

Karen Gainey: Oh, great! What was it about it that interested you particularly.

Participant 5: Especially the idea, you know.

Participant 5: people are doing a lot of replicable resources nowadays. But the ideas and the

Participant 5: So, and even when I was selecting the different option during the registration process I selected, yeah, I definitely would seek to have to know about the abstract of this.

Karen Gainey: It's time.

Participant 5: Yeah, so that's.

Karen Gainey: That's right.

Participant 5: Yeah, I'm interested. Actually, what are the ideas, perceptions, things? Currently, the associate and the editors are

Participant 5: hiding, especially for the plain language, English summary for their journals.

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

Participant 5: Yeah.

Karen Gainey: Fantastic, all right. Well, I'll give you a bit of background on.

Karen Gainey: Why, I'm doing this study how I got here. But I just want to go through a couple of quick things, so I don't forget just as a reminder. It's been a couple of weeks since you registered that a reminder. I'm recording this just recording the audio. I won't keep anything that's in the chat. But Zoom will be automatically transcribing this interview for me, and but I'll de-identify any information which will be your name, your journal, anything like that that might identify you.

Participant 5: Yeah.

Karen Gainey: So if you're comfortable with that.

Participant 5: Yeah, yeah, I give consent. No problem. Yeah, I know about the 1st question.

Karen Gainey: Okay? And so I mean, I'm I'm gonna ask a range of questions. But

Karen Gainey: it's okay. If if the answer to some of them is, you don't know, or you haven't had a lot of experience in that particular area, or and I'm not particularly looking, you know. I don't just want positive feedback or experiences. I really want to know the the real picture or your real perception. So it's okay. I really want to hear good, bad, the ugly, the.

00:03:43.190 --> 00:03:43.860

Participant 5: Yeah.

Karen Gainey: Optimistic, the futuristic, whatever it happens to be. Please don't hold back.

Karen Gainey: But based. So basically, I.

Participant 5: I hope just one questions. Can I mention the journal name that I am editing for.

Karen Gainey: Of course.

Participant 5: The inter interview process. Okay.

Karen Gainey: Of course. Yeah. And I'll just remove that from the transcript.

Participant 5: Yeah, you're, yeah.

Karen Gainey: So I've had a look. I've had looked up your journal, so I wasn't very familiar with it, and had a look at the author instructions, and particularly for the plain English summary to be become familiar with it. So that's something we will touch on. Yeah. So yeah, that's that's perfectly fine. So I did want to mention, though if so, I know you're

Karen Gainey: an associate editor with that with (journal X). But if you've had any experience in editorial roles with plain language summaries, or you have perspectives on them. With any other journal. Please feel free to draw on that as well. It doesn't have to be limited to your current position.

Participant 5: Okay. Okay.

Karen Gainey: Yep,

Karen Gainey: so, yeah. So this is the final project in my Phd, so I started doing a scoping review, looking at the author guidelines for a range of journals.

Participant 5: Okay.

Karen Gainey: Which was really useful found, though they were quite heterogeneous.

Karen Gainey: Then I looked at from health and medical journals. So then I.

Participant 5: All the health and medical analysis you were covering in your scoping review. It's huge.

Karen Gainey: I well, what I did was I searched 534, I think, initially, and then had to limit it, based on the audience.

Participant 5: Okay.

Karen Gainey: Was mentioned in the plain language summary, limiting it to just

Karen Gainey: in the author instructions whether it mentioned like a general, the general public a lay audience, that sort of thing with some of them.

60

00:05:55.730 --> 00:06:01.020

Participant 5: You are trying to include only the journals that have instructions for the play in English semi.

61

00:06:01.430 --> 00:06:07.260

Karen Gainey: Yeah, that was specifically aimed at that general public general audience, not.

62

00:06:07.260 --> 00:06:07.760

Participant 5: Okay.

63

00:06:08.040 --> 00:06:23.707

Karen Gainey: Clinicians or other researchers or so really just specific. Or it's okay. If they were aimed at those as well, but they had to mention that they were specifically aimed at the the general public, if you like.

64

00:06:24.390 --> 00:06:27.390

Karen Gainey: and then

65

00:06:28.570 --> 00:06:51.379

Karen Gainey: so I just analysed the components of those, broke them down into, you know word counts how it was structured and content. Then I followed that up with like a compliance study to see how well the actual plain language. Summaries complied to the author. Instructions from those journals found some did quite well, some really poorly.

66

00:06:51.380 --> 00:06:52.390

Participant 5: Use task.

67

00:06:53.120 --> 00:06:57.630

Karen Gainey: Was massive. Yeah, that was just published recently.

68

00:06:57.800 --> 00:06:58.530

Participant 5: Okay.

69

00:06:58.530 --> 00:06:59.150

Participant 5: I'm guessing.

70

00:07:00.430 --> 00:07:29.680

Karen Gainey: Then I did a qualitative study interviewing people who read plain language summaries, high users of health information, people with chronic medical conditions to find out what they think about these summaries, what they think works doesn't work, what they'd like, why they use them. So I put everything together and developed some questions to ask people at the journal end publishing end to kind of see.

71

00:07:29.770 --> 00:07:35.240

Karen Gainey: or we kind of know what's out there. We know what the end users like, but we want to find out

72

00:07:35.520 --> 00:07:56.119

Karen Gainey: really, bring it full circle to find out what's what's happening at the publishing end, and also to see how well, things match with what the audience might expect or like, but what might be practical or realistic. And so what I'm wanting to explore mostly are some of the decision, making

73

00:07:56.600 --> 00:08:11.930

Karen Gainey: processes some of the barriers or facilitators that might lead to those decisions about how plain language summaries are thought of, prioritized or published.

74

00:08:12.070 --> 00:08:17.649

Karen Gainey: and also looking to the future of plain language. Summaries in journal, publishing.

75

00:08:17.650 --> 00:08:18.270

Participant 5: Okay.

76

00:08:18.270 --> 00:08:26.489

Karen Gainey: So quite broad. So yeah, do you have any questions before we start.

77

00:08:26.670 --> 00:08:28.209

Participant 5: I think we can go ahead. Yeah.

78

00:08:28.460 --> 00:08:30.769

Karen Gainey: Yeah, terrific. So

79

00:08:30.900 --> 00:08:44.509

Karen Gainey: just to give me an idea of of as a starting point, can you give me a little bit of just an overview of your role with your journal, and as an editor, associate editor.

80

00:08:44.830 --> 00:08:49.869

Participant 5: Okay. So I want to share my background first.st So.

81

00:08:49.870 --> 00:08:50.250

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

82

00:08:50.250 --> 00:09:05.000

Participant 5: From Bangladesh. Surely I'm serving as editorial board member for last, maybe 3 years at highest. I started with (Journal X) like first.st I started with (Journal X).

83

00:09:05.680 --> 00:09:08.920

Participant 5: and then I started with (Journal Y)

84

00:09:09.380 --> 00:09:26.380

Participant 5: But I was an editorial board member there. So my decision was not the final there. So ultimately the editorship was the persons to decide whether, but generally the editorial recommendation is is the ultimate one. There

85

00:09:26.700 --> 00:09:40.429

Participant 5: and then I started working on the (journal X), especially the adolescents, health, adolescent nutrition, these things, and I trusted Phil in the (specialist) health channels. And you know the Editor. (name). He's my friend.

86

00:09:40.700 --> 00:09:50.529

Participant 5: and they had a circular, and before I joined as a Phd. Student in (country), currently, I'm based in (country), doing Phd. In X University

87

00:09:50.650 --> 00:09:52.390

Participant 5: on adolescent health.

88

00:09:52.980 --> 00:09:56.384

Participant 5: So before I start my Phd, I was

89

00:09:57.190 --> 00:10:04.139

Participant 5: serving as editorial board. And okay, maybe I started my the associate role before I start. My Phd.

90

00:10:04.730 --> 00:10:25.440

Participant 5: so, yeah, so because I had, almost 5 years experience on researching different fields of public health, especially the adolescence and reproductive health issues, reproductive health rights in (Country), in different projects and in different government and international funded projects in (Country).

91

00:10:25.680 --> 00:10:41.879

Participant 5: And then I decided to become an associate editor of the Journal the primary role. When I applied there there was a circular, or what could be the responsibilities for an associate editor of the journals. I had to

92

00:10:42.110 --> 00:10:46.139

Participant 5: manage at least 12 manuscripts a month preliminary.

93

00:10:46.280 --> 00:10:55.050

Participant 5: but the submission the sub number of submission nowadays is so huge, so I have to screen a lot of paper smart week even

94

00:10:55.250 --> 00:10:56.480

Participant 5: weekly. So

95

00:10:56.800 --> 00:11:14.629

Participant 5: the primary responsibility is to have a quick look at the manuscripts, especially the abstract. If the plain language is available there, though our journals strongly recommend to provide the plain language summary. But sometimes I find a lot of papers

Participant 5: that that doesn't have any plain language but the initial stage. We can proceed for the further review process or anything, without having the plain language, and then we can ask the authors to submit

Participant 5: in the revised file, or in the latest for the plain language, but initially they are strongly recommended to provide. You know you. You have read the guidelines for the plain language of persona, so we highly encourage the authors to submit this

Participant 5: so initially. I screened and have a at a glance, maybe 20 min at highest.

Karen Gainey: Interesting.

Participant 5: To to review papers especially, I notice, on the abstract sections or stops objectives of this press ready.

Participant 5: And the main thing is

Participant 5: which type of methodology they applied to attain these objectives. If the methodologically sound, if the manuscript is sound and methodologically.

Participant 5: Then I think we had some training from the journals, from the publisher side. How we can decide how we can skin initially

Participant 5: if the papers doesn't have a very good content in their backgrounds that could be improved. But if it's methodologically flaws.

Participant 5: you cannot improve in some cases. In some cases. For example, a study that's not feasible to to take some interviews over phone. But you have already declared, yeah, we took some interviews over phone, but you cannot remedy these things right?

Participant 5: So I have to. I have to give a decision that's very disappointing for the Sotos at that time.

Participant 5: So that's the initial phase. And if I think yeah, it's at least good for go for the further review process to the external reviewers, then I decide to invite some

Participant 5: external reviewers, at least. Initially, personally, me, I invite at least 10 reviewers

Participant 5: initially, but nowadays it's voluntary work, you know, and everyone is so busy with their own job, so they always

Participant 5: deny our requested. So it's very tough situation for the editors. When I submit a paper as an author, I always feel why does it take so long time?

Participant 5: 6 months, 7 months, 8 months. But after became an editor I can realize how it's difficult to find different. Trivia's in different fields. Different topic.

Participant 5: So that's my primary responsibility for the journal.

Karen Gainey: Oh, great! Then that gives you a really good understanding. And that really helps with the questions. I appreciate that. So one thing that jumps to mind you were talking about with the submission. So that did come across in the author instructions that plain link, or plain English summaries are highly recommended. So

Karen Gainey: do you have a sense of what percentage of authors include them in the 1st draft with the manuscript towards that.

Participant 5: Oh!

Karen Gainey: Bit hard to.

Participant 5: I don't think there is any statistics from the journal sites, but if I if I want to say my personal experience that I handle in the maybe last one month.

119

00:14:29.850 --> 00:14:33.940

Participant 5: Most papers they don't include any plain language survey.

120

00:14:34.220 --> 00:14:49.410

Participant 5: and because, you know nowadays most of the journals not about the Medical or Health science related journals, all field journals they prefer even they don't have any problem with the format free submissions.

121

00:14:49.480 --> 00:15:14.450

Participant 5: So authors are more careless nowadays in formatting, especially according to the guidelines for the journals. So in the 1st submission, they my primary experience, I don't handle. After joining the Phd. I don't handle a lot of papers, because I am processed with a lot of trust here. I'm serving as a tutorial course even now. So I had a great, you know.

122

00:15:14.570 --> 00:15:20.900

Participant 5: schedules. So my primary experience in the last one manipai say

123

00:15:21.080 --> 00:15:27.939

Participant 5: most of them maybe 70 to 80 persons. Authors. They don't include the plain language numbers in their 1st submission.

124

00:15:28.744 --> 00:15:42.220

Participant 5: But when I decide if it's a desk rejection, or if it's go for the further review, I don't. I don't consider this thing in my decision process. Firstly, in the in the initial. Yeah.

125

00:15:42.920 --> 00:15:45.059

Karen Gainey: As you said, they can always be added later.

126

00:15:45.060 --> 00:15:45.610

Participant 5: Yes.

127

00:15:45.610 --> 00:15:48.369

Karen Gainey: And if it's a test rejection, it doesn't matter.

128

00:15:48.590 --> 00:15:48.970

Participant 5: Yes.

129

00:15:48.970 --> 00:16:00.580

Karen Gainey: That it's not included. Yeah, so does that mean? What I'm trying to understand is, say, it's it's a paper that you think's got promise it'll go for peer review.

130

00:16:00.580 --> 00:16:00.910

Participant 5: Yet.

131

00:16:00.990 --> 00:16:09.609

Karen Gainey: And so it goes and makes it through peer review. Whether it's minor major revisions or an accept.

132

00:16:10.000 --> 00:16:18.559

Karen Gainey: At what point might the journal or one of the editors, or someone at the journal ask for that plain English summary.

133

00:16:19.570 --> 00:16:21.090

Karen Gainey: Or would they?

134

00:16:21.550 --> 00:16:28.070

Karen Gainey: What would be the process would they ask for it? Is it does that depend on the editor?

135

00:16:28.410 --> 00:16:34.180

Karen Gainey: Is that a personal discretion, kind of situation? Or is there a process for that.

136

00:16:34.180 --> 00:16:35.253

Participant 5: Think it's

137

00:16:36.060 --> 00:16:44.920

Participant 5: from the Journal's guidelines. It's not too flexible, but in in practically it's a little bit flexible for the author side.

138

00:16:45.830 --> 00:17:05.359

Participant 5: But I understand your questions. But the thing is, it not completely depends on the editors. Since the journal prefers to have the plain language summaries, the authors are required to provide this, but the thing is whether it should be, it should be before the review process or during review, or after the review.

139

00:17:05.599 --> 00:17:17.349

Participant 5: We generally prefer to have before the review process, or at least during the review process, so that the reviewers, in their second submission, or the revised file, at least they can access the plane like this.

140

00:17:17.560 --> 00:17:18.920

Participant 5: So yeah.

141

00:17:19.359 --> 00:17:27.189

Karen Gainey: Gotcha right? So if I'm understanding the preferences, is at least

142

00:17:27.419 --> 00:17:32.389

Karen Gainey: that plain English summary can go through at least one round of peer review.

143

00:17:32.390 --> 00:17:33.650

Participant 5: Exactly. Yes.

144

00:17:33.850 --> 00:17:43.700

Karen Gainey: Right, Gotcha, do you tend to get any feedback from reviewers on that summary as opposed to the main manuscript

145

00:17:44.410 --> 00:17:45.320

Karen Gainey: or.

146

00:17:45.320 --> 00:17:45.680

Participant 5: And you know.

147

00:17:45.680 --> 00:17:47.970

Karen Gainey: Really involved in that. So.

148

00:17:47.970 --> 00:17:51.649

Participant 5: Any feedback. Can. Can you please elaborate your question? I didn't.

149

00:17:51.650 --> 00:18:02.229

Karen Gainey: Sorry when reviewers give feedback on the manuscript, they tend to comment on the plain English summary. Do you know, or is it just the manuscript.

150

00:18:02.240 --> 00:18:11.510

Participant 5: Yeah, I I cannot say. In most of the cases they have a lot of comments on the plain languages. They have very minor comments, mostly.

151

00:18:11.560 --> 00:18:12.280

Karen Gainey: But.

152

00:18:12.280 --> 00:18:22.149

Participant 5: Yeah, I find some comments in the plain language, even especially the grammatical errors, or the explanation, or the interpretation in a plain language. For examples

153

00:18:22.210 --> 00:18:50.109

Participant 5: if you say maybe you calculated the risk ratio. But you are saying maybe mistakenly. You are saying the word ratios. That's a statistical jargon that's not even related to the plain language summary. So sometimes the reviewers can ask, you can say the higher

probability you are higher, higher risk or something to change the word, so that the general leaders, the general public, can understand these findings easily. So yeah.

154

00:18:50.350 --> 00:18:58.529

Karen Gainey: Oh, that's interesting. You're the 1st person who said that most people have said reviewers haven't really commented. So that's interesting.

155

00:18:58.530 --> 00:19:05.610

Participant 5: Yeah, it. But it's very. It's very low. I I cannot say, Yeah, very low, very low, because.

156

00:19:05.610 --> 00:19:05.970

Karen Gainey: Should.

157

00:19:05.970 --> 00:19:31.570

Participant 5: The review, especially in my public health field. Those are based on the observational and the experimental studies. Nowadays I'm handling mostly the experimental studies. But in case of the observational studies like the cross-sectional case, control the case studies cohort studies. In these cases, reviewers always prefer to have a focus on the methodological sections in order to focus on the background

158

00:19:31.680 --> 00:19:44.960

Participant 5: the justification of this resource and the methodological strength. Yeah, because, you know, you can improve your writings. But you cannot. You cannot improve further, if you have a methodological error that you did previously.

159

00:19:45.560 --> 00:19:46.889

Participant 5: Yeah, a hundred percent.

160

00:19:46.890 --> 00:19:47.490

Participant 5: Yeah. So.

161

00:19:47.490 --> 00:19:48.899

Karen Gainey: Short of starting again.

162

00:19:48.900 --> 00:19:59.409

Participant 5: Yeah. So that's why they mostly prefer to focus on the methodological, the statistical procedures, and how they interpret their findings. Their conclusion based on their findings.

163

00:20:00.040 --> 00:20:02.480

Karen Gainey: Understood. Yeah. And that makes sense.

164

00:20:02.480 --> 00:20:10.779

Participant 5: Yeah. So that's why you will find maybe very few comments, or mostly no comments on the plain language summary. In most cases.

165

00:20:11.240 --> 00:20:17.679

Karen Gainey: Okay, is there a question in the do you have guidance for peer review

166

00:20:18.000 --> 00:20:25.550

Karen Gainey: or notes for peer review peer reviewers that they have to answer in the portal.

167

00:20:25.870 --> 00:20:27.270

Participant 5: Yes. Yes.

168

00:20:27.960 --> 00:20:28.340

Participant 5: Okay.

169

00:20:28.340 --> 00:20:31.360

Karen Gainey: Plain English, plain English summary. Do you know.

170

00:20:31.360 --> 00:20:32.470

Participant 5: Oh.

171

00:20:33.660 --> 00:20:41.109

Participant 5: I need to check again, maybe, but I I don't think I cannot, I cannot assure you, but maybe

172

00:20:41.320 --> 00:20:51.040

Participant 5: it's not in the portal as a cushions, whether it's whether the authors provided the plain language summary or not. But maybe, after checking, I can email you.

173

00:20:51.730 --> 00:20:58.149

Karen Gainey: Yeah, that'd be great. Yeah, yeah. And maybe it's because they're not mandatory. So it's not always there.

174

00:20:58.150 --> 00:20:59.400

Participant 5: Yeah, because

175

00:20:59.550 --> 00:21:21.940

Participant 5: when I check the editorial portal as an editor, I cannot see anything but as an author or as a reviewer. If I check because I reviewed for these journals few months back. I cannot remember. I cannot remember what's the portal, especially for the reviews. You know. There are different features for the reviewers, authors, and editors, so.

176

00:21:22.270 --> 00:21:27.699

Karen Gainey: Yeah, no. Understood completely. No, that I'd appreciate that if you don't mind.

177

00:21:27.700 --> 00:21:29.280

Participant 5: Yes. Okay. Okay.

178

00:21:29.280 --> 00:21:29.710

Karen Gainey: Sure.

179

00:21:29.710 --> 00:21:30.739

Participant 5: I will try.

180

00:21:30.740 --> 00:21:34.021

Karen Gainey: Okay, yes, thank you. I'm just interested.

181

00:21:34.490 --> 00:21:54.260

Participant 5: You know, when, as a reviewer, when I submit any report to the journals Portal, I can get an email. So if I check my email. Even they sent my response as a Pdf, so if I check the Pdf. In the previous months, when I was acting as a reviewer of any papers. Maybe I can check. Whether is there any portal.

182

00:21:54.260 --> 00:21:55.440

Karen Gainey: Yeah, or any option.

183

00:21:55.440 --> 00:21:56.380

Karen Gainey: Right?

184

00:21:56.380 --> 00:21:57.020

Participant 5: Okay.

185

00:21:59.530 --> 00:22:03.319

Participant 5: But most probably, as far I know, maybe no, maybe no.

186

00:22:10.210 --> 00:22:11.340

Karen Gainey: All right.

187

00:22:12.805 --> 00:22:17.770

Karen Gainey: Okay, just trying to think of

189

00:22:29.360 --> 00:22:41.640

Karen Gainey: Thinking of the wording in the author instructions that the plain English summaries are very encouraged.

190

00:22:42.010 --> 00:22:51.180

Karen Gainey: and if and I this this may be something you can't answer which is understandable. But do you have a sense of why

191

00:22:51.560 --> 00:23:00.770

Karen Gainey: the journal chose to not make them mandatory, but just have that wording that they're still very much encouraged.

192

00:23:00.900 --> 00:23:02.570

Karen Gainey: If do you know what I mean?

193

00:23:02.700 --> 00:23:04.550

Participant 5: Okay, yes, I think

194

00:23:04.720 --> 00:23:13.149

Participant 5: if the journals, if the journals made it mandatory for the authors they had to submit that in their initial submission.

195

00:23:13.520 --> 00:23:21.030

Participant 5: But the thing is, it depends on the policy of the journals. But personally, my my perception. If you ask my perception.

196

00:23:21.410 --> 00:23:33.810

Participant 5: I I would I would definitely suggest to adapt all the journals, even not even the reproductive health journals, all the journals, because, you know, every month, maybe globally.

197

00:23:34.550 --> 00:23:39.769

Participant 5: hundreds of hundreds and thousands papers are producing from the publishers different journals.

198

00:23:40.030 --> 00:23:40.850

Participant 5: So

199

00:23:40.960 --> 00:23:52.680

Participant 5: it's and you know, the statistical procedure, especially in the health and medical research, is advancing nowadays, few months back, a method was a very precise and the robust method statistical method.

200

00:23:52.870 --> 00:23:57.419

Participant 5: But now we are seeing it's not a robust method.

201

00:23:57.600 --> 00:24:12.180

Participant 5: so something new is evolving. So the statistical terminology these are evolving, you know. So that's why, especially who are even researching on the medical related topic on the Health science related topics.

202

00:24:12.180 --> 00:24:31.059

Participant 5: They even don't understand what this paper or this analysis is trying to say, sometimes because of the following on different statistical modeling, different advanced analytical procedures. So that's why I personally think it should be mandatory. But it depends on the publishers. It depends on the

203

00:24:31.470 --> 00:24:40.970

Participant 5: channels. But what I can do in in the editorial meetings I can recommend only, but I cannot change their policy.

204

00:24:40.970 --> 00:24:42.929

Karen Gainey: No, I don't expect the impossible.

205

00:24:43.930 --> 00:24:47.329

Karen Gainey: Just trying to understand the thought processes.

206

00:24:47.330 --> 00:24:57.080

Participant 5: Yeah, I think. I think they consider. You know, nowadays a lot of journals are trying to

207

00:24:57.190 --> 00:24:59.459

Participant 5: collaborate with the good publishers.

208

00:24:59.920 --> 00:25:27.430

Participant 5: Maybe maybe I initiated a journals, and I will always try to have to publish with the (Journal X) Or they'll spare all the sprinters everything. So I have to comply with their policies, the publishers, policies. So if as a society, maybe it's a society journals, or if I'm the return chief, or we are the stakeholders of the journals, but I have to comply with that publishers policy. So that's that could be a hindrance, or the barriers to adopt it as a.

209

00:25:27.710 --> 00:25:28.639

Karen Gainey: Yeah, of course.

210

00:25:28.640 --> 00:25:29.130

Participant 5: Could be.

211

00:25:29.130 --> 00:25:43.900

Karen Gainey: Yeah. And that's 1 of the things I really want to try and understand with this study is that relationship between the journal and the publisher, and where decisions might be made, are they at the publisher level, or the journal level.

212

00:25:43.900 --> 00:25:44.410

Participant 5: Exactly.

213

00:25:44.410 --> 00:25:54.629

Karen Gainey: Because I understand there's going to be having done my scoping review. I saw a lot of whilst the instructions were heterogeneous. They were homogeneous

214

00:25:54.640 --> 00:26:19.930

Karen Gainey: down publishing lines, or you know, Elsevier's instructions are all the same Springer nature, Francis very much the same. So it seems that that's in place. But then talking to some editors, there's 2 different types of relationships. There's the relationship that there's journals that are

215

00:26:20.587 --> 00:26:31.110

Karen Gainey: those that represent like a medical association or society.

216

00:26:31.300 --> 00:26:41.980

Karen Gainey: that use a publisher as kind of a framework for their submission portal, and some of the copy personnel and infrastructure.

217

00:26:41.980 --> 00:26:42.390

Participant 5: Yeah.

218

00:26:42.390 --> 00:26:45.590

Karen Gainey: Whereas others are owned by the journal owned by the publisher.

219

00:26:45.590 --> 00:26:46.590

Participant 5: Publisher? Yeah.

220

00:26:46.780 --> 00:26:54.700

Karen Gainey: So that level of autonomy, and where the decisions are made seems to vary between the 2 types.

221

00:26:54.700 --> 00:26:55.869

Participant 5: True. It's true.

222

00:26:55.870 --> 00:26:59.470

Karen Gainey: That's what I'm kind of learning so trying to tease it all out.

223

00:26:59.470 --> 00:27:06.060

Participant 5: Yeah, it could be a barrier in some cases to add up different policies from the Journal society side.

224

00:27:06.630 --> 00:27:07.370

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

225

00:27:07.710 --> 00:27:20.659

Karen Gainey: yeah, do you know if your journal is because I know it's part of the (Publisher), so how does that work? Is? (Publisher). Kind of a subgroup of spring and nature.

226

00:27:20.660 --> 00:27:23.110

Participant 5: Yes, it's a separate page. And actually, yeah.

227

00:27:23.420 --> 00:27:24.900

Karen Gainey: Yeah, so.

228

00:27:24.900 --> 00:27:31.579

Participant 5: The appreciation. It's (Publisher)'s observation. The elaboration is (Publisher). It's Uk Based publisher.

229

00:27:32.200 --> 00:27:32.520

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

230

00:27:32.520 --> 00:27:32.920

Participant 5: So.

231

00:27:32.920 --> 00:27:33.270

Karen Gainey: Yep.

232

00:27:33.270 --> 00:27:35.970

Participant 5: Yeah, like the nature. You know the nature.

233

00:27:35.970 --> 00:27:42.359

Participant 5: Okay, (Publisher X )and (Publisher), they have the subgroups everything of the (Publisher X). Now.

234

00:27:43.000 --> 00:27:43.330

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

235

00:27:43.330 --> 00:27:54.719

Participant 5: Previously. It was like (Publisher X) only, but maybe few years back they had a coalitions, and now the final product of their companies, like the (Publisher X), or something.

236

00:27:55.350 --> 00:27:56.000

Karen Gainey: Yes.

238

00:27:59.900 --> 00:28:01.330

Participant 5: Yes, yeah.

239

00:28:01.330 --> 00:28:03.639

Participant 5: Spec. Maybe. But I don't know the exact type.

240

00:28:04.280 --> 00:28:08.104

Karen Gainey: Yeah, yeah, no. That's okay.

241

00:28:09.050 --> 00:28:11.110

Participant 5: Alrighty.

242

00:28:11.110 --> 00:28:27.279

Participant 5: It's part of the (Publisher X) They are called. They are part of (Publisher X) Journal, so they have a coalition of the (Publisher X). In publishing. But (Publisher). Have

some separate policies and kind of a separate publisher, but they are the part of spin generation.

243

00:28:27.970 --> 00:28:28.430

Karen Gainey: Okay.

244

00:28:28.430 --> 00:28:34.479

Participant 5: All the (Publisher) journals. A lot of journals. (Publisher) has. (Publisher), yeah. The (Publisher). Has a lot of journals.

245

00:28:35.070 --> 00:28:42.048

Karen Gainey: Oh, yeah, yeah. And I'm really glad you came along. Because,

246

00:28:43.030 --> 00:28:50.750

Karen Gainey: I hadn't yet emailed anyone from (Publisher), the (Publisher) journals. So yeah, I was absolutely delighted.

247

00:28:50.750 --> 00:28:53.239

Participant 5: Am I the 1st person from the (Publisher). Then.

248

00:28:53.240 --> 00:28:53.980

Karen Gainey: Yes, you are.

249

00:28:53.980 --> 00:28:54.480

Participant 5: Okay.

250

00:28:54.980 --> 00:28:56.490

Karen Gainey: Yeah, yeah, yeah.

251

00:28:56.490 --> 00:28:56.990

Participant 5: Okay.

252

00:28:56.990 --> 00:29:02.530

Karen Gainey: So this is, it's great, because there's a few differences with the (Publisher). Journals.

253

00:29:02.530 --> 00:29:09.380

Participant 5: Yeah, they have many multidisciplinary journals, but mostly they are focused on the health and medical related.

254

00:29:10.368 --> 00:29:14.050

Participant 5: You'll find a lot of nutritions, public health, Health

255

00:29:14.390 --> 00:29:17.810

Participant 5: of Health Sciences, medical journals, you know.

256

00:29:17.810 --> 00:29:27.660

Karen Gainey: Yeah. And there's 1 1 difference. I really wanted to try and touch on which is the label given to the summary

257

00:29:27.950 --> 00:29:41.019

Karen Gainey: plain English summary. Do you have any sense? When that? Has that always been the label of the summaries? Do you know? From your experience and.

258

00:29:41.020 --> 00:29:42.000

Participant 5: I

259

00:29:42.580 --> 00:29:55.550

Participant 5: I I exactly don't know exactly when they post it to be included in any every manuscript. But up immediately after becoming an associator. I I saw this so maybe

260

00:29:55.650 --> 00:29:57.830

Participant 5: few years back, maybe.

261

00:29:57.830 --> 00:30:01.800

Karen Gainey: Yeah, yeah, okay, do.

262

00:30:02.040 --> 00:30:15.500

Karen Gainey: So you might not be able to answer this. But I'm just trying to understand, because when I spoke to people who read a lot of plain language summaries. One of the things they mentioned was how important that label or title

263

00:30:15.660 --> 00:30:29.565

Karen Gainey: was for the type of summary, so I don't mean the headline of the paper, but the label given to so plain language, summary, plain English summary lay summary, patient, summary

264

00:30:30.300 --> 00:30:37.099

Karen Gainey: and so just trying to understand the relationship between that title and the audience.

265

00:30:37.290 --> 00:30:46.199

Karen Gainey: and whether that label, if your journal, or if you know the (Publisher). Chose that quite deliberately.

266

00:30:46.630 --> 00:30:54.860

Karen Gainey: Or if it was somewhat arbitrary, because it's quite common in the literature, that kind of title, to have a sense of.

267

00:30:55.300 --> 00:30:56.329

Participant 5: Yeah, you are true.

268

00:30:56.330 --> 00:30:56.840

Karen Gainey: Okay.

269

00:30:56.840 --> 00:31:17.124

Participant 5: And I think your observation is completely right here. But especially if I focus I'm I'm not expert in all the health sciences related topic. I'm very much focused on the public health, and especially the community based community-based research, you know, more relevant with the implementations and

270

00:31:17.890 --> 00:31:33.759

Participant 5: survey based findings, especially so in these cases. From my experiences very few papers, you will find that they have very technical terminologies in their titles that's not easily understandable.

271

00:31:33.920 --> 00:31:55.190

Participant 5: but who are very relevant with the weight lab based research and those who are very disease oriented resources. They are also belong to the medical research, but very disease oriented, and their treatment based resources. So certainly I find every times to have very jargon or scientific terms, even in their titles.

272

00:31:55.290 --> 00:32:05.809

Participant 5: that that may be different or difficult to understand, for the general audience especially to know the objectives and orders, the, and sometimes, even after reading the

273

00:32:06.240 --> 00:32:25.970

Participant 5: title, they may feel I'm not interested in this title, because I will not understand anything from this paper. So, but from my field it's very understandable in. I can say, more than 80%, 90% papers. The objectives, and what actually they are trying to do in this papers is very understandable from the title.

274

00:32:27.130 --> 00:32:27.810

Karen Gainey: Yep.

275

00:32:28.470 --> 00:32:33.759

Karen Gainey: So by title or label I mean the label plain English summary.

276

00:32:33.760 --> 00:32:34.380

Participant 5: Yeah.

277

00:32:34.790 --> 00:32:36.190

Karen Gainey: Those 3 words.

278

00:32:38.070 --> 00:32:39.120

Participant 5: Python solve.

279

00:32:39.600 --> 00:32:43.340

Karen Gainey: So I don't mean the title of the paper or the title

280

00:32:43.450 --> 00:32:47.459

Karen Gainey: I mean the literal title. I mean it quite literally.

281

00:32:48.670 --> 00:32:55.060

Karen Gainey: so in the author instructions, there's a subheading plain English summary.

282

00:32:55.060 --> 00:32:55.670

Participant 5: Yeah.

283

00:32:55.820 --> 00:32:58.830

Karen Gainey: So I'm I literally mean that that subheading.

284

00:32:58.830 --> 00:33:00.029

Participant 5: Oh, okay. South Korea.

285

00:33:00.030 --> 00:33:00.460

Karen Gainey: Summary.

286

00:33:00.460 --> 00:33:01.529

Participant 5: Okay, okay, I.

287

00:33:01.530 --> 00:33:03.340

Karen Gainey: I was just thinking the title, but.

288

00:33:03.340 --> 00:33:04.440

Participant 5: Topic, okay.

289

00:33:04.440 --> 00:33:15.959

Karen Gainey: No, no, I'm sorry, that's I was very clear. So using those 3 words, to describe this type of summary

290

00:33:17.400 --> 00:33:18.199

Participant 5: I think.

291

00:33:18.700 --> 00:33:25.660

Participant 5: I think. Yeah, you mentioned several things like plain English summary, and what else you you mentioned before.

292

00:33:25.660 --> 00:33:26.960

Karen Gainey: My language, summary.

293

00:33:26.960 --> 00:33:28.210

Participant 5: In language.

294

00:33:28.210 --> 00:33:30.400

Karen Gainey: Summary, patient, Summary.

295

00:33:30.400 --> 00:33:38.670

Participant 5: I think. Yeah, patient summary is somewhat a little bit irrelevant for me, especially because

296

00:33:39.100 --> 00:33:51.029

Participant 5: only the patients could not be the audience, some some general audience who are interested. Maybe I'm not the patients, but some of my trained, maybe yeah, or some

297

00:33:51.881 --> 00:33:58.009

Participant 5: maybe my relative. They are suffering from Alzheimer's disease, and I'm I'm maybe

298

00:33:58.190 --> 00:34:12.819

Participant 5: looking for something. Research on the Alzheimer's disease. What? What could be the rematy process of the advanced Alzheimer? So I am a general interested public, you know. So this is not only for the patients or the clinicians.

299

00:34:12.949 --> 00:34:17.429

Participant 5: and the other term is plain language. Somali.

300

00:34:17.900 --> 00:34:18.300

Karen Gainey: Yes.

301

00:34:18.300 --> 00:34:37.899

Participant 5: It's it's also a big term like the language. So whose language are you referring to? Right? So like, maybe you are from the Spain, and your playing language could be, or your mother tongue could be, the Spanish. So in our journals. Another thing is, you can publish some, maybe Spanish, Portuguese

302

00:34:37.940 --> 00:34:50.499

Participant 5: or France, Germany, or some other languages, abstracts immediately after your main abstracts in the manuscripts, but you have to mention which languages you use to translate your plain language so mari.

303

00:34:50.679 --> 00:35:00.236

Participant 5: so I think plain, if you are giving something in English language, so the title could be, the plain English summary could be the beta.

304

00:35:01.070 --> 00:35:01.750

Karen Gainey: Okay.

305

00:35:01.750 --> 00:35:11.270

Participant 5: All plain language. Summary is also good, but since you are giving something in English language, so it's better to mention the name of the language so plain English, Somali.

306

00:35:11.880 --> 00:35:13.810

Karen Gainey: Okay, that's what I was trying to understand.

307

00:35:13.810 --> 00:35:18.039

Karen Gainey: So it it's very. It's very rational that.

308

00:35:18.350 --> 00:35:32.970

Participant 5: You are giving something in a succinct way, like the succinct summary of your main resource in English language, like in plain English language, so the title could be the plain English summary, so that says more reasonable and more relatable.

309

00:35:33.370 --> 00:35:39.450

Karen Gainey: Right? Okay, I understand. So do you know what happens when, say it might be translated into German?

310

00:35:39.740 --> 00:35:40.960

Karen Gainey: Would it then be.

311

00:35:40.960 --> 00:35:47.209

Participant 5: i i i didn't see, or I never handed any paper. Honestly speaking, I.

312

00:35:47.210 --> 00:35:47.760

Karen Gainey: Okay.

313

00:35:47.760 --> 00:35:56.579

Participant 5: I haven't. But there is instructions. And while we have any meetings among the editors and the publishers.

314

00:35:56.790 --> 00:36:07.390

Participant 5: yeah, they always mention about the other languages things, but I find some Arabic papers, but I didn't handle those papers, but I find some Arabic papers that are some Arabic

315

00:36:07.640 --> 00:36:09.490

Participant 5: abstracts there.

316

00:36:09.791 --> 00:36:14.920

Karen Gainey: Okay, oh, no, thank you. I appreciate that. That helps me understand that thought process. So.

317

00:36:14.920 --> 00:36:15.580

Participant 5: Yes.

318

00:36:16.035 --> 00:36:20.589

Karen Gainey: I I understand what you're saying. That makes sense.

319

00:36:20.730 --> 00:36:21.802

Karen Gainey: Do you know?

320

00:36:22.400 --> 00:36:28.910

Karen Gainey: And and that was conveyed when I saw the author guidelines it said, wider public.

321

00:36:29.970 --> 00:36:36.850

Karen Gainey: So that conveyed what you were saying. It didn't say I didn't say the word patience in there, so I think so.

322

00:36:37.440 --> 00:36:38.260

Karen Gainey: What you're saying.

323

00:36:38.260 --> 00:36:57.129

Participant 5: Say, the general public that that will include all the peoples, like even the clinicians, the patients like the others, health researchers who can understand the maybe the statistical terminologies or the research terminologies. So if you say the general audience, general readers, or general public.

324

00:36:57.320 --> 00:36:59.029

Participant 5: so that's fine, maybe.

325

00:37:00.920 --> 00:37:04.980

Karen Gainey: So it sounds like there was quite a bit of thought put into the wording.

326

00:37:04.980 --> 00:37:07.610

Participant 5: Yes, yes, I I think I think all.

327

00:37:07.610 --> 00:37:07.960

Karen Gainey: Okay.

328

00:37:07.960 --> 00:37:17.160

Participant 5: Or you can mention all the things like the general public's patients, everything you can mention, all the things in your policies or in your guidelines even.

329

00:37:17.300 --> 00:37:26.159

Participant 5: it's a completely okay. So I may think I'm a patient. And they mentioned mentioned the patients as their audience.

330

00:37:26.310 --> 00:37:27.090

Participant 5: So.

331

00:37:27.600 --> 00:37:28.070

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

332

00:37:28.070 --> 00:37:36.239

Participant 5: They may, they may fill themselves as a prioritized one. So you can also mention all the things, including the general public Journal readers. Everything here.

333

00:37:36.830 --> 00:37:44.700

Karen Gainey: Gotcha. Yeah. Do do you know? When the guidelines for the plain English summary were developed

334

00:37:45.300 --> 00:37:46.260

Karen Gainey: in my channel?

335

00:37:46.552 --> 00:37:47.720

Karen Gainey: Yeah, in your journal.

336

00:37:47.720 --> 00:37:49.179

Participant 5: No, I don't know about this, honest.

337

00:37:49.780 --> 00:37:50.290

Participant 5: No.

338

00:37:50.290 --> 00:37:55.319

Karen Gainey: Do you know if they've been reviewed since they were 1st developed? Or if there's any plans.

339

00:37:55.641 --> 00:38:02.710

Participant 5: But I would take it. But in in our next meeting, or I can ask, but I don't think Bright Bright also

340

00:38:02.880 --> 00:38:06.349

Participant 5: may be unaware about this when actually they adopted this. But

341

00:38:06.550 --> 00:38:10.190

Participant 5: I am involving with the journals last 3 years, but I.

342

00:38:10.190 --> 00:38:10.580

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

343

00:38:10.580 --> 00:38:18.490

Participant 5: After in within the last 3 years. I I don't think it was evolved before then before then, I think.

344

00:38:18.730 --> 00:38:25.559

Participant 5: yeah, they adopted it, but it's a very good practice, a very good practice, and during the

345

00:38:26.050 --> 00:38:30.090

Participant 5: meeting time everyone appreciates.

346

00:38:30.250 --> 00:38:39.660

Participant 5: Everyone appreciates these initiatives to have plain English language or plain English summary is in this channels. So all the editors they are so happy with this.

347

00:38:40.620 --> 00:38:41.529

Karen Gainey: Oh, great!

348

00:38:41.530 --> 00:38:48.470

Participant 5: Even I know, some senior researchers from my country who are working in different developed countries in high

349

00:38:49.291 --> 00:38:58.320

Participant 5: highly recognized research based. Institute, like one of his evidence, Synthesis Island.

350

00:38:58.430 --> 00:39:03.830

Participant 5: Cochrane Evidence Synthesis Island. So he's mainly the evidence synthesis. So

351

00:39:04.050 --> 00:39:08.920

Participant 5: you always write a lot of blogs. A lot of posters on LinkedIn or anywhere.

352

00:39:09.150 --> 00:39:24.250

Participant 5: All the journals, especially those from the Medical or Health Science, will be related. So journals should add up something about the policies related to include the plain language or English plain English summary or plain English language, summary something

353

00:39:24.510 --> 00:39:26.090

Participant 5: in their journals. Policy.

354

00:39:27.110 --> 00:39:27.890

Karen Gainey: Oh, great!

355

00:39:27.890 --> 00:39:41.530

Participant 5: I also appreciate this. And I also support this. You know, I'm also currently serving another journal. Section editor, like the Journal of X. They don't have any policy or any guidelines on the plain language summaries.

356

00:39:41.900 --> 00:39:42.430

Karen Gainey: Oh, really.

357

00:39:42.430 --> 00:39:45.120

Participant 5: So that's the same publisher from (Publisher).

358

00:39:45.920 --> 00:39:59.320

Participant 5: And the editor in chief, 2 editor in chief. One is from (Country) and another is from (Country), but I haven't joined any meeting in the last meeting. I was so busy, so maybe I will raise this voice again.

359

00:40:00.180 --> 00:40:06.690

Karen Gainey: Yeah, that'd be interesting. I'm actually, that's my background. I'm a dietician by background. So.

360

00:40:06.690 --> 00:40:07.550

Participant 5: Oh, really.

361

00:40:07.920 --> 00:40:14.559

Karen Gainey: Yeah. And I actually have not come across any dietetics or nutrition journals that have plain language summaries.

362

00:40:14.560 --> 00:40:18.850

Participant 5: I'm also researching on nutrition now, and my background is nutrition and dietetics also.

363

00:40:18.850 --> 00:40:19.370

Karen Gainey: He said.

370

00:40:50.730 --> 00:40:51.060

Karen Gainey: I'm.

371

00:40:51.060 --> 00:40:51.460

Participant 5: Summer

372

00:40:51.460 --> 00:41:03.070

Participant 5: the saturator of the nutrition section of the journal, because the journal have a broader scope journal of Health Population and nutrition. So nutrition is a complete separate wing, and

373

00:41:03.270 --> 00:41:12.979

Participant 5: we don't have any connection with the other sections. Honestly, we we have some meetings together, but we have separate sections. So I become a section.

374

00:41:13.140 --> 00:41:17.300

Participant 5: And yeah handled some papers recently, and

375

00:41:17.880 --> 00:41:33.299

Participant 5: before joining, when when I was invited to become an actionator, I've always tried to read the guidelines of the journals, the quality, and actually some recent publication of the journals. How they maintain their quality.

376

00:41:33.530 --> 00:41:36.050

Participant 5: the journal quality is so good even.

377

00:41:36.600 --> 00:41:45.039

Participant 5: but they don't have anything related to plain language, summary, or anything. But I don't have any scopes to raise these boys, but maybe I will later.

378

00:41:47.640 --> 00:41:48.950

Karen Gainey: When you get your Phd.

379

00:41:49.670 --> 00:41:50.630

Participant 5: Yeah.

395

00:42:52.870 --> 00:43:05.039

Participant 5: Yeah. But yeah, I I see some something about health literacy you are trying to establish in. I saw in your, you know, the patient information. Sorry participants. Information. Sheet

396

00:43:05.230 --> 00:43:06.399

Participant 5: you upload it.

397

00:43:08.460 --> 00:43:11.890

Karen Gainey: I'm not sure that'd be someone else's project.

398

00:43:12.370 --> 00:43:14.420

Participant 5: Okay, maybe maybe it could be.

399

00:43:14.420 --> 00:43:14.790

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

400

00:43:14.790 --> 00:43:26.399

Participant 5: Yeah, but it's appreciable. You know, very few researchers are doing the health things in Australia, but mostly Australia is mostly based in the health promotion focused area, you know.

401

00:43:26.550 --> 00:43:48.539

Participant 5: Like in U.S.A, they always prefer, especially for the health and public health fields. They prefer to have the inferential analysis, epidemiological things, biostatistical things mostly. But here the preferences and the emphasis, especially on the health, promotion, things, and for health, promotion from the government and the policy sides. Health literacy is a must.

402

00:43:48.830 --> 00:43:49.750

Participant 5: Yeah, 3 times.

403

00:43:49.750 --> 00:43:50.080

Karen Gainey: Thought.

404

00:43:50.080 --> 00:43:51.460

Participant 5: Cast, definitely.

405

00:43:51.460 --> 00:44:13.029

Karen Gainey: Definitely it's and it's it's when I did my undergrad. We had a strong focus on community nutrition. I mean, this is a long time ago, but health, promotion and that kind of thing. And yeah, so whilst I'm not, I haven't worked as a dietician for a really long time.

406

00:44:13.030 --> 00:44:13.430

Participant 5: Yeah.

407

00:44:13.430 --> 00:44:24.129

Karen Gainey: Got into other areas. So I'm more interested in misinformation. So I saw so much misinformation in Facebook groups about nutrition and other areas.

408

00:44:24.130 --> 00:44:25.160

Participant 5: Especially for the.

409

00:44:25.160 --> 00:44:25.740

Karen Gainey: Tudo.

410

00:44:25.740 --> 00:44:28.093

Participant 5: Different social media platforms. Oh, my God.

411

00:44:28.430 --> 00:44:36.759

Karen Gainey: It was crazy. So that's that's what got me doing this. So yeah, that's my particular interest. And so

412

00:44:36.930 --> 00:44:50.150

Karen Gainey: now I'm applying that to plain language summaries, and how they might be used as a tool to help provide health information to people who are who are looking for good, reliable.

413

00:44:50.300 --> 00:45:00.210

Karen Gainey: trustworthy information, because we know people from research that they're going to journals. They're going to all different sources. But we want to make sure

414

00:45:00.470 --> 00:45:07.250

Karen Gainey: that what they get what they look for, they can understand and use. So that's what

415

00:45:07.370 --> 00:45:14.419

Karen Gainey: I'm I'm focused on, which is good segue into the area of access.

416

00:45:14.420 --> 00:45:15.569

Participant 5: Yes, yes.

417

00:45:16.229 --> 00:45:24.140

Participant 5: so one thing I I actually forgot to have a look at with your journal was whether it was open access or hybrid, or.

418

00:45:25.480 --> 00:45:26.509

Karen Gainey: All open access.

419

00:45:26.510 --> 00:45:27.809

Participant 5: I'll pay next this year.

420

00:45:27.810 --> 00:45:37.659

Karen Gainey: Oh, great! So that I assume that means all. The plain English summaries are open access and freely available.

421

00:45:39.840 --> 00:45:44.640

Participant 5: Oh, that's a very good question, though I need to take.

422

00:45:44.890 --> 00:45:54.979

Participant 5: I need to check honestly, I I didn't think in this way whether the plain English summary is accessible pen access. But

423

00:45:56.072 --> 00:46:07.760

Participant 5: since since since it's open exit journals, all the contents of the papers is available. But for the others journals who publishes in hybrid mode. Maybe.

424

00:46:08.376 --> 00:46:15.080

Participant 5: Those. Those are not open access journals, maybe, but my concept is it should be available.

425

00:46:16.216 --> 00:46:16.870

Karen Gainey: Right? Okay.

426

00:46:16.870 --> 00:46:29.630

Participant 5: It should be available, and in some cases like it should be indexed in different databases also, because, you know, when we review some papers, we only find the main abstract sections along with the.

427

00:46:29.630 --> 00:46:30.050

Karen Gainey: \$5.

428

00:46:30.390 --> 00:46:40.579

Participant 5: In different databases, search engines, and everything. But if I have to have some very plain thing, what actually the findings, what actually the key message of this papers.

429

00:46:40.950 --> 00:46:52.119

Participant 5: From the source engine. You know the systematically source databases like the pubmed for examples. They don't have any plain thing or key messages in their in their indexing or abstraction.

430

00:46:52.280 --> 00:46:59.830

Participant 5: so it can be included there also. But I don't think whether it's a very ambitious thing or not.

431

00:47:00.410 --> 00:47:01.120

Participant 5: but

432

00:47:01.260 --> 00:47:09.890

Participant 5: it can be if it's possible, within a very low budget. Or I don't know about the website process. You know, the it person may be.

433

00:47:10.320 --> 00:47:20.479

Participant 5: can relate with this. How is it whether it's feasible to include all these things in the search engine or databases? But if it's possible that that be highly appreciable.

434

00:47:20.810 --> 00:47:25.409

Karen Gainey: Oh, that'd be brilliant, wouldn't it? Because that was one of the things people said was

435

00:47:25.880 --> 00:47:48.019

Karen Gainey: access into different aspects, access to the actual journal, and it not being behind a paywall so they could access, because a lot of them are reading the plain language, summary or plain English summary, to see if they want to read. See how relevant it is to their needs to then see if they want to go on and read the journal article.

436

00:47:48.190 --> 00:48:02.040

Karen Gainey: because often they're reading it to see. Say they have diabetes they want to see. Oh, this is a new medication for diabetes. Management. Does this apply to me? Or is this relevant something I could take to my doctor and talk about.

437

00:48:02.810 --> 00:48:11.329

Karen Gainey: but also access in terms of how do I even find out this is available. This exists because search engines don't

438

00:48:11.510 --> 00:48:12.600

Karen Gainey: bring up.

439

00:48:13.090 --> 00:48:21.679

Participant 5: But since it's the abstract, you know. You know, summary is an abstract kind of like abstract is a summary of your whole research study.

440

00:48:21.680 --> 00:48:22.000

Karen Gainey: Yes.

441

00:48:22.000 --> 00:48:30.410

Participant 5: So plain English summary or plain language summary, whatever you say. So it's a summary, or it's the plain English appearance state.

442

00:48:30.940 --> 00:48:42.860

Participant 5: Yeah, the plain English of yours. So since it's abstract and abstract, is accessible for all, even those who are not the open externals. So it should be available. So since it's abstract, yeah.

443

00:48:43.540 --> 00:48:53.919

Karen Gainey: Yeah, that makes sense. That makes sense. What do you? What do you think of the idea? And this could have been what you're talking about before. I'm not sure. So I want to just double check.

444

00:48:54.460 --> 00:49:14.850

Karen Gainey: you know, with the Cochrane Library, how they have their plain language summaries on a separate section. Searchable by keyword. What do you think of the idea of journals doing that for their plain English summaries?

445

00:49:15.080 --> 00:49:31.519

Participant 5: I checked it. Yeah, I checked it. It's a very good questions, but I have very limited knowledge on Cochrane's databases. Honestly, because for any systematic reviews except the Umbrella reviews. I don't go for the Cochrane one. Honestly, it's a bit complicated for me.

446

00:49:31.970 --> 00:49:48.559

Participant 5: so I try to avoid Cochrane. Only so, but for my limited expense, I think it's a very good idea, but because most of the journals I think most of the, I think, more than 95, or even more. They don't have any plain language in the system. But

447

00:49:48.740 --> 00:49:57.739

Participant 5: I appreciate if Cochrane initiate these things to include all this plain language summaries in their databases. That would be that would be good.

448

00:49:58.040 --> 00:50:09.000

Participant 5: That would be good. But in some cases I don't find anything in Cochrane, because it's not because of the Cochrane it because of the journals, because they don't have anything in their papers.

449

00:50:10.300 --> 00:50:10.910

Participant 5: Right?

450

00:50:10.910 --> 00:50:12.240

Participant 5: Somebody. Yeah.

451

00:50:12.530 --> 00:50:15.780

Karen Gainey: Right? Yeah, because Cochrane only publish their own.

452

00:50:15.780 --> 00:50:16.300

Participant 5: Yes.

453

00:50:16.380 --> 00:50:18.080

Karen Gainey: Magnet wish summary for their own.

454

00:50:18.080 --> 00:50:24.541

Participant 5: Yeah, exactly. Yeah. They own Cochrane Cochrane, review papers. And it's a very huge papers, you know.

455

00:50:24.900 --> 00:50:25.920

Participant 5: Yeah, talking. Yeah.

456

00:50:25.920 --> 00:50:28.270

Participant 5: So so big often.

457

00:50:28.270 --> 00:50:28.789

Karen Gainey: Is there also.

458

00:50:28.790 --> 00:50:31.110

Participant 5: Time consuming and.

459

00:50:32.090 --> 00:50:47.269

Karen Gainey: Yeah, understood. I am in there playing because I've reviewed a few of their systematic reviews, and particularly the plain language summaries. They're one to 2 pages, so the summaries are still quite.

460

00:50:47.270 --> 00:50:47.870

Participant 5: Yeah.

461

00:50:47.870 --> 00:50:48.700

Karen Gainey: Quite long.

462

00:50:50.690 --> 00:51:02.060

Karen Gainey: all right. So we've talked about Peer Review just going through my questions to see what what I still wanted to ask you. We're getting there. Almost done.

463

00:51:02.760 --> 00:51:05.368

Karen Gainey: One of the journals.

464

00:51:06.666 --> 00:51:20.090

Karen Gainey: sorry. Publishers wirely offer this service of outsourcing plain language summaries in their what's it called? I think it's language editing services.

465

00:51:20.650 --> 00:51:24.469

Karen Gainey: I is that something you're familiar with? Or have you seen that before?

466

00:51:24.470 --> 00:51:28.369

Participant 5: I think most of the publisher. They have the language editing services.

467

00:51:28.730 --> 00:51:29.290

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

468

00:51:29.290 --> 00:51:43.429

Participant 5: I don't. I don't see any publisher, especially the big publishers. They don't have any like sprinter elsewhere. BMC. Springer, natural everything. I don't. I think they all have language editing services, but.

469

00:51:43.430 --> 00:51:44.280

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

470

00:51:44.280 --> 00:51:55.529

Participant 5: It's a very good idea. If they have expertise. They have maybe some expert in their houses to edit for the manuscripts in a very polished format.

471

00:51:55.930 --> 00:51:59.579

Participant 5: But yeah, it's a bit costly at the same time.

472

00:51:59.580 --> 00:52:00.220

Karen Gainey: Hmm.

473

00:52:00.660 --> 00:52:07.830

Participant 5: So this this could be a barriers for the low income and the middle income countries.

474

00:52:07.940 --> 00:52:14.359

Participant 5: yeah, especially, who are independent researcher and don't have any funding in any projects. Maybe so.

475

00:52:14.750 --> 00:52:25.770

Participant 5: Yeah, it's a good idea for those who have the projects and funding for the publishing or editing services, but it's not feasible for all the papers for all the countries.

476

00:52:26.390 --> 00:52:30.170

Karen Gainey: Yeah, I I don't know much about it, because you have to.

477

00:52:30.170 --> 00:52:34.620

Participant 5: I have 1 1 realization for last 3 years

478

00:52:34.730 --> 00:52:43.610

Participant 5: some publishers, for example, if I say I don't, I don't want to blame anyone. But in some publishers production is so good.

479

00:52:44.360 --> 00:52:53.750

Participant 5: so good, and like the basic corrections. Sometimes the researchers may mistake something in their wording in their structure of the sentence.

480

00:52:54.170 --> 00:53:11.710

Participant 5: But the publishers even sometimes like the Bmj. You know British medical journals, and they have some some other journals as Bmg. Open, Bmj. Health prevention, nutrition, Bmj sports, nutrition, everything. So maybe so that production. I love the

481

00:53:11.840 --> 00:53:35.619

Participant 5: Bmj production most, most, even all of the publishers, their production services. It's free. It's like the production to publish their papers in the final shape in their

own format. So they they edit a lot of things. If the paper requires, and ask you to permission whether whether you agree with this editor editing or to change it.

482

00:53:35.710 --> 00:53:45.449

Participant 5: But in some journals it's a very good quality. Journals, high impact factors, even q. 1 and renown. But the production experience is so bad

483

00:53:46.084 --> 00:54:02.230

Participant 5: especially for me, because most of the times I find something flaws after publications. I find something mistake, something mistake. But it was very easily to detect during the production process. So production is

484

00:54:02.830 --> 00:54:09.509

Participant 5: a bit careful and maybe a more constructive like the Bmj.

485

00:54:09.860 --> 00:54:15.590

Participant 5: The editing service could be. The editing of a paper could be improved even

486

00:54:15.820 --> 00:54:28.350

Participant 5: for the plain links and for the whole papers, all of it, especially for those who are for the low and high middle income countries don't have any funding for the publishing, so it will help.

487

00:54:28.350 --> 00:54:28.750

Karen Gainey: That's it.

488

00:54:28.750 --> 00:54:29.350

Participant 5: Haven.

489

00:54:29.910 --> 00:54:33.469

Karen Gainey: Like, like, we have examples. Bmj is doing this.

490

00:54:36.230 --> 00:54:37.276

Karen Gainey: Yeah, I

491

00:54:38.100 --> 00:54:41.930

Participant 5: I I just published my.

492

00:54:41.930 --> 00:54:49.620

Participant 5: there is a concerns is raising even. It has goes to the legal court in U.S.A.

493

00:54:49.770 --> 00:55:12.970

Participant 5: The like. The revenue revenue generations by these publishers. So all our business, according to them who are claiming so they are called they. They're saying it's not it's not public interesting thing. Or maybe it's a nonprofit organizations, these publishers, but their revenue generation is billions billions every year.

494

00:55:13.100 --> 00:55:23.109

Participant 5: so they are not paying the editors. They are not paying the reviewers. They're not paying. And also they are asking a lot of money for the language editing services. So.

495

00:55:23.790 --> 00:55:30.670

Participant 5: Yeah, it's completely okay. It's a process. And there is a legal trial is going on in U.S.A. Maybe I'm not sure, though. But

496

00:55:30.780 --> 00:55:41.929

Participant 5: if their production is more constructive and more formative in editing services, to be very careful that we must helpful for the blank, summary even, and further.

497

00:55:42.290 --> 00:55:43.579

Participant 5: whole papers in.

498

00:55:44.240 --> 00:55:48.640

Karen Gainey: Yeah, yeah, because we just want a better product at the end.

499

00:55:48.640 --> 00:56:00.669

Participant 5: Yes, yeah, because it's also their reputations, their publishing. It's not about the author's reputations. It's a collective way, you know, the editor's reputation. It's the publishers, the journal's reputations, the author's reputations.

500

00:56:01.470 --> 00:56:10.209

Karen Gainey: Yeah. One thing that's really reminded me doing these interviews is that editors are authors as well.

501

00:56:11.900 --> 00:56:13.010

Participant 5: Editor, sir.

502

00:56:13.010 --> 00:56:19.869

Karen Gainey: Editor, journal editors are also authors of papers. So you see both sides of things.

503

00:56:19.870 --> 00:56:20.640

Participant 5: Yes.

504

00:56:20.960 --> 00:56:22.650

Karen Gainey: Very uniquely positioned.

505

00:56:23.120 --> 00:56:27.080

Participant 5: I'm publishing and trying to publish even nowadays, you know.

507

00:56:28.220 --> 00:56:30.050

Participant 5: Really did so have to publish, you know.

508

00:56:30.050 --> 00:56:30.990

Karen Gainey: Is hard.

509

00:56:30.990 --> 00:56:31.340

Participant 5: Yeah.

510

00:56:31.340 --> 00:56:33.580

Karen Gainey: What I knowing you.

511

00:56:33.580 --> 00:56:34.320

Participant 5: I own it.

512

00:56:34.320 --> 00:56:34.890

Karen Gainey: Don't get paid.

513

00:56:34.890 --> 00:56:35.490

Participant 5: And why.

Participant 5: For example, if I invite any of my relative, probably one of my friend, I know he has some expertise on this field, so I can invite him to review these papers who doesn't have any conflict of interest with the authors, or any kind of conflict of interest. And if you know. Sometimes I get text.

516

00:56:57.450 --> 00:57:14.609

Participant 5: Do you have any suggestions for reviewing this? I obviously would always say, No, it's your own task, so do it by yourself independently. If you think the paper is not good, just go for the comments like this. Don't ask me anything because it could be biasness, and the thing is

517

00:57:16.150 --> 00:57:18.700

Participant 5: I forgot on topic. I was just trying to say.

518

00:57:18.980 --> 00:57:21.609

Participant 5: what is what is the question? So what is the.

519

00:57:21.610 --> 00:57:23.229

Karen Gainey: As well as publishers.

520

00:57:23.230 --> 00:57:32.560

Participant 5: Always I ask them if it's a very close person. I ask them when you review papers think, always think you are an author also.

521

00:57:32.870 --> 00:57:53.439

Participant 5: So don't be hard. Don't be Rush always. I remind this because I know I know and don't don't put. I extremely hate the generalized comments, generalized comment. You know very general comments. Oh, you need to improve the discussion. Where? Where do I need to improve this? If you don't have time? Don't accept the paper to review them.

522

00:57:53.610 --> 00:57:59.719

Participant 5: So that's my perceptions. Yeah, I know you are busy. Don't accept my invitation. Then.

523

00:58:00.290 --> 00:58:00.830

Karen Gainey: Yes.

524

00:58:00.830 --> 00:58:05.689

Participant 5: So if you are committing, yeah, I will review this paper. So it have to be very constructive.

525

00:58:06.490 --> 00:58:09.179

Karen Gainey: Yes, now, that's really good advice.

526

00:58:09.180 --> 00:58:26.680

Participant 5: Yeah. So you should think when you are submitting a paper as an author, you have to think like an editor, what? Actually they are trying to sort out from your paper, and when you are reviewing a papers, always try to be, mind that. You are an author also. So someone is giving comments to you.

527

00:58:27.240 --> 00:58:34.809

Karen Gainey: Fantastic. Yeah, yes, yes. How would I like to read this if I was an author? Yeah, yes.

528

00:58:35.030 --> 00:58:36.830

Karen Gainey: Dopey reviewer, too.

529

00:58:37.120 --> 00:58:47.260

Participant 5: Too hardly or too rash. Yeah, the paper quality could be wrong. It should be deleted. But you have to. You have to give reasons why and why to improve. There.

530

00:58:47.950 --> 00:58:48.710

Karen Gainey: That's right. And.

531

00:58:48.710 --> 00:59:02.219

Participant 5: You know, I once, when I realized these things once I got some comments from some reviewers. The papers are hungry to publish more papers without without generating the evidence for the science.

532

00:59:02.590 --> 00:59:06.489

Participant 5: So how do they know I am so hungry to publish paper?

533

00:59:07.390 --> 00:59:09.219

Participant 5: Do you know me personally, then.

534

00:59:10.410 --> 00:59:12.700

Participant 5: Because it's anonymous right. I don't know the name of the

535

00:59:13.440 --> 00:59:19.180

Participant 5: but you should not. You can reject my papers by giving eject region.

536

00:59:19.770 --> 00:59:23.409

Participant 5: but you should not be so harsh, so.

537

00:59:23.410 --> 00:59:23.960

Karen Gainey: Hmm.

538

00:59:23.960 --> 00:59:29.040

Participant 5: That's the thing. We have to think both the author side and in the editor side.

539

00:59:29.810 --> 00:59:39.810

Participant 5: And sometimes we have to always think about the publisher side. Also because we need to think what the journals target in the next, maybe one year.

540

00:59:39.930 --> 00:59:46.220

Participant 5: what they are trying to sort out, or they are trying to improve their journals. What their priorities nowadays.

541

00:59:46.620 --> 00:59:49.100

Karen Gainey: Yes, right?

542

00:59:49.680 --> 00:59:51.339

Karen Gainey: That's very interesting.

543

00:59:51.910 --> 00:59:53.490

Karen Gainey: Yeah. And that's.

544

00:59:53.490 --> 00:59:55.710

Participant 5: I'm sorry. Maybe I'm talking out of the box, Maggie.

545

00:59:55.710 --> 01:00:01.593

Karen Gainey: No, you're not. No, this is fantastic. I see. I knew I'd get something new from you.

546

01:00:02.210 --> 01:00:05.769

Karen Gainey: because that's exactly what I want to touch on

547

01:00:05.890 --> 01:00:09.120

Karen Gainey: is the where you think the future might be.

548

01:00:09.900 --> 01:00:28.850

Karen Gainey: So some of the things. When I was talking to people who read these summaries, they were talking about some of the things they would like to see that are a bit different. And so I deliberately spoke to people with chronic medical conditions, because when they're high users of health information.

549

01:00:29.000 --> 01:00:33.364

Karen Gainey: but also because they face unique challenges. And

550

01:00:34.110 --> 01:00:42.519

Karen Gainey: one of the things they touched on was the importance of having a variety of different formats.

551

01:00:43.826 --> 01:00:52.850

Karen Gainey: For or the option sorry for different formats. So I.

552

01:00:52.970 --> 01:01:09.780

Karen Gainey: And just when when I've done my studies I've only looked at kind of text based. Summaries. I haven't looked at graphical or video infographics. Is that something reproductive health

553

01:01:09.930 --> 01:01:11.620

Karen Gainey: offer? Or is there any.

554

01:01:11.620 --> 01:01:13.300

Participant 5: Yes, yes.

555

01:01:13.300 --> 01:01:22.870

Participant 5: you can. You can publish I never. I never experienced anything about the graphical or infographics, though, or even video.

556

01:01:23.140 --> 01:01:28.790

Participant 5: But they have their policy. You can publish the graphical abstracts, even. Yeah.

557

01:01:28.790 --> 01:01:39.249

Karen Gainey: Yeah, okay, and is that just do you know where that would be located? On the journal? Or or is there a link in the main

558

01:01:39.470 --> 01:01:42.510

Karen Gainey: manuscript like a supplementary information.

559

01:01:42.910 --> 01:01:44.569

Karen Gainey: Or do you know.

560

01:01:44.570 --> 01:01:52.279

Participant 5: Yeah, yeah, they have. They have the separate link. So you can download the supplementary materials. Maybe. And before the references.

561

01:01:53.080 --> 01:01:55.789

Karen Gainey: Right. Yep, Gotcha. Yep.

562

01:01:55.930 --> 01:02:04.290

Karen Gainey: yes, I think that's where I've seen it in the past that makes sense. Do you know how popular they are, or if it got any sense.

563

01:02:05.070 --> 01:02:06.839

Karen Gainey: or have had any feedback.

564

01:02:10.080 --> 01:02:11.649

Participant 5: How could I say?

565

01:02:12.305 --> 01:02:12.810

Participant 5: Oh.

566

01:02:12.810 --> 01:02:13.900

Karen Gainey: Okay, just.

567

01:02:14.470 --> 01:02:23.120

Participant 5: Oh, the popular of the plain language summary, or the graphical aspects, or which part of but I think

568

01:02:23.660 --> 01:02:30.569

Participant 5: I think, yeah. At the same time it's popular, and in some cases who are the new authors.

569

01:02:30.710 --> 01:02:45.609

Participant 5: it's a bit confusing for them. Even after reading, I can realize, because they they don't understand what actually I should write in the plain language summary, because I have already explained everything in my abstracts.

570

01:02:45.610 --> 01:02:45.990

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

571

01:02:45.990 --> 01:03:01.199

Participant 5: So what should I write again? So sometimes sometimes I feel they didn't give mass emphasis on writing the English summary. So it's just a kind of reputations of the main abstract.

572

01:03:02.310 --> 01:03:03.130

Karen Gainey: So.

573

01:03:03.130 --> 01:03:27.650

Participant 5: Sometimes who are the new, completely new authors. Or maybe so, they may feel difficult to understand what actually I write in the plain English service. So in this case we always prefer to read the guidelines, and you know there is in the last meeting. I remember there is a campaign like the plain English campaign from the there is a campaign globally, I think it's a global campaign. So

574

01:03:28.010 --> 01:03:32.059

Participant 5: already the voice is rising from all the countries. So

575

01:03:33.120 --> 01:03:44.659

Participant 5: so they can read. And there are some clear instructions how you can write in in a video instructions in some examples and everything they can. And I think it's linked with our channels. So.

576

01:03:44.660 --> 01:03:45.040

Karen Gainey: Yes.

577

01:03:45.040 --> 01:03:45.920

Karen Gainey: Oh, yeah. Yeah.

578

01:03:46.230 --> 01:03:47.320

Karen Gainey: Involve.

579

01:03:47.730 --> 01:03:50.299

Participant 5: Yeah, maybe I need to check it.

580

01:03:50.884 --> 01:03:56.520

Karen Gainey: In the Uk, and I the nih

581

01:03:57.290 --> 01:03:58.423

Participant 5: Maybe. But

582

01:03:58.990 --> 01:03:59.850

Karen Gainey: Such.

583

01:03:59.850 --> 01:04:13.000

Participant 5: Maybe one or 2 links. I take the plain English summaries resources. So it's the plain English summaries resources. So you can. You can get to the.

584

01:04:13.650 --> 01:04:18.939

Karen Gainey: Oh, the plain English campaign I see yes, involve is great. I.

585

01:04:18.940 --> 01:04:32.829

Participant 5: Even there is. There is guideline, and in steps from the Cochrane Library, and maybe and guide on medical writing. I can see here. Yeah, there is some instructions how to write that. How can they organize.

586

01:04:33.550 --> 01:04:33.940

Karen Gainey: Yep.

587

01:04:33.940 --> 01:04:43.150

Participant 5: It should not be too elaborated. People always think, oh, I can write 3 and 500 from my journals. You can write more than 300, maybe 3 and 50,

588

01:04:43.280 --> 01:04:54.679

Participant 5: 3 and 50 words in the plain English language, but sometimes it's too much for the authors, and in some research. Sometimes some some researcher may think it's very less words, count.

589

01:04:55.030 --> 01:05:06.160

Participant 5: but it depends on the topic. It depends on the research content. If you are trying to test only one hypothesis, maybe, whether it can impact on it. So you can write it very briefly.

590

01:05:06.736 --> 01:05:17.840

Participant 5: Yeah, it's the limit. But you don't need to have more than \$300. So that's the that's the thinking from the author side, especially the new authors. So there are guys.

591

01:05:17.840 --> 01:05:22.330

Participant 5: Yes, so they can easily understand how to write the plain English summary for their findings.

592

01:05:23.090 --> 01:05:31.030

Karen Gainey: That's really interesting, and that when you think about it makes a lot of sense, it's just experience. Because one thing

593

01:05:31.150 --> 01:05:57.370

Karen Gainey: I'm finding, and it comes up in the literature a lot, but I'm hearing from other editors. Is that theme of it. Writing these plain English summaries is a different skill to writing the main manuscript a research paper. And that's when you're just starting out. It's not obvious that it's a different skill until you start writing it and realize. Oh, I can't use medical jargon, or I can't.

594

01:05:57.370 --> 01:05:57.720

Karen Gainey: It's come.

595

01:05:57.720 --> 01:05:59.620

Participant 5: Apex language

596

01:05:59.620 --> 01:06:09.209

Participant 5: they they used to use the medical. Sometimes it's it's a bit difficult honestly to avoid some terminologies in the

597

01:06:09.330 --> 01:06:25.999

Participant 5: in the key summaries of your findings, and you know I published my 1st paper in the Reproductive Health Journal, maybe more than 3 and a half years ago. 1st papers, and when and I was, I had no experience with editing service, and I don't know the perception from the editor side. So

598

01:06:26.090 --> 01:06:40.600

Participant 5: I even that was that was in my mind how to write the plain English summary. Then that's the guideline from the journals again. So I have already done everything in my los text. So it's just the reputation. So so I can easily relate with this.

599

01:06:41.370 --> 01:06:45.980

Karen Gainey: Yeah. Yeah. So as as from the journal end, how do you.

600

01:06:46.220 --> 01:06:50.630

Karen Gainey: when you see medical jargon or complex complex language.

601

01:06:51.292 --> 01:07:05.959

Karen Gainey: What happens, do you? Then? Does someone at the journal kind of give feedback on how to change it? Does someone, a copy editor change it? Or do you just send it back to the author, or do you leave it? Do you know how that works?

602

01:07:05.960 --> 01:07:28.900

Participant 5: If it's for me, if it's a statistical jargon, a statistical terminology, I always ask to change it because it's possible to change. But, for example, in some cases like the diseases

Alzheimer's disease, how can you write in a plain English? So it's a long process. So in some cases that's that's not possible to convert it in plain language. Yeah, I leave it.

603

01:07:29.050 --> 01:07:46.719

Participant 5: And but if it's especially, I emphasize on the statistical thing, you know, the public health feed is, moreover, relevant to epidemiology and statistical modeling and analysis nowadays, so they always prefer to have something in. It's easy to explain in a statistical way

604

01:07:46.860 --> 01:07:57.800

Participant 5: sometimes, but it's sometimes a bit difficult for the new authors to to explain in a plain language. So if I find something in statistical terminologies, jargons like the

605

01:07:57.980 --> 01:08:00.079

Participant 5: higher odds, ratio.

606

01:08:00.360 --> 01:08:02.599

Karen Gainey: So for examples.

607

01:08:02.770 --> 01:08:15.600

Participant 5: So you have already explained these odd ratios and the estimates you already provided, the estimates in the main abstract, so I always ask them, and I will ask them to change their statistical terminology. Is it possible.

608

01:08:16.069 --> 01:08:16.759

Karen Gainey: Yes.

609

01:08:17.179 --> 01:08:31.729

Karen Gainey: that that makes sense, and that's interesting, because some, when I spoke to people, they said they don't necessarily want all the medical jargon dumbed down or replaced, because if they have a disease.

610

01:08:32.170 --> 01:08:37.959

Karen Gainey: Even if it has a quite complex name, they understand it because they have it, and they're familiar with it.

611

01:08:37.960 --> 01:08:39.260

Participant 5: Exactly, exactly.

612

01:08:39.260 --> 01:08:42.309

Karen Gainey: And so that's interesting. Yeah.

613

01:08:42.319 --> 01:08:47.399

Participant 5: Even sometimes it's not possible to explain a disease like, you know.

614

01:08:48.069 --> 01:08:49.739

Karen Gainey: Yeah. It's about 20 words.

615

01:08:49.740 --> 01:08:50.190

Participant 5: Yeah.

616

01:08:50.640 --> 01:08:53.970

Karen Gainey: Yeah, and with with limited number.

617

01:08:53.970 --> 01:08:54.290

Participant 5: Yes.

618

01:08:54.687 --> 01:08:59.060

Karen Gainey: It may not be worth it. Yeah, but some cardiovascular disease.

619

01:08:59.060 --> 01:09:00.350

Participant 5: Hmm hmm, yes.

620

01:09:00.359 --> 01:09:16.619

Karen Gainey: It's a bit easier heart disease. So it's yeah. So no, that's very consistent with what I found. But it's just interesting to hear the thought processes behind all the rationale. That's what I'm trying to understand. So that's really useful.

621

01:09:17.144 --> 01:09:28.749

Karen Gainey: So just kind of quickly. Has there been any discussion around the use of AI tools at your journal, or any plans? Or what are your thoughts on that? In general?

622

01:09:28.750 --> 01:09:32.177

Participant 5: No, in the last, maybe in the last 2 months.

623

01:09:32.649 --> 01:09:39.280

Participant 5: 2 months ago maybe we had a meeting, and I don't think anything. We have the policies on the AI.

624

01:09:39.729 --> 01:09:40.920

Participant 5: Maybe

625

01:09:41.382 --> 01:09:52.360

Participant 5: the journals will come. Come up with the AI. Policy based on. Maybe I'm not sure, though, whether they have incorporated anything in there, because if they incorporate anything we could get email.

626

01:09:52.550 --> 01:09:58.940

Participant 5: But I haven't noticed any email. Maybe I missed the email. I could be. I could miss the email. But I will check again. But

627

01:09:59.070 --> 01:10:27.840

Participant 5: but mostly a lot of journals. If I say some other journals about. I checked it. But yeah, it's okay to use the AI in many journals nowadays I find some journals, but not always all journals. But in many journals I find it's okay to use the AI, but you have to declare which sections and how did you use the AI and what actually you got from you? Maybe you have to declare you have to declare this.

628

01:10:27.840 --> 01:10:28.290

Karen Gainey: Yes.

629

01:10:28.290 --> 01:10:35.900

Participant 5: Maybe they have some policy. How you can declare this, and how you can use the AI in your manuscript, or writing, or everything.

630

01:10:36.140 --> 01:10:47.940

Participant 5: But I'm I'm unaware about the reproductive health channels at this moment, but I will check whether they have. But maybe a few months back they didn't have. But in the meantime, if they have something, but

631

01:10:48.270 --> 01:10:50.350

Participant 5: maybe I didn't take anything.

632

01:10:51.200 --> 01:10:52.180

Karen Gainey: No, that's okay.

633

01:10:52.180 --> 01:10:52.610

Participant 5: Yeah.

634

01:10:52.610 --> 01:11:07.922

Karen Gainey: Just wondering if it's come up with your plain English summaries in particular, and whether some editors, one editor I spoke to said they had seen some summaries coming through, they felt were AI generated

635

01:11:08.490 --> 01:11:15.750

Karen Gainey: and some some weren't, but they felt they could see some differences. So just wondering if you'd had that experience.

636

01:11:16.126 --> 01:11:29.679

Participant 5: I haven't experienced anything, but the thing is, if you ask me do you agree with using the AI especially to generate the plain English summary from the main key summary, or the main abstract.

637

01:11:30.180 --> 01:11:31.820

Participant 5: I would say yes.

638

01:11:32.150 --> 01:11:39.709

Participant 5: I would say yes, it can be. But the journal should have a policy the author should have. Should have declared about this.

639

01:11:40.680 --> 01:11:49.530

Participant 5: Yeah, so my perception. And if the journal can take a policy, yeah, no, no. AI is acceptable for the journals.

640

01:11:50.130 --> 01:11:55.790

Participant 5: So then it could be different. But per! My opinion is

641

01:11:56.480 --> 01:12:09.589

Participant 5: especially writing the other sections, the research, and particularly me. I don't prefer AI. But for writing the plain English summary, since you focus on the plain English summary here. So.

642

01:12:09.590 --> 01:12:10.040

Karen Gainey: Hmm.

643

01:12:10.240 --> 01:12:23.469

Participant 5: The the authors meeting all I have explained in the main abstract. So what I will do, and how I can articulate this thing in a plain English, especially those who are not the English speaking country from

644

01:12:23.880 --> 01:12:30.380

Participant 5: so especially whose English is English, is not the 1st language. So for them.

645

01:12:30.640 --> 01:12:40.220

Participant 5: AI could be an effective tool to get an idea, especially to not the copy and paste to get an idea how I can articulate especially this finding only.

646

01:12:40.390 --> 01:12:48.259

Participant 5: And they can declare, yeah, we use the aid site, or maybe, according to the journal's policy or the publisher's policy.

647

01:12:48.730 --> 01:12:49.530

Participant 5: Maybe.

648

01:12:50.120 --> 01:12:52.420

Karen Gainey: Yeah. Okay, so there might be room for.

649

01:12:52.420 --> 01:12:58.559

Participant 5: Yeah, it's not, you know, without AI. It's not possible to go way forward in the next future

650

01:12:58.670 --> 01:13:01.670

Participant 5: world. Maybe what I think everything.

651

01:13:02.100 --> 01:13:02.430

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

652

01:13:02.430 --> 01:13:21.769

Participant 5: Everything will be based on, even in the recent funding from the UN. From the every international stakeholders, the funders they are focusing on the AI with healthcare. AI with medical research. AI with this, or if you look at the recent funding receivers, if you check 20 funders.

653

01:13:22.270 --> 01:13:24.820

Participant 5: you may find 15 out of 20

654

01:13:25.466 --> 01:13:29.980

Participant 5: the research based in the AI with the Health Science everything.

655

01:13:30.640 --> 01:13:31.280

Participant 5: So.

656

01:13:31.280 --> 01:13:32.039

Karen Gainey: I got it.

657

01:13:32.370 --> 01:13:39.379

Karen Gainey: I got an email today from the new editor of the Bmj Digital Health and AI Journal.

658

01:13:39.380 --> 01:13:40.000

Participant 5: We have.

659

01:13:40.000 --> 01:13:42.489

Karen Gainey: That's just a new journal journal that's launched.

660

01:13:42.490 --> 01:13:43.679

Participant 5: Yeah, I know.

661

01:13:44.100 --> 01:13:44.490

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

662

01:13:44.490 --> 01:13:50.630

Participant 5: Utilia. Yeah, yeah. So have another journals. It's also new Bmj public health.

663

01:13:50.800 --> 01:13:55.260

Participant 5: It's also New journal there, maybe a few months, maybe a few months.

664

01:13:55.544 --> 01:13:58.099

Karen Gainey: Not sure if I've got that on my list.

665

01:14:00.030 --> 01:14:01.699

Karen Gainey: Check that out. Thank you.

666

01:14:01.880 --> 01:14:07.359

Participant 5: Bmj public health. So it's maybe few months back. They they just launched it.

667

01:14:08.610 --> 01:14:14.260

Karen Gainey: Thank you. All right. So, lastly, just

668

01:14:14.550 --> 01:14:27.109

Karen Gainey: thinking of in general the future of plain English summaries, what do you think they might be out of everything, or what would you like the future to be either for your journal or in general.

669

01:14:27.110 --> 01:14:31.739

Participant 5: Say about the future. As I said, the journal should have.

670

01:14:31.990 --> 01:14:41.379

Participant 5: The journals may think about the incorporation of AI. Honestly. So that's just now it. It comes in up in my mind.

671

01:14:42.140 --> 01:14:46.790

Participant 5: So yeah, the journals and the publisher can incorporate the

672

01:14:47.400 --> 01:14:50.200

Participant 5: usage of AI to generate the

673

01:14:50.440 --> 01:15:14.389

Participant 5: maybe plain English symbols, but not the copy paste, and it should have a logic, because I think authors, authors, should be well aware about the meaning of the sentences they are writing for the plain English, to the editors, to the general leaders, journals, everything. So the incorporation of AI in an appropriate way. I don't know.

674

01:15:14.390 --> 01:15:14.830

Karen Gainey: Wow!

675

01:15:14.830 --> 01:15:27.139

Participant 5: Because I'm not an AI specialist. I'm not an It specialist. So they may know. How can we, Chatbot? Or which type of AI, or how we can incorporate. But it could be a solution, or

676

01:15:27.540 --> 01:15:30.629

Participant 5: we have to go with this, because without AI

677

01:15:30.790 --> 01:15:35.720

Participant 5: the next few serves or the coming days would be difficult, you know.

678

01:15:36.880 --> 01:15:38.389

Karen Gainey: Kind of inevitable, isn't it?

679

01:15:38.390 --> 01:15:39.020

Participant 5: Yes.

680

01:15:39.020 --> 01:15:41.369

Karen Gainey: Just how we, how we navigate.

681

01:15:41.370 --> 01:15:47.379

Participant 5: Yeah, we have to comply with the recent innovations. And the way world is moving.

682

01:15:47.970 --> 01:15:48.610

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

683

01:15:48.930 --> 01:16:01.889

Karen Gainey: cool. All right. Thank you so much. Is there any other barriers or facilitators to publishing or disseminating plain English summaries? We haven't covered. That you think are is important.

684

01:16:01.890 --> 01:16:08.589

Participant 5: It needs to be more popular. It's not that popular yet, but it needs to be. It needs to be more popular. So

685

01:16:08.780 --> 01:16:14.269

Participant 5: like one campaign I can see, I think maybe there are some more campaigning, but

686

01:16:14.600 --> 01:16:22.030

Participant 5: the journals and the publishers should have some policies about the plain English summary, especially in the medical and the health resources.

687

01:16:23.420 --> 01:16:25.430

Karen Gainey: You're preaching to the choir. There.

688

01:16:25.590 --> 01:16:26.370

Participant 5: You can do.

689

01:16:26.720 --> 01:16:27.940

Participant 5: Yeah. Man.

690

01:16:28.463 --> 01:16:46.260

Karen Gainey: I completely agree. Oh, thank you so much for your time here on a Saturday. It's been absolutely delightful, and you've given me some fantastic information really? Useful? I appreciate it.

691

01:16:46.260 --> 01:16:51.310

Participant 5: Pleasure to be part of your study. It's a very unique study. I appreciate honestly.

692

01:16:51.820 --> 01:16:52.550

Karen Gainey: Because of the.

693

01:16:52.550 --> 01:16:57.020

Participant 5: Topic. I just got interested. Honestly, no, that's coming to

694

01:16:57.020 --> 01:17:02.100

Participant 5: new thing. Someone can think about this. Oh, my God, it's very fascinating.

695

01:17:02.720 --> 01:17:04.470

Participant 5: Yeah, I appreciate it

696

01:17:04.470 --> 01:17:10.710

Participant 5: honestly, I appreciate your thinking and best research for you, for your research, for your degree.

697

01:17:11.820 --> 01:17:22.919

Karen Gainey: You also, and I should have mentioned at the beginning. I'm offering to everyone who participates. If you'd like to review the

698

01:17:23.160 --> 01:17:31.290

Karen Gainey: the transcript and just check that. You're happy, your that it's captured, your opinions accurately. I'm happy to send you.

699

01:17:31.290 --> 01:17:45.879

Participant 5: Okay, it's completely okay. Whatever you do, you are a researcher. So as a researcher, I have to rely on you. But I'm interested to read the health director of your manuscripts, to know actually what you found, what you actually you found.

700

01:17:46.870 --> 01:17:48.020

Karen Gainey: Most definitely.

701

01:17:48.850 --> 01:17:49.830

Participant 5: Yeah.