

WEBVTT

9

00:03:01.530 --> 00:03:17.099

Karen Gainey: Well, thank you for agreeing to participate. I'm yeah, really excited. You're the only person I've got from the (journal), so this is great, because your journals are a little bit different. So

10

00:03:17.100 --> 00:03:20.349

Karen Gainey: I mean, good to hear to hear from you.

11

00:03:21.700 --> 00:03:24.380

Karen Gainey: Thank you. Thank you really appreciate it?

12

00:03:26.620 --> 00:03:27.000

Karen Gainey: So.

13

00:03:27.000 --> 00:03:30.749

Participant 6: Just just this is about a plain language. Summer? Right? Yeah. Okay. Good.

14

00:03:30.750 --> 00:03:32.350

Karen Gainey: That's right. Yeah, yeah.

15

00:03:32.915 --> 00:03:33.370

Participant 6: Yeah.

16

00:03:34.130 --> 00:03:40.549

Participant 6: Oh, my God! I had to jump from call to call. So I tried to get the topic heading, Yeah.

17

00:03:40.930 --> 00:03:48.330

Karen Gainey: Yeah, okay, so I understand it's night for me. It's probably morning or daytime for you. Is that right?

18

00:03:49.005 --> 00:03:49.680

Participant 6: Yes.

19

00:03:49.680 --> 00:03:56.269

Karen Gainey: Okay, so we've scheduled this for an hour. Do you need to be strict with the time.

20

00:03:57.810 --> 00:04:02.519

Participant 6: I mean ideally. Yes, we have. I have a meeting in 57 min. Yes.

21

00:04:02.520 --> 00:04:12.960

Karen Gainey: Okay, I'll make sure we keep to that then. So we'll we'll get through everything. So just a really quick just want to remind you, we're recording this

22

00:04:13.740 --> 00:04:37.560

Karen Gainey: transcribe. And the zoom is transcribing the audio automatically. And but I'm not keeping the video. The video won't be saved or any chat. And I'll remove any identifying information such as your name, your journal, or anything else else that might identify you, and that won't be published. Either.

23

00:04:38.880 --> 00:04:52.780

Karen Gainey: So I'll just quickly start with why I'm doing this and what led me to this, and if you're happy with that we'll get going. This is the final project in my Phd. So

24

00:04:52.850 --> 00:05:11.339

Karen Gainey: I've done a scoping review which looked at the guidelines for plain language summaries in health journals, and I followed that up with a compliance study that compared the plain language summaries against the guidelines to see how well they matched

25

00:05:12.020 --> 00:05:13.919

Karen Gainey: and that was actually just

26

00:05:14.050 --> 00:05:43.409

Karen Gainey: published by the (journal). Open, which was terrific and found a range of different levels of compliance. Yours wasn't included, but I've also done a series of semi-structured interviews with end users of plain language summaries. So people who read them a lot also use health information. So people with chronic medical conditions that use

27

00:05:43.410 --> 00:05:48.470

Karen Gainey: health information, particularly plain language summaries to find out what they think is most important.

28

00:05:48.470 --> 00:06:14.480

Karen Gainey: So I've taken the results of all of those studies, and that's under review at the moment to get together questions for journal editors. So we know what's out there. We know what people who read these summaries like and don't like. So now I want to investigate from your end to kind of close that loop and see, try and understand the decisions that go into this side of publishing

29

00:06:14.480 --> 00:06:22.600

Karen Gainey: what are the barriers or facilitators, and really understand that relationship between the editors and the publisher.

30

00:06:22.740 --> 00:06:41.240

Karen Gainey: because it obviously varies from journal to journal, but just trying to understand all of the components that go into publishing, disseminating, and all aspects of plain language summaries, and then, looking to the future of where you see, think that might go.

31

00:06:43.260 --> 00:06:47.269

Karen Gainey: Do you have any questions or comments or concerns before we get started?

32

00:06:47.630 --> 00:06:49.289

Participant 6: No no just get started.

33

00:06:49.750 --> 00:06:55.610

Karen Gainey: Perfect. And please let me know if I'm speaking too quickly.

34

00:06:55.910 --> 00:07:02.900

Karen Gainey: Sometimes Australians do. We're told. We speak too quickly. So that's an issue at all, all right.

35

00:07:02.930 --> 00:07:32.499

Karen Gainey: So just to get started. Could you maybe tell me a little bit about your role at (Journal X)? So I get an overview of where things are situated, and specifically, as it relates, I know you don't publish, or I want to understand what you do publish. I know they're key messages that are framed as 3 questions. So I don't know whether you consider those language summaries or not. But I guess

36

00:07:32.950 --> 00:07:47.750

Karen Gainey: I should mention with these questions. It doesn't just have to relate to your current role. If you've been involved as an editor in other journals and have perspectives on these kind of summaries, you're welcome to draw on that as well. So.

37

00:07:47.750 --> 00:07:48.140

Participant 6: Hmm.

38

00:07:48.140 --> 00:07:55.470

Karen Gainey: And please tell me, good, bad, ugly, indifferent, all of it. I'm interested in hearing.

39

00:07:56.930 --> 00:07:57.715

Participant 6: So.

40

00:07:59.290 --> 00:08:12.149

Participant 6: so I've been working as an editor for more than 10 years. I started with a local journal, and then I was in (Country) that we published commentary on published research for for Doctors.

41

00:08:12.260 --> 00:08:17.510

Participant 6: which I think is sort of a plain language summary, because it's a. It was a

42

00:08:18.020 --> 00:08:26.510

Participant 6: 800 word article summarizing a very lengthy research paper. And I thought, I, I see that in the past

43

00:08:27.730 --> 00:08:32.449

Participant 6: plain language summary, because most clinicians cannot read proper research

44

00:08:32.730 --> 00:08:56.970

Participant 6: point number one. Then I started working for (Organisation) in 2015, and (Organisation) has official plain language summaries, as you know, and I became an editor of (Organisation) in 2018. So I've been editing (Organisation) Reviews ever since. I also was a managing editor for this group here in (Country) and I'm 1 of the senior sign-off editors for (Organisation), so I'm very involved in the plain language summaries for (Organisation).

45

00:08:57.190 --> 00:09:06.630

Participant 6: and then I'm also an editor-in-chief of (journal) medicine since 2022 and

46

00:09:07.930 --> 00:09:15.089

Participant 6: is it? That's correct. It's 2022 to 2021. I think it's 2021, 2021 sorry, and

47

00:09:16.250 --> 00:09:19.769

Participant 6: I'm also a technical editor for the main (journal).

48

00:09:20.130 --> 00:09:42.840

Participant 6: so in both my current editorial roles at (journal). Medicine, I mean, I have a similar experience, because we publish just regular research papers, and we don't publish plain language summaries. As far as I know, I don't consider the 3 questions to be plain language summaries. I think that is just part of the

49

00:09:43.090 --> 00:09:52.730

Participant 6: format that many (journal) journals have for some article types. And and there's a degree of harmonization. We have a harmonization project

50

00:09:52.930 --> 00:09:54.650

Participant 6: across the (journal) group.

51

00:09:54.840 --> 00:10:02.300

Participant 6: The (journal) has over 70 journals. So there's a lot of variation in what the journals do. And there's a publisher team

52

00:10:02.470 --> 00:10:14.642

Participant 6: working to improve the publishing practices and try to make the article types a little bit similar, make the journey for authors smoother. So

53

00:10:15.710 --> 00:10:22.320

Participant 6: so I was also involved in in trying to harmonize my journal into the the guidelines of the (Publishing) group.

54

00:10:24.620 --> 00:10:28.800

Participant 6: Is that okay? Does that answer your question about the overview of it really does.

55

00:10:29.170 --> 00:10:29.910

Participant 6: Okay? Right?

56

00:10:29.910 --> 00:10:40.039

Karen Gainey: Yeah, that's great. Can you tell me a little bit about so? With the (journal) I guess the

57

00:10:40.380 --> 00:10:59.190

Karen Gainey: the head. (journal), just the just, the (journal), what's the relationship between that and the other journals? Say, the (journal X), (journal Y), etc. And the level of autonomy or

58

00:11:00.950 --> 00:11:13.649

Karen Gainey: I forget the word you used. But the harmonization. Yeah, where does that? Does it come from? The (journal) itself? Or is there collaboration between the journals.

59

00:11:14.360 --> 00:11:23.419

Participant 6: So, as you know, the World Association of Medical Editors had a paper as well called editorial independency, and so every editor in chief has.

60

00:11:23.490 --> 00:11:48.450

Participant 6: So there's guidelines from the World Association of medical editors that provide that editor-in-chief should have editorial dependency from the organizations that are funding them or hosting them so on. So that paper was changed many years ago, and that was called the relationship between editors and something like that. But it sort of contains the same principle, but the idea is that each editor-in-chief has the capacity to

61

00:11:49.710 --> 00:11:52.500

Participant 6: to do, publish what they want, and

62

00:11:52.640 --> 00:12:03.859

Participant 6: have their own narratives, and so that is very much respected at the (journal). At the same time the (journal) does have a brand that they need to

63

00:12:05.270 --> 00:12:23.120

Participant 6: protect and credibility. I would say also that they need to protect. So we have a research integrity team that provides supports for all the journal. So so they handle complaints, queries, and so on. So that is a point of contact of all the journals.

64

00:12:23.290 --> 00:12:25.129

Participant 6: and at the same time you have

65

00:12:25.200 --> 00:12:47.670

Participant 6: always in the journals. You have the editor side, which are more the scientific people, and you have the publisher side, which are the experts on publication that always try to look at what are the best practice nowadays, the latest regulations, compliance, and so on. So the (journal). Has a publishing team that works to

66

00:12:47.730 --> 00:12:55.920

Participant 6: harmonize the publishing practices of all journals, so they all fit best practice. So, for example, if an editor.

67

00:12:56.200 --> 00:12:57.910

Participant 6: I don't know, it's not

68

00:12:58.600 --> 00:13:16.636

Participant 6: properly peer. Reviewing the articles, then the publisher would intervene, and said, Look, you have to follow practice, but not because they are judging the decisions that the editor makes. But you're just trying to make sure that the editorial policies of the pack of the in general are respected. So

69

00:13:17.780 --> 00:13:44.890

Participant 6: And there's also a little bit of a difference between the journals that the (journal) owns and the journals that the (journal). Provides a platform. So, for example, the (journal X) is a journal that (journal). Owns as compared to other journals that are owned by medical societies, and the (journal). Only publishes. So in those cases the relationship is a little bit different, because the societies can say, Well, we're not going to publish. (journal), we're going to go to

70

00:13:45.620 --> 00:13:51.469

Participant 6: Springer or another publisher, and and we have a little bit more in different relationship.

71

00:13:51.620 --> 00:14:09.700

Participant 6: and especially in my case, because I work at the Bain, (journal). And (journal X). Everything is a little bit mixed because we collaborate a lot with the main (journal). And I consider myself more of

72

00:14:09.880 --> 00:14:13.170

Participant 6: of a (journal) person rather than an external

73

00:14:13.880 --> 00:14:18.836

Participant 6: editor that is appointed and doing her own his own thing. So

74

00:14:20.100 --> 00:14:45.959

Participant 6: yeah. And we also collaborated between journals in transfers, so sometimes articles are transferred from one paper to the other, which is a little bit, and we had a transfer manager. That is very useful, because they've been trying to improve the author experience, and if you publish, you know, the history from moving from one journal to the other might be a nightmare, sometimes in terms of formatting, and so on

75

00:14:46.350 --> 00:15:15.559

Participant 6: the key messages. Or how do you spread your abstract? So we're trying to improve that, and allow the authors to to change. As an author, I may say I did find sometimes that some editors try to do their own plain language thing with a key box of messages in plain language, and that was sometimes a little bit difficult as an author, because once you're transferring from journal to journal.

76

00:15:16.160 --> 00:15:38.370

Participant 6: You don't know if your paper is going to be accepted. So you have to do this extra work for a journal that you don't know if the work is going to be accepted at all. So if that's a little bit of a in (Organisation), it's different, because you know up front that the plain language summary is going to be mandatory. I'll shut up now, and you can.

77

00:15:38.370 --> 00:15:48.329

Karen Gainey: Is great, because I want to let you talk because you're kind of answering a bunch of questions, anyway. So this is really great.

78

00:15:48.490 --> 00:16:07.220

Karen Gainey: As an author. I, yeah. My compliance study was just published by the (journal). Open, and I submitted to a different (journal) journal initially. So we got recommended for transfer because it didn't meet the aims or scopes. And that transfer process was really quite smooth.

79

00:16:07.814 --> 00:16:15.025

Karen Gainey: So I understand what you're saying, and I didn't have to change, I think anything.

80

00:16:17.210 --> 00:16:23.009

Karen Gainey: from what I recall, it was really quite straightforward. So that was, yeah. That was terrific.

81

00:16:23.800 --> 00:16:25.430

Participant 6: We have 1 1 which makes it.

82

00:16:25.430 --> 00:16:33.889

Participant 6: It was a process of 2 years of making that with someone dedicated specifically making that transfer smooth. It's still not a hundred percent

83

00:16:35.665 --> 00:16:40.449

Participant 6: operational sometimes. But but yeah, it's a very good experience.

84

00:16:40.830 --> 00:16:43.510

Karen Gainey: Yeah, yeah, terrific.

85

00:16:45.360 --> 00:16:46.570

Karen Gainey: So

86

00:16:48.600 --> 00:16:58.796

Karen Gainey: keeping in mind. So I'm trying to. Just, I've made a few notes. So hope you don't mind. I just want to make notes, so I don't forget things you've said to come back to

87

00:16:59.250 --> 00:17:04.227

Karen Gainey: When I looked at your author guidelines, I did notice that

88

00:17:05.020 --> 00:17:13.479

Karen Gainey: those key messages with the the kind of subheadings or the questions it looked like they were mandatory. Is that right?

89

00:17:14.030 --> 00:17:14.730

Participant 6: Yes.

90

00:17:15.130 --> 00:17:20.825

Karen Gainey: Yes, so I know, although they're not a plain language. Summary

91

00:17:21.410 --> 00:17:28.900

Karen Gainey: Do you know what was behind? The reason for making those mandatory.

92

00:17:32.790 --> 00:17:35.750

Participant 6: Can I be absolutely honest? It was sort of.

93

00:17:35.750 --> 00:17:39.510

Karen Gainey: Please no like. Throughout the whole interview.

94

00:17:39.510 --> 00:17:44.289

Participant 6: No, no, no, I, because it might make me look a little bit dumb. But, to be honest.

95

00:17:44.290 --> 00:17:44.790

Karen Gainey: No.

96

00:17:44.790 --> 00:17:45.960

Participant 6: Something that

97

00:17:46.120 --> 00:17:55.145

Participant 6: that is sort of inherited, and I think it's just from the previous editor. And it's not something that I I put a lot of thought into

98

00:17:55.760 --> 00:18:10.300

Participant 6: I always edit that always as an editor, I always look at that carefully, because there's a place where authors tend to spin their results into making them more sexy or attractive, or something like that. And when we're sharing it social media.

99

00:18:10.400 --> 00:18:24.959

Participant 6: we sometimes use the key messages, especially for very complicated papers. So we have a I mean Twitter and and and Facebook, we, we usually put the link, the title of the, and then we

100

00:18:25.080 --> 00:18:45.226

Participant 6: grab a part of the article that looks interesting. For example, a good table, a good figure, and sometimes we have articles that they don't have a very good table, a good figure, so we might take the key messages as something that it might highlight. We generally don't use the abstract for social media. And so.

101

00:18:46.810 --> 00:18:50.805

Participant 6: I think that that's sort of the usefulness. But

102

00:18:52.320 --> 00:18:58.960

Participant 6: But if if you ask me whether it adds much or not, I wouldn't. I wouldn't say that

103

00:19:00.470 --> 00:19:14.804

Participant 6: I think sometimes it's a little bit difficult. I would just I would just say, remove the key messages. I'm not sure. I I think that maybe (journal Y), also has that. So it probably has to do with the harmonization of articles. So

104

00:19:16.070 --> 00:19:17.196

Participant 6: yeah. So

105

00:19:17.760 --> 00:19:22.900

Karen Gainey: Yeah, I should have said that some of these questions. I I don't

106

00:19:22.960 --> 00:19:44.699

Karen Gainey: kind of expect you to kind of know, but I'm just wondering if you had an inkling, or if you I guess that's what I'm trying to understand how much of that decision making is filtered down to the journals, so I totally don't expect you to necessarily know but or that that's a reflection or a bad thing.

107

00:19:45.126 --> 00:19:55.360

Karen Gainey: That's part of what I'm curious to understand, and it seems to be a legacy, and it's something I have noticed throughout the (journal).

108

00:19:55.440 --> 00:20:08.529

Karen Gainey: There's sometimes in the instructions. It's just called Summary Box, but not published with the title, Summary Box. But yours are a little bit different. It's got a title key messages. So I was just a bit curious about your journal.

109

00:20:09.170 --> 00:20:13.339

Karen Gainey: Ab in particular, because it's just fears away from that

110

00:20:13.670 --> 00:20:22.439

Karen Gainey: a little bit. So I thought you might have a little bit of insight, or or that was something you had done yourself.

111

00:20:25.570 --> 00:20:28.990

Participant 6: No, no, it's not something. We implemented ourselves.

112

00:20:30.150 --> 00:20:32.730

Participant 6: I was just seeing that.

113

00:20:33.180 --> 00:20:50.550

Participant 6: Yeah, because (journal X) has strengths and limitations of this study as a summary box. I see I'm just reading. I'm seeing your paper, the review and environmental scan. So I I yeah, I think that varies across. To be honest, I think that we are so.

114

00:20:50.550 --> 00:20:50.890

Karen Gainey: I understand.

115

00:20:50.890 --> 00:20:55.790

Participant 6: Thinks of of the offers that that

116

00:20:56.130 --> 00:21:13.089

Participant 6: as we. If we get it for us, it's just easier, because if the paper is rejected the (journal). And it's transferred to (journal). Medicine, and he has key messages. It's easier for us to edit, so I think that's probably the rationale behind that. But I don't have really strong feelings about

117

00:21:14.147 --> 00:21:26.249

Participant 6: They keep messages in manuscripts, I think sometimes, if you ask me sometimes they're even more problematic than than just the absolute, as as an editor is always a

118

00:21:26.730 --> 00:21:30.790

Participant 6: pain asking editing that part because

119

00:21:31.380 --> 00:21:35.929

Participant 6: the what it, what it does actually, sometimes

120

00:21:36.150 --> 00:21:47.790

Participant 6: it's good for screening articles, because sometimes you have very abstracts that don't make any sense. So sometimes the authors are a little bit clearer on what they're trying to do with what the study adds question.

121

00:21:48.110 --> 00:21:53.199

Participant 6: And sometimes you read the abstract, and it's a little bit complicated, and you read what study has. And you realize, oh.

122

00:21:53.350 --> 00:22:15.270

Participant 6: it's very probably very complicated, abstract, because they this doesn't add a lot to to the literature, to what they would say. So I go back to the abstract and and you know, and sometimes people write things very complicated. You know English is not my 1st language, and and sometimes I struggle with some of the

123

00:22:15.643 --> 00:22:33.956

Participant 6: I mean for me. It's already a huge under undertaking to to to read so much and and figure out what's good or not. So. It might be. It might be that it works like a pls for for me to screen in and screen out. But

124

00:22:35.030 --> 00:22:56.989

Participant 6: But I don't have a I don't look at the abstract, and I think that it should be the clearest as possible for everyone to read, and I think that that is probably has to do with my (Organisation) training, because (Organisation) is very focused on making the abstracts very readable, because everyone knows that no one reads a full (Organisation) review. So they want the abstracts to be so clear

125

00:22:57.200 --> 00:22:57.855

Participant 6: and

126

00:22:58.760 --> 00:23:02.679

Participant 6: And because of that training, (Organisation), I think that I always

127

00:23:03.390 --> 00:23:17.220

Participant 6: very carefully read all the abstracts of all the manuscripts like with it, I mean, we always read everything, but I just don't want them to be perfect, because they're probably the most read thing by people. So.

128

00:23:18.630 --> 00:23:19.410

Participant 6: yeah.

129

00:23:20.040 --> 00:23:22.489

Karen Gainey: Yeah, no, that actually makes a lot of sense.

130

00:23:24.270 --> 00:23:38.309

Karen Gainey: and I think it's interesting the way those key messages or those 3 questions are used in social media to advertise or promote the article. That's not something I've really heard a lot, but I think it could be an underutilized opportunity.

131

00:23:38.859 --> 00:23:55.020

Karen Gainey: Whether it's thought of as a pls. Or not doesn't really matter. It's a brief summary of the article that's not the abstract. So it's still a catchy way of of doing it. So that's great! Have you had much feedback on that, though.

132

00:23:55.020 --> 00:23:57.080

Participant 6: No, no, I haven't had much feedback.

133

00:23:57.679 --> 00:24:00.739

Participant 6: The only thing that I would add is that

134

00:24:02.010 --> 00:24:06.801

Participant 6: people are reading the literature in a very odd way, I would say,

135

00:24:07.530 --> 00:24:16.990

Participant 6: nowadays. And I found that a lot of I mean, from what I'm seeing online, and for some things that I myself sometimes do.

136

00:24:17.687 --> 00:24:30.502

Participant 6: Is you just plug it into Chatgpt and ask for a summary. If you want a plain language summary, you upload the Pdf. To Chatgpt, and you get an excellent plain language summary of what the article says.

137

00:24:31.180 --> 00:24:35.889

Participant 6: and so the use of AI to to

138

00:24:36.920 --> 00:24:43.339

Participant 6: to summarize some of the things in plain language. It really has changed for me

139

00:24:43.510 --> 00:24:46.721

Participant 6: a lot of how I think about

140

00:24:49.170 --> 00:24:56.720

Participant 6: how to communicate what the scientific article says, because we edit. We, as editors, edit something very

141

00:24:58.580 --> 00:25:07.609

Participant 6: very sophisticated. That is the scientific manuscript, and so on. But then, when I think of producing materials for dissemination.

142

00:25:09.410 --> 00:25:16.229

Participant 6: I think I would just plug everything into AI and and and proof with the output

143

00:25:16.420 --> 00:25:28.559

Participant 6: that that comes out, you know, and that and that. And I'm not 90% sure, I'm not a hundred percent sure. But I think that the (journal) press releases are AI generated

144

00:25:28.990 --> 00:25:38.479

Participant 6: and then proves so a lot of publishers are using AI to to create content derivative there.

145

00:25:38.590 --> 00:25:45.080

Participant 6: derivative content. So for a better understanding. So

146

00:25:45.600 --> 00:25:48.440

Participant 6: in the future, I'm not really clear whether this

147

00:25:48.860 --> 00:25:54.399

Participant 6: key messages, or anything that we put as editors during the editorial process makes sense.

148

00:25:54.860 --> 00:25:59.460

Participant 6: If, then, AI is going to lay over it something that is understandable.

149

00:26:00.360 --> 00:26:29.673

Karen Gainey: Yeah, no, I understand. That's something I want to ask you about. So I noticed the (journal) has a new journal, AI and digital health. I think it's called yeah. So I there's

some I've had. So I was at the (Organisation) (Conference), and there was some discussion about the use of AI in generating pls, but there was a lot of conflicting viewpoints, and I mean that was a year ago.

150

00:26:30.300 --> 00:26:47.349

Karen Gainey: But yes, I wanted to kind of hear your point of view from that, and whether pls is, I guess, different to what you've got. Now, if you think that might be something the Bnj. Would consider either with AI or as A as a tool.

151

00:26:47.790 --> 00:26:55.614

Participant 6: I mean, I use. I use AI to generate the pls for (Organisation), I mean I as an author, I'm allowed so

152

00:26:56.160 --> 00:26:59.509

Participant 6: I mean when I'm sold. I mean writing a (Organisation) Review.

153

00:26:59.780 --> 00:27:09.390

Participant 6: It's just such a painful thing that when you have to write a plain language summary, it's the thing that you hate the most because you have to

154

00:27:09.730 --> 00:27:15.010

Participant 6: bring all these sets other sets of skills that has to do with

155

00:27:15.752 --> 00:27:21.307

Participant 6: plain language communication in a language that is not my own. So

156

00:27:22.170 --> 00:27:41.109

Participant 6: And as an author I can do it. It's loud like as long as you declare it, which is, you declare it in the acknowledgement we use AI to generate the 1st draft of the PIs. Of course you have to prove everything right. You have to check whether the AI said something that was not in the manuscript, and so on. Of course you have to prove it. But

157

00:27:41.800 --> 00:27:44.859

Participant 6: I would be a hundred percent in favor of

158

00:27:45.130 --> 00:28:14.800

Participant 6: of generating derivative content with AI. The problem of that is and is that who I mean? I, as an author, can do it. But as an editor sometimes it's a little bit difficult, because authors don't like the content to be AI processed, and and they have to prove that the output of the AI. So it's more of like a 3 way situation. You know the AI, the editor, and the author, and that needs to be sort of

159

00:28:15.700 --> 00:28:21.099

Participant 6: prepared and streamline so so that it works

160

00:28:21.310 --> 00:28:30.269

Participant 6: good. You know I mean, a lot of people don't want their manuscript to be in Chatgpt, but once it's published, everything could be be uploaded to Chatgpt. There's no

161

00:28:30.560 --> 00:28:40.402

Participant 6: privacy concerns, or I mean, you can say, even if you have a private copy of a manuscript. You're allowed to upload it to chat gpt. There's no restrictions to that. So

162

00:28:41.790 --> 00:28:59.299

Participant 6: but having to download a Pdf upload it to chatgpt export, I mean that it seems a little bit archaic in the future. It would be good if everything is a little bit integrated, and the authors can say, yes, okay. Okay. Everything seems fine. I'm not sure if I answered your question.

163

00:28:59.580 --> 00:29:02.756

Karen Gainey: It. There is no one answer, so.

164

00:29:03.210 --> 00:29:04.170

Participant 6: Say, Wendell.

165

00:29:04.340 --> 00:29:09.370

Participant 6: I went to another topic, and then, yeah, I want. I don't want to deviate from the point. Yeah.

166

00:29:09.370 --> 00:29:15.660

Karen Gainey: No, no, I appreciate that. It's all right. So

167

00:29:16.000 --> 00:29:19.051

Karen Gainey: I guess. Let me just check

168

00:29:20.190 --> 00:29:23.348

Karen Gainey: So I guess, for now there's no

169

00:29:23.960 --> 00:29:37.579

Karen Gainey: sounds like. So I'm just understanding, I said. I hate making assumptions. There's no consideration for adding plain language summaries at the (journal). Other than what

170

00:29:38.280 --> 00:29:42.220

Karen Gainey: already exists with the the summary boxes. The key messages.

171

00:29:44.060 --> 00:29:46.250

Karen Gainey: Is that your understanding.

172

00:29:47.400 --> 00:29:49.339

Participant 6: Not that I know what? Oh.

173

00:29:50.040 --> 00:29:54.450

Participant 6: If you want to, I can put you in contact with the publishing team

174

00:29:54.980 --> 00:30:01.460

Participant 6: and ask them whether that's the actual case. Perhaps there's a pilot project, or something like that that I don't know.

175

00:30:01.460 --> 00:30:02.159

Karen Gainey: Oh, that'd be great!

176

00:30:02.600 --> 00:30:07.090

Participant 6: But I cannot give you like you know.

177

00:30:08.800 --> 00:30:13.969

Participant 6: An official answer from the (journal). As I understand.

178

00:30:15.000 --> 00:30:17.460

Karen Gainey: And I don't want to push you on that either.

179

00:30:17.920 --> 00:30:21.439

Participant 6: The one the one person that I may know. Do you know, (name).

180

00:30:22.230 --> 00:30:25.200

Karen Gainey: Her name doesn't ring a bell. No.

181

00:30:25.200 --> 00:30:34.296

Participant 6: Amy Price is like our patient advocate. I mean, there's we have a couple of patient advocates from (journal), and she

182

00:30:35.300 --> 00:30:44.399

Participant 6: Actually, she might be an excellent person to interview if you want to. She has a lot of. She's been at (journal). For a long time. She's led the patient initiatives, and so on. So

183

00:30:44.560 --> 00:30:52.350

Participant 6: if you're looking for, if you're still looking for interview, but otherwise, why, I'm saying that because a lot of the I mean, I think that

184

00:30:53.090 --> 00:31:12.179

Participant 6: oh, healthcare professionals and researchers need plain language summaries, because we don't handle all the vocabulary and all the methods and everything. So we all need sort of plain language summaries. But a lot of the work on plain language summaries was focused on targeting patients. So and I know people like

185

00:31:12.860 --> 00:31:26.379

Participant 6: we've been working on a paper with (name). Do you know her from (Country)? Yeah. Yeah. And (name) told me that a lot of the work that she does with patient involvement is that sometimes the patients write the

186

00:31:26.750 --> 00:31:28.220

Participant 6: plain language summary.

187

00:31:28.610 --> 00:31:35.627

Participant 6: and as one of the forms of involvement, and and I thought that that was brilliant and

188

00:31:36.700 --> 00:31:42.140

Participant 6: and that's something that perhaps a little bit the (journal) could do if they want patient involvement and and

189

00:31:42.936 --> 00:31:57.959

Participant 6: so (name) might be someone who can tell her a little, and she knows she's been (journal). For a long time. So but but otherwise, not to my knowledge. I cannot, I should answer officially, and and I can contact you with someone.

190

00:31:58.720 --> 00:32:17.970

Karen Gainey: Yeah, no, no. Problem. Yeah. I was going to ask about patient or consumer involvement and really wanted to understand. I guess before that. Who do you think the audience is for the (journal). And who do you think reads the key messages?

191

00:32:18.210 --> 00:32:19.520

Karen Gainey: Well, the summary

192

00:32:19.630 --> 00:32:26.140

Karen Gainey: those questions. Do you have a any feedback, or it's okay. If you're guessing or an educated guess.

193

00:32:27.210 --> 00:32:37.599

Participant 6: I mean, it's an educated guess. I would say that the audience, the readership that they are targeting historically has been clinicians.

194

00:32:38.630 --> 00:32:59.349

Participant 6: and they're targeting general practitioners and people who receive the paper, the (journal). And paper in the Uk. But as the (journal). Has become international is also become important for medical doctors and researchers throughout the world. I don't think that the readership of the (journal) is targeting

195

00:32:59.830 --> 00:33:03.000

Participant 6: patience. I think that

196

00:33:03.380 --> 00:33:14.710

Participant 6: that that the media team, when they work with press releases, and with with other forms of of mainstream media, they, they

197

00:33:14.920 --> 00:33:18.430

Participant 6: and the and with social media

198

00:33:18.780 --> 00:33:32.850

Participant 6: contributions they may target the general public. But it's not the the readership of the manuscripts themselves. So that's a little bit of a of a difference. So

199

00:33:33.820 --> 00:33:37.500

Participant 6: yeah, that is sort of my estimation of of who the research is.

200

00:33:37.920 --> 00:33:51.380

Karen Gainey: Do you think it's so mainly clinicians or specialists, medical specialists? Do you think it's other researchers, or like non-specialist researchers or researchers?

201

00:33:51.650 --> 00:33:52.469

Karen Gainey: Oh, policy.

202

00:33:52.470 --> 00:33:59.860

Participant 6: Researchers, researchers and policymakers may also be reading the (journal).

203

00:34:00.600 --> 00:34:14.910

Participant 6: yeah. Yeah. But clinician researchers, probably if I think about it, because a lot of them. Then, for example, the research methods and reporting articles are focusing on on people who are clinicians and do research.

204

00:34:15.150 --> 00:34:35.250

Participant 6: And my journal, to be honest, (journal X) may have more of a methodologist or researcher, non-clinician researchers target as well, but we are in the category of general medicine. Both journals. The main (journal), and (journal X). So I always keep that in mind.

205

00:34:35.860 --> 00:34:36.845

Participant 6: because,

206

00:34:38.860 --> 00:34:53.930

Participant 6: yeah, you always have to keep that in mind because you can't go like fully public health methodology. Because well, 1st of all, I'm a clinician. So I want to keep the clinician focus. And and it's basically in the category. What we're supposed to be publishing.

207

00:34:55.249 --> 00:34:58.769

Karen Gainey: Do you mean with the citation reports the.

208

00:34:58.770 --> 00:34:59.190

Participant 6: You know.

209

00:34:59.750 --> 00:35:02.450

Participant 6: Which is a little bit of a yeah, exactly.

210

00:35:02.450 --> 00:35:03.230

Karen Gainey: Yeah, okay.

211

00:35:03.230 --> 00:35:09.499

Participant 6: So that's why we publish sometimes reviews or studies that are

212

00:35:10.310 --> 00:35:25.930

Participant 6: focusing on diseases and problems, health problems in general. And not only this and this and that. And we. And since we are (journal X), a lot of people think that we're just a methods journal and they submit a lot of methods, research.

213

00:35:26.040 --> 00:35:38.570

Participant 6: and and some of it is good. But we chose not to publish, because we don't want to fill the entire journal with methods. Papers. We want to keep a little bit of balance. So yeah, there's a conscious decision to do that.

214

00:35:39.260 --> 00:35:42.235

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

215

00:35:43.270 --> 00:35:48.719

Karen Gainey: I'm I'm just kind of, I guess the reason for asking that and really wanting to understand it is

216

00:35:48.720 --> 00:36:13.439

Karen Gainey: of the people I spoke to. We spoke to people, particularly with chronic health conditions, because the literature suggests they are high users of health information. But journals are in their top. 3. What the literature doesn't tell us is what they read when they go to journals, so we kind of asked them and what they told us. They use plain language summaries often to decide, so they have diabetes

217

00:36:13.510 --> 00:36:33.649

Karen Gainey: to decide whether a new pharmaceutical product or or treatment therapy, maybe diabetes. Not a great example. Cancer might be relevant for them, and then they'll choose to read the full article, or at least the abstract or use it in shared decision making with their practitioner.

218

00:36:33.940 --> 00:36:54.240

Karen Gainey: So they kind of use it as a twofold kind of the what's in it for me. How relevant is the information to me as a patient. But also, how can I use this to further improve the quality of my care in conjunction with my physician? So

219

00:36:55.320 --> 00:36:57.560

Karen Gainey: that's what I'm trying to understand whether

220

00:36:58.110 --> 00:37:12.570

Karen Gainey: you've got an insight into how many given. It's very medically focused whether these kind of people might be trying to access your your articles, which is obviously a bit difficult to understand.

221

00:37:12.860 --> 00:37:14.269

Karen Gainey: to to glean.

222

00:37:15.980 --> 00:37:19.589

Participant 6: Yeah, I mean, I'm not sure what the reality is in Australia, but I think.

223

00:37:19.590 --> 00:37:20.300

Karen Gainey: Hmm.

224

00:37:20.480 --> 00:37:24.109

Participant 6: The the language is something to consider. I mean.

225

00:37:24.220 --> 00:37:31.239

Participant 6: here in (Country) patients would not go to a journal.

226

00:37:31.640 --> 00:37:35.419

Participant 6: even though they have high proficiency of English.

227

00:37:35.630 --> 00:37:55.399

Participant 6: To go and read a scientific article in English is a little bit complicated for a non-native speaker. So if you and if you think about Latin America people in chronic illnesses. I'm not sure if the information healthy skin behavior is the same. So I think language is a sort of a big

228

00:37:55.945 --> 00:38:06.844

Participant 6: aspect in general, because even even a plain language summary might be too complicated for someone whose proficiency in English is not good enough. So

229

00:38:08.670 --> 00:38:20.850

Participant 6: So I I am less familiar with that, and I can tell you from from my clinic. I worked 11 years as a doctor in in (Country), and and people with chronic illnesses.

230

00:38:21.530 --> 00:38:28.000

Participant 6: There they always relied on secondary sources of information, not journals primarily so.

231

00:38:28.630 --> 00:38:30.039

Karen Gainey: Yeah, that's interesting.

232

00:38:30.340 --> 00:38:31.079

Participant 6: So you know.

233

00:38:31.680 --> 00:38:47.249

Karen Gainey: Yeah. Well, out of my study I spoke to almost 20 people. Half of them were from a 3rd from Australia. A mix from the UK. Some from Europe, Germany, Italy, some from the Us.

234

00:38:47.990 --> 00:38:51.099

Karen Gainey: few other countries. Sweden, Switzerland,

235

00:38:53.390 --> 00:39:22.489

Karen Gainey: I can't recall. So we didn't get a lot of interest from South America, unfortunately, but what they did say was, often they were looking up information on behalf of family or friends, or other people for whom the English was poor or health. Literacy was poor, so I think your points very valid, but that kind of leads me into another area they did bring up was

236

00:39:22.710 --> 00:39:49.639

Karen Gainey: talking about how medical conditions impact the use of health information. And they were talking about how different formats was interesting because it gave them different options. So I'm just wanting to understand. So they're talking about videos, audio infographic and just different kind of formats or ways in which the information was presented. Is that something the (journal).

237

00:39:49.640 --> 00:39:53.589

Karen Gainey: Does or might consider? Do you know.

238

00:39:54.770 --> 00:39:58.150

Participant 6: Well, the (journal). Has infographics so.

239

00:39:58.150 --> 00:39:58.580

Karen Gainey: Okay.

240

00:39:58.580 --> 00:40:05.349

Participant 6: They're very good infographics. I'm not sure. Who are they targeting with infographics?

241

00:40:05.890 --> 00:40:09.292

Participant 6: But but I think they have sort of

242

00:40:10.040 --> 00:40:13.123

Participant 6: A very good infographics team.

243

00:40:14.810 --> 00:40:22.980

Participant 6: that's another person that you can get in touch from from the info. Are you interested in talking to someone from infographics, team, or or is it too special.

244

00:40:23.350 --> 00:40:28.010

Karen Gainey: I'd love to talk to a range of people. But unfortunately, my study is limited to editors.

245

00:40:28.630 --> 00:40:31.040

Karen Gainey: Yeah, yeah, yeah.

246

00:40:31.040 --> 00:40:35.750

Participant 6: Well, I think he's an editor, though. Right? I mean, doctor, we'll we'll

247

00:40:36.020 --> 00:40:39.600

Participant 6: stems, is it? Is it considered? I think he's a

248

00:40:39.750 --> 00:40:44.920

Participant 6: it's called a multimedia editor. It's called, but I'm not sure the them

249

00:40:45.640 --> 00:40:47.720

Participant 6: well, I don't know if the position is

250

00:40:47.880 --> 00:40:53.265

Participant 6: if you're yeah. Okay. So basically

251

00:40:57.360 --> 00:41:11.001

Participant 6: yeah, the infographics is a little bit time consuming to. You can need the the main (journal), can do it because they can afford it. But it's a really expensive to do keep infographics. So

252

00:41:14.342 --> 00:41:16.877

Participant 6: so yeah, I'm a little bit

253

00:41:18.200 --> 00:41:30.889

Participant 6: I always want. I had conversations with the editor of Jay because I wanted to include infographics, because I know that people love infographics for the update and improve the uptake of the reading of the articles, but they're just very difficult

254

00:41:31.460 --> 00:41:40.849

Participant 6: a to get it right, and not to for them not to look like like Microsoft paint drawing.

255

00:41:41.980 --> 00:41:42.810

Participant 6: And

256

00:41:45.040 --> 00:41:47.514

Participant 6: And the other thing is,

257

00:41:49.370 --> 00:41:57.800

Participant 6: yeah, it's just don't or and get the right information. It's just extremely complicated to do infographics.

258

00:41:57.800 --> 00:41:58.140

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

259

00:41:58.140 --> 00:42:11.619

Participant 6: Extremely, extremely complicated, and sometimes you, if you, you have to have a lot of money to do so, I mean, special graphic designers are very expensive in general to hire, and

260

00:42:11.930 --> 00:42:29.150

Participant 6: and I, as an author, got some money sometimes, and I I got like friends who did it for us for me, and and they were super, and they did like a friendly price. But otherwise it's just very, very expensive. And to to implement

261

00:42:29.761 --> 00:42:35.170

Participant 6: in a systematic way. And also I would say that sometimes

262

00:42:37.640 --> 00:42:43.690

Participant 6: I think sometimes it's a little bit belittling of people with chronic conditions, because

263

00:42:44.430 --> 00:43:00.740

Participant 6: it feels like you're saying that people need strawing to understand their medical literature, and sometimes they need just something to be explained more plainly. People read a lot of information in blogs, in substacks in Reddit

264

00:43:00.910 --> 00:43:01.700

Participant 6: and

265

00:43:02.660 --> 00:43:26.490

Participant 6: and there's a lot of I'm not an expert in communication like your team, but I've heard that a lot of people are reading a lot more, even though people say that people are reading less in books, wise and so on. People seem to be reading more, but just in a different format, and even people reading twitter threads. For instance.

266

00:43:27.240 --> 00:43:45.172

Participant 6: they all that information is mostly in text and and and in small byte format, and I sometimes find that even a little bit more powerful than in infographics, so the decision, infographic or or text, is a little bit

267

00:43:46.440 --> 00:43:50.989

Participant 6: different. I also think. For example, audio sometimes is very good.

268

00:43:51.850 --> 00:43:52.260

Karen Gainey: Yes.

269

00:43:53.090 --> 00:43:56.940

Participant 6: Audio, we have a podcast. (Podcast title).

270

00:43:57.420 --> 00:44:03.589

Participant 6: And we, yeah, where do you? Where do we.

271

00:44:03.740 --> 00:44:05.309

Karen Gainey: Find the link to that.

272

00:44:06.020 --> 00:44:18.230

Participant 6: So yeah, we are in apple, podcast spotify and so on. We had a little bit last year, fewer episodes. But we're catching up this year, ideally, once a month.

273

00:44:18.440 --> 00:44:19.770

Karen Gainey: Oh, great! Thank you.

274

00:44:20.290 --> 00:44:20.654

Participant 6: And

275

00:44:21.120 --> 00:44:23.510

Karen Gainey: If that oh, brilliant!

276

00:44:23.820 --> 00:44:34.230

Participant 6: And we're targeting clinicians. And we're doing some interviews and so on. So I think that nowadays there's a huge uptake in podcasts for information.

277

00:44:34.230 --> 00:44:34.600

Karen Gainey: Oh, yeah.

278

00:44:34.830 --> 00:44:49.449

Participant 6: As well, because people listen to it while commuted to work. We're cleaning their house while doing yeah. And and I do as a user, and sometimes I find it less expensive, less burdensome

279

00:44:49.450 --> 00:45:05.970

Participant 6: and more insightful. When you can get into people's ears, you know, and their airpods directly into their ears into their brain. And people, I think, sometimes receive much better information than text.

280

00:45:06.330 --> 00:45:06.860

Participant 6: Yeah.

281

00:45:06.860 --> 00:45:34.020

Karen Gainey: That's something they told. They really commented on just that for having a variety of formats just gave them a choice. And I mean, I have a number of chronic illnesses of fibromyalgia. And I get brain fog. So having audio, I love podcasts because I can consume it. When I've got some brain fog or a migraine and audio. I mean, text is a bit difficult. And so that was a common theme that came up.

282

00:45:34.348 --> 00:45:40.579

Karen Gainey: So yeah, I'll definitely let more people know because I I didn't know about that. So I think that's

283

00:45:40.590 --> 00:45:54.269

Karen Gainey: brilliant. But I'm curious to to understand what decides the choice to do an infographic for an article, because obviously you can't do one for every article at the Journal. What?

284

00:45:54.350 --> 00:45:57.149

Karen Gainey: What's yeah behind those choices.

285

00:45:58.080 --> 00:46:22.320

Participant 6: Well, there are a couple of things that we consider, at least from what my experience I've been in the research part of the (journal) for a year now. So not that much so. What I've heard about the decision making about infographics usually relates to the topic, whether as a topic could be graphically represented. So if you're talking about something that's a little bit abstract or.

286

00:46:22.660 --> 00:46:23.100

Karen Gainey: Hmm.

287

00:46:23.100 --> 00:46:27.980

Participant 6: You know, if you say, for example, exercise to.

288

00:46:28.090 --> 00:46:35.130

Participant 6: or menstrual bleeding, and so on. So there are a couple of things that are very easy to graphic through infographic.

289

00:46:35.560 --> 00:46:47.380

Participant 6: and also whether the stats, the statistics are translatable to a visual format. So sometimes meta analysis trials

290

00:46:47.820 --> 00:47:01.620

Participant 6: are easy to represent. Some observational studies are easy to represent, but some complicated observation. Studies that perhaps have complex graphics are very difficult to translate into an infographic or.

291

00:47:01.620 --> 00:47:02.140

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

292

00:47:02.350 --> 00:47:28.360

Participant 6: If you have. Yeah, if you, the study is extremely complicated, it's very difficult to translate in the infographic, which is a little bit funny if you think about it, because it makes sense. It says that even the articles that are easier to read are more amenable to an infographic, and you would say, well, actually, I need a simpler version of the more complex article, right? If you think about it.

293

00:47:28.360 --> 00:47:30.979

Karen Gainey: Yeah, right? But that's good. That's good.

294

00:47:30.980 --> 00:47:33.039

Participant 6: It's paradoxical, but that.

295

00:47:33.040 --> 00:47:34.880

Karen Gainey: It is. It's yeah.

296

00:47:35.060 --> 00:47:45.670

Participant 6: But that makes it a little bit the the complicated articles very inaccessible because they just remain in the original format. So

297

00:47:47.070 --> 00:47:48.430

Karen Gainey: Oh, yeah, yeah.

298

00:47:48.680 --> 00:47:51.604

Karen Gainey: Oh, yeah. I thought you were saying the opposite

299

00:47:51.930 --> 00:47:52.830

Participant 6: No, no, because.

300

00:47:52.830 --> 00:47:53.170

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

301

00:47:53.170 --> 00:48:05.339

Participant 6: No one wants to do an infographic on a very complicated article. No one wants to language on a complicated article, and so those articles remain inaccessible for most readers.

302

00:48:05.830 --> 00:48:12.619

Karen Gainey: There's a fine balance, I mean, just a bit too complicated, but not too not really really super complicated.

303

00:48:12.800 --> 00:48:14.120

Karen Gainey: just complicated enough.

304

00:48:14.120 --> 00:48:16.590

Participant 6: Yeah, just complicated, enough, yeah.

305

00:48:16.590 --> 00:48:21.330

Karen Gainey: Right. Right? What did the authors think of?

306

00:48:21.680 --> 00:48:26.749

Karen Gainey: Are they involved in that decision, or is it all in house? And then they do a sign off.

307

00:48:28.502 --> 00:48:29.527

Participant 6: So there's

308

00:48:30.410 --> 00:48:55.339

Participant 6: So will. Who is our graphic designer? Monitors, the papers that are being that are likely to be accepted, and when and and he might suggest himself. Oh, this article lends lends itself for an infographic, or sometimes, if we think that the article lends itself, we contact will before making a

309

00:48:55.710 --> 00:49:05.789

Participant 6: when we are sending the article for revision, and we think that the article is likely to be accepted. We already flag this to to will. So he he knows.

310

00:49:06.100 --> 00:49:08.850

Participant 6: hey, will! I had this article. He has very

311

00:49:08.960 --> 00:49:11.080

Participant 6: good graphics. Do you think we can.

312

00:49:13.080 --> 00:49:17.450

Karen Gainey: All right. So it's just a conversation and negotiation between all parties involved.

313

00:49:17.870 --> 00:49:29.229

Karen Gaine: Okay, I know we've got to wrap up shortly, just right at the end, I guess, thinking of the future just in general, in journal, publishing, what do you think's the future for plain language summaries.

314

00:49:29.690 --> 00:49:31.820

Karen Gaine: or what would you like the future to be.

315

00:49:35.660 --> 00:49:50.640

Participant 6: Well, I like to be more automated. You know, there's a talking about podcasts. There's a friend of mine from (Organisation), that because we we did a review on

316

00:49:51.050 --> 00:50:00.139

Participant 6: under nutrition and diabetes as risk factor for tuberculosis, and we have a very international team here, so I speak English, German.

317

00:50:00.973 --> 00:50:02.359

Participant 6: and Spanish.

318

00:50:02.600 --> 00:50:14.369

Participant 6: And so we did podcast like dialogue in those 3 languages with colleagues here, and we recorded our pod 3 languages, which is great for (Organisation). But then.

319

00:50:14.370 --> 00:50:15.000

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

320

00:50:15.474 --> 00:50:23.069

Participant 6: But then Matteo, from Cochrane said, do you know that there's this app called notebook? Lm.

321

00:50:23.750 --> 00:50:28.269

Participant 6: that is a so tool where you can plug your scientific article

322

00:50:28.710 --> 00:50:33.354

Participant 6: and and get a podcast out of it. And

323

00:50:34.680 --> 00:50:58.809

Participant 6: and and he sent me. He basically uploaded my manuscript and he took it out, and it was like an interview, like a couple of minutes interview of 2 very lovely people. I mean speaking accent free English, and summarizing all the the aspects of the article in very plain language, in the conversational style everything AI generated. So

324

00:50:58.830 --> 00:51:05.509

Participant 6: I thought that, yeah, I thought that it was a little bit great, overwhelming. It's just fantastic. So.

325

00:51:05.510 --> 00:51:07.030

Karen Gainey: Amazing.

326

00:51:08.220 --> 00:51:09.400

Karen Gainey: Yeah, yeah.

327

00:51:10.820 --> 00:51:16.879

Karen Gainey: so yeah, it sounds like you like the use of these kind of tools as a way of just saving time.

328

00:51:17.607 --> 00:51:27.610

Karen Gainey: But still like that human like I've mentioned before a human to look at the output of tools, to make sure they have high quality and are useful.

329

00:51:28.380 --> 00:51:35.360

Participant 6: Yeah, I mean they they. If if I mean communication, you have to put safeguards on on the AI thing.

330

00:51:36.990 --> 00:52:00.889

Participant 6: but that's okay, being, I mean, we, as human being safeguard. And that sort of redefines the role of us as scientific communicators, and saying, Well, instead of trying to do everything, we will be the safeguard. And at some point you can also create AI. That can be a safeguard. So, and you'll be the safeguard of the safeguard. And that's something that very meta.

331

00:52:01.160 --> 00:52:01.620

Participant 6: But

332

00:52:02.410 --> 00:52:11.559

Participant 6: but yeah, we could. You can also program an AI to check these things. And and theoretically, and that is some thought around some people.

333

00:52:12.410 --> 00:52:17.869

Karen Gainey: Sounds like a driverless car who's built with built in decision, making capabilities a little bit.

334

00:52:18.210 --> 00:52:19.380

Participant 6: Exactly, exactly.

335

00:52:19.380 --> 00:52:21.889

Karen Gainey: It just makes sense. It just makes sense.

336

00:52:22.020 --> 00:52:34.500

Karen Gainey: all right. Well, I won't keep you. But is there anything else any barriers or facilitators around the publication or dissemination of plain language summaries you think we haven't touched on, but might be important, or anything.

337

00:52:34.750 --> 00:52:36.000

Karen Gainey: You would just think I should know.

338

00:52:36.000 --> 00:52:39.379

Participant 6: I think that the main one is language. As I mentioned, I think that.

339

00:52:39.760 --> 00:52:46.450

Participant 6: and no one considers the importance of of the language, proficiency, and

340

00:52:46.580 --> 00:53:04.639

Participant 6: especially people working in English, usually forget that the dominance of the English language and everything, and how that trickles down. And I live here in (Country) for 3 years, and a lot of people say, Oh, (X) speaks perfect English, and so on. Blah blah! But

341

00:53:04.640 --> 00:53:20.779

Participant 6: in reality people, especially if you go down the street. People don't prefer not to speak English, so they're quite bothered by it. They can. But if they can not do it and speak their own language, which is fine. I mean, it's your your.

342

00:53:20.780 --> 00:53:21.330

Karen Gainey: Yes.

343

00:53:21.330 --> 00:53:30.550

Participant 6: And if your language proficiency is low, then it's even more annoying. And if you have people with health problems

344

00:53:31.137 --> 00:53:56.449

Participant 6: our situation, brain fog. Can you imagine with brain fog having to listen to read for plain language? Summary, that is not in your language. It's just. It's just, not right. And and considering the diversity of languages. It's a huge barrier that is in the way science is disseminated in general.

345

00:53:57.180 --> 00:54:01.180

Karen Gainey: Yeah, okay, I appreciate that. It's just another layer of difficult.

346

00:54:01.180 --> 00:54:03.209

Participant 6: Another night the other night. Yeah.

347

00:54:03.350 --> 00:54:06.780

Participant 6: but just I mean, if you think that sort circulation.

348

00:54:07.460 --> 00:54:07.960

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

349

00:54:07.960 --> 00:54:10.609

Participant 6: Much of the world population. I mean, we have.

350

00:54:10.780 --> 00:54:12.380

Participant 6: How many population.

351

00:54:12.580 --> 00:54:19.089

Participant 6: a billion people living in China, and the English proficiency in China is very low, you know. How do you access

352

00:54:19.560 --> 00:54:23.267

Participant 6: make accessible information for all those people? I mean?

353

00:54:24.060 --> 00:54:42.462

Participant 6: we're talking about the majority of the world. That is not proficiency in English, and and a lot of discussions about playing with summaries is how we create, like the English language summaries or the English infographic and well, the most of the world does not speak English. As for 1st language and

354

00:54:43.180 --> 00:54:56.510

Participant 6: and that's very challenging. I must say that I really enjoyed this conversation. I I when I was talking to you, I had a lot of ideas that I hadn't thought of before, so which speaks of great interviews, a great interviewers.

355

00:54:56.510 --> 00:55:00.100

Karen Gainey: I'm absolutely thrilled. You have made my day one.

356

00:55:00.100 --> 00:55:04.200

Participant 6: Alright, and that's easy to do, since it's at the end of the day. So.

357

00:55:05.110 --> 00:55:07.560

Karen Gainey: Brilliant, so much.

358

00:55:07.560 --> 00:55:10.989

Participant 6: A lot. No, thank you so much for your insightful interview.

359

00:55:11.390 --> 00:55:16.279

Karen Gainey: No, and and thank you. And I appreciate you looking up my article so quickly. That was

360

00:55:16.430 --> 00:55:18.129

Karen Gainey: very, very nice.

361

00:55:20.200 --> 00:55:40.640

Karen Gainey: so yeah, thank you. I appreciate it very much, and I did want to ask that. I ask everybody, would you like to see and review a copy of the Transcript to ensure your words are, or clarify the context of anything you've said in the interview. I'm very happy to send that to you. If you don't.

362

00:55:40.640 --> 00:55:50.709

Participant 6: I probably won't have the time to review it, and and I trust that they'd be fine. So I just mentioned this anonym and I. So it's everything's fine. Don't worry.

363

00:55:51.000 --> 00:55:53.708

Karen Gainey: Okay, well, thank you again, and

364

00:55:54.380 --> 00:56:04.339

Karen Gainey: I will. I will send you. I will check what? Whether you've requested the full article or not. But yeah.

365

00:56:04.340 --> 00:56:09.429

Participant 6: So I think I'd be interested in looking at the 4 article. Yeah, so it'd be very nice. Thank you so much, Karen.