think that's something that

387

00:36:56.190 --> 00:37:04.190

Participant 4: he or somebody else is coming back to have another go at it along with a few other things with AI next this this year, sometime.

388

00:37:04.450 --> 00:37:04.810

Karen Gainey: Yep.

389

00:37:04.810 --> 00:37:07.079

Participant 4: So as far as I'm concerned.

390

00:37:07.260 --> 00:37:18.929

Participant 4: I think the authors have done their research. You know they've they've run the searches. They've crunched the data. They've written the review, and I think if they want to use AI to write the plain language summary, then

391

00:37:19.060 --> 00:37:27.960

Participant 4: fine, and they might already be doing that I don't know, and I I think it would be fantastic if you got a really good quality product.

392

00:37:28.360 --> 00:37:40.769

Participant 4: That was some, you know, based on the template, using the right kind of language, and all you had to do was press a button, say, right, do my plain language summary from this? Yeah. But that seems to be really hard.

393

00:37:41.100 --> 00:37:41.590

Karen Gainey: Oh, great!

394

00:37:41.590 --> 00:37:51.729

Participant 4: I don't use AI, so I I don't know. But apparently I think if you could, if you could say Well, I want you to put the information in this template. Use these headings.

395

00:37:51.840 --> 00:37:55.180

Participant 4: Make the language at this kind of level. Yeah, you know.

396

00:37:55.800 --> 00:38:02.320

Participant 4: just put all of this information in here. And I mean, I thought, that's what AI was for. But apparently it's quite hard

397

00:38:02.660 --> 00:38:03.390

Participant 4: what's going on.

398

00:38:03.390 --> 00:38:03.780

Karen Gainey: To make it.

399

00:38:03.780 --> 00:38:09.389

Participant 4: Do that, but I don't know. So, as far as I'm concerned, that would be great. But it's a long way off.

400

00:38:10.120 --> 00:38:25.169

Karen Gainey: Right? Okay, yeah, it's it's that was one of the things I was going to ask about, because it came up in a few workshops at the Colloquium, and there were mixed thoughts on it. Certainly, in the sense of

401

00:38:25.320 --> 00:38:36.380

Karen Gainey: with planning or summaries, it might help them get out faster, because it's something that when you talk to authors something they find they find a bit onerous and.

402

00:38:36.380 --> 00:38:37.359

Participant 4: Yes. Yeah.

403

00:38:37.360 --> 00:38:37.720

Karen Gainey: Oh!

404

00:38:37.720 --> 00:38:39.209

Participant 4: And very difficult and.

405

00:38:39.210 --> 00:38:43.770

Karen Gainey: Difficult, because it's not always easy or intuitive.

406

00:38:43.990 --> 00:38:44.320

Participant 4: Bet.

407

00:38:44.460 --> 00:38:50.110

Karen Gainey: To be able to hit that right balance between informing but not patronising.

408

00:38:50.110 --> 00:38:50.850

Participant 4: Yeah.

409

00:38:51.293 --> 00:38:55.730

Karen Gainey: And it can take up quite a bit of time.

410

00:38:55.880 --> 00:38:56.250

Participant 4: Yep.

411

00:38:56.250 --> 00:39:01.960

Karen Gainey: Do it. So anything that can speed up that process and get more plain language summaries out there.

412

00:39:02.140 --> 00:39:04.840

Karen Gainey: Yeah. But then it was a question of

413

00:39:05.270 --> 00:39:09.570

Karen Gainey: that's good. But are they reliable and good quality? So it's.

414

00:39:09.570 --> 00:39:10.030

Participant 4: Right.

415

00:39:10.030 --> 00:39:14.670

Karen Gainey: When do we know we're kind of at that kind of point?

416

00:39:14.670 --> 00:39:21.190

Participant 4: Yeah, yeah, I I think we're a long way off a long way off. I wouldn't want to send something out without

417

00:39:21.480 --> 00:39:27.569

Participant 4: having checked very, very thoroughly. That it was, you know, actually properly representing the review, and it was.

418

00:39:28.640 --> 00:39:34.010

Karen Gainey: Yeah, it. It obviously still needs that human check after.

419

00:39:34.010 --> 00:39:34.600

Participant 4: Yes.

420

00:39:34.920 --> 00:39:36.979

Karen Gainey: So it's at.

421

00:39:36.980 --> 00:39:47.950

Participant 4: But even if it produced a 1st draft, I think you know very. They've done the work. Why couldn't they have a little? Because they, you know people do find it. As you said, they get to the end of the review, and they think, Oh, I've got to do this now.

422

00:39:48.490 --> 00:39:51.679

Participant 4: and it is a hard. It's a skill that lots.

423

00:39:51.680 --> 00:39:52.010

Participant 4: Yeah.

424

00:39:52.010 --> 00:39:59.569

Participant 4: don't. Quite, quite frankly. They're not very good at writing, anyway. So you know, actually being able to write in plain language is is really difficult.

425

00:39:59.760 --> 00:40:10.520

Karen Gainey: Yeah. And and and it's it's not obvious that it's that it's

426

00:40:11.230 --> 00:40:13.669

Karen Gainey: meant to be very different to the abstract.

427

00:40:15.600 --> 00:40:22.220

Karen Gainey: In terms of how to focus the information that is not just a dumbed down version of the abstract.

428

00:40:22.220 --> 00:40:23.640

Participant 4: Yeah, yeah.

429

00:40:23.940 --> 00:40:29.110

Karen Gainey: Yeah. Yeah, I I that's that's kind of

430

00:40:29.320 --> 00:40:36.294

Karen Gainey: what I'm gathering from people that the role might be just a starting point, that then

431

00:40:36.850 --> 00:40:41.642

Karen Gainey: Authors can then build on. So it gets out of that

432

00:40:42.250 --> 00:40:45.830

Karen Gainey: block of having to or where do I start? Well, here's where you start.

433

00:40:46.250 --> 00:40:47.430

Participant 4: And then.

434

00:40:47.430 --> 00:40:50.780

Karen Gainey: Tweak it from there, or a copy of it, and tweak it from there.

435

00:40:50.940 --> 00:40:51.400

Participant 4: Yeah.

436

00:40:51.400 --> 00:40:53.319

Karen Gainey: Is a possibility.

437

00:40:53.540 --> 00:41:04.939

Karen Gainey: Yeah, anything else would be on your wish list, even for how they're disseminated distribution channels or.

438

00:41:04.940 --> 00:41:05.973

Participant 4: You know.

439

00:41:06.490 --> 00:41:07.240

Karen Gainey: Bye.

440

00:41:07.630 --> 00:41:14.820

Participant 4: No, I think they're already quite widely disseminated. And the fact that they're translated they're one of the bits that are translated into so many different languages.

441

00:41:14.820 --> 00:41:15.220

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

442

00:41:15.220 --> 00:41:40.865

Participant 4: I'm not every review, but I think that's really, you know, really helpful. And sometimes I think the plain language summaries are the only contact really with (journal) that lots of people will have. But I would love to have some more data on on who is using them and how they're using them properly, and I would really love to be able to revisit the template and the guidance and say, Well, hang on! Is this working? Do you like this, you know, because I think

443

00:41:41.500 --> 00:41:45.879

Participant 4: I think there are things that could be tweaked, and I would like to do that, but not without the evidence.

444

00:41:45.880 --> 00:41:46.710

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

445

00:41:46.960 --> 00:41:49.150

Karen Gainey: Any plans to revisit.

446

00:41:49.150 --> 00:41:51.120

Participant 4: No, well, no, not the moment.

447

00:41:51.120 --> 00:41:57.279

Karen Gainey: Yeah, is that just a priority. Other projects or resourcing.

448

00:41:57.280 --> 00:41:59.189

Participant 4: It's a resource thing, I think.

449

00:41:59.190 --> 00:42:00.150

Karen Gainey: Otherwise, yeah.

450

00:42:00.150 --> 00:42:00.880

Participant 4: Yeah.

451

00:42:00.880 --> 00:42:04.659

Karen Gainey: Yeah, yeah. Understood? All right.

452

00:42:05.000 --> 00:42:10.889

Karen Gainey: Well, there's is there anything else you can think of that? We haven't kind of covered that.

453

00:42:12.330 --> 00:42:13.470

Karen Gainey: No, I don't. I don't.

454

00:42:13.470 --> 00:42:13.970

Participant 4: Think it's

455

00:42:13.970 --> 00:42:21.119

Participant 4: no. If if I do, then I'll I'll drop you an email. But I can't. I can't think of anything. We covered all of your questions.

456

00:42:21.120 --> 00:42:21.900

Karen Gainey: You have.

457

00:42:22.220 --> 00:42:23.220

Participant 4: Excellent.