

WEBVTT

31

00:14:06.910 --> 00:14:33.179

Karen Gainey: all right. Well, thank you for agreeing to do this. I'm really interested in in your journal. So I was. I was super excited when you agreed, because your journal is a little bit unique in the type of summaries you publish so really excited as I said, let me just get these papers out of the way.

32

00:14:35.580 --> 00:14:38.259

Karen Gainey: But one of the

33

00:14:38.930 --> 00:14:50.080

Karen Gainey: I just want to go over because it's a it was the end of last year, wasn't it, when you when (name) got in touch about the study and sent you.

34

00:14:50.080 --> 00:14:54.239

Participant 8: Yeah, I was just looking at that. I think so. And December is what I have in my email.

35

00:14:54.240 --> 00:14:56.819

Karen Gainey: Yeah. So I wanted to just

36

00:14:57.690 --> 00:15:19.499

Karen Gainey: quickly, I guess. Give you a really quick snapshot of, I guess. Why I'm doing this. The study and then then we can kick it off. And this is the final study in my Phd.

37

00:15:19.640 --> 00:15:19.960

Participant 8: Go ahead!

38

00:15:19.960 --> 00:15:38.960

Karen Gainey: So I started. So my Phd is all about the use of plain language summaries as a way of communicating health research, and I started with a scoping review of the author, guidelines for writing plain language, summaries in health, and medical journals, then looked at

39

00:15:38.960 --> 00:15:50.939

Karen Gainey: a compliance study which compared the author guidelines in those same journals to actual plain language, summaries to see how well they.

40

00:15:50.940 --> 00:16:00.589

Participant 8: I hesitate to. I am nervous about what you would have found from us. I'm not sure we we are always good at enforcing what we say we should be doing for our authors, but.

41

00:16:00.590 --> 00:16:10.169

Karen Gainey: We, we focused on journals that represented the top 10 non-communicable diseases. So your journal

42

00:16:10.320 --> 00:16:14.120

Karen Gainey: wasn't 1 of them. Yeah, neither study. So

43

00:16:14.390 --> 00:16:25.060

Karen Gainey: I can't comment, but results, as you can imagine, were mixed. Yeah, in terms of compliance

44

00:16:25.420 --> 00:16:32.139

Karen Gainey: with some. And I broke down the elements, you know. Use of jargon content, wording

45

00:16:32.930 --> 00:16:35.480

Karen Gainey: word, count that sort of thing, some

46

00:16:35.610 --> 00:17:00.049

Karen Gainey: more compliant than others, and they're published most recently. I've just got peer review back on a study. I did, asking people with chronic medical conditions again, sticking with that Ncd theme who read plain language summaries what they think is most important, why they use them how they use them. That sort of thing.

47

00:17:00.050 --> 00:17:09.699

Karen Gainey: So I've taken the results of all of that, and put together some questions to find out from the publishing perspective

48

00:17:11.960 --> 00:17:37.990

Karen Gainey: the things that matter most to consumers of summaries, but also trying to understand really the decision making process at the journal and publisher level, to see from what people told us is important, what's really practical, what goes on behind the scenes, what barriers, facilitators there might be. And

49

00:17:38.100 --> 00:17:41.690

Karen Gainey: yeah, basically, all of those sort of elements.

50

00:17:41.910 --> 00:17:44.049

Participant 8: Yep. Kind of bring it full circle.

51

00:17:44.592 --> 00:17:45.829

Karen Gainey: So there's probably.

52

00:17:45.830 --> 00:17:46.430

Participant 8: With it.

53

00:17:47.080 --> 00:17:53.340

Karen Gainey: Some questions I'm going to ask. If you're like everybody else that you'll be oh, I'm not sure I don't.

54

00:17:53.340 --> 00:17:56.359

Participant 8: Well, I don't know. I've thought a lot about this space, so.

55

00:17:56.360 --> 00:17:57.289

Karen Gainey: Do you have.

56

00:17:57.500 --> 00:17:58.380

Participant 8: Oh yes!

57

00:17:58.380 --> 00:18:11.062

Karen Gainey: Oh, great! Let's get into it. So just as housekeeping just a reminder. I'm recording the audio for this. Zoom is doing the transcription.

58

00:18:11.660 --> 00:18:34.890

Karen Gainey: I'm not saving anything in the chat, and I'll remove any identifying information in the Transcript, such as your name, where you work the journal information, all of that, and I'll and at the end I'm offering everyone the opportunity to look at the transcript. If there's anything you think you might want to clarify for context or whatever you've got that opportunity. At the end.

59

00:18:34.890 --> 00:18:36.109

Participant 8: Doubt it, but sure.

60

00:18:36.110 --> 00:18:39.629

Karen Gainey: You've got that so, and let me know if you need a break or.

61

00:18:39.630 --> 00:18:39.970

Participant 8: Okay.

62

00:18:39.970 --> 00:18:49.100

Karen Gainey: Need to attend to something at any stage, or if you want to stop and please hit me with.

63

00:18:49.210 --> 00:18:54.570

Karen Gainey: as you probably you know, you've experienced. Negative

64

00:18:54.780 --> 00:18:59.739

Karen Gainey: comments are just as useful as positive ones, so don't hold back, please.

65

00:18:59.930 --> 00:19:14.079

Karen Gainey: Great. So just to kind of give me an understanding, because every journal is a bit different. And every publisher, journal, relationship, and editor, can you give me just an idea of your role? And

66

00:19:14.770 --> 00:19:28.150

Karen Gainey: yeah, where that kind of fits in with the plain language. Summary kind of space, I guess. Actually, before I start, I guess I want to just understand. So I know your journal. Oh, I should, I should say

67

00:19:28.540 --> 00:19:32.540

Karen Gainey: we don't have to limit this to your current journal if you've had

68

00:19:33.370 --> 00:19:37.020

Karen Gainey: editorial roles with other journals.

69

00:19:37.290 --> 00:19:44.260

Karen Gainey: feel free to draw on that as well. But I know medical decision making publish highlights.

70

00:19:45.213 --> 00:19:52.950

Karen Gainey: So I'd like to understand if they're considered a type of plain language, summary or not.

71

00:19:53.721 --> 00:19:56.810

Karen Gainey: So, and those sort of factors, too.

72

00:19:56.810 --> 00:19:57.959

Participant 8: Okay, I got lots.

73

00:19:57.960 --> 00:20:01.319

Karen Gainey: Yep, so hit me. I'll just shut up now.

74

00:20:03.280 --> 00:20:13.300

Participant 8: so little bit of journal context. 1st of all, I'm editor-in-chief of 2 journals, (journal X), and (journal Y). (journal Y) is our open source.

75

00:20:13.810 --> 00:20:23.479

Participant 8: Companion Journal. We move papers from one to the other, as do many journal families. Very frequently most papers get submitted directly to (journal).

76

00:20:23.770 --> 00:20:29.430

Participant 8: And then we sometimes transfer them to (journal Y). How I want to be clear.

77

00:20:29.800 --> 00:20:31.730

Participant 8: that's based on scope.

78

00:20:31.890 --> 00:20:34.570

Karen Gainey: Not quality, so.

79

00:20:34.840 --> 00:20:41.323

Participant 8: (journal Y) is (topic) oriented stuff. (journal X) is more (topic) oriented stuff.

80

00:20:42.790 --> 00:20:46.849

Participant 8: the journals are owned by the (Society).

81

00:20:48.200 --> 00:20:50.920

Participant 8: We have a contract with (Publisher) as the publisher.

82

00:20:51.460 --> 00:20:57.186

Participant 8: I have. My contract is with the Society to act as the editor in chief.

83

00:20:58.320 --> 00:21:07.429

Participant 8: What that means, though, is that I via the Society have had a fairly open

84

00:21:08.294 --> 00:21:22.159

Participant 8: license to shape the Journal's editorial policies as I see fit. And that was true for the editors before me because this is not a publisher owned editor. This is the society owned journal. So

85

00:21:23.200 --> 00:21:30.910

Participant 8: the highlights were something that I put in place when I became editor in chief in January of 2021.

86

00:21:31.420 --> 00:21:33.719

Participant 8: They did not exist for the journal before that.

87

00:21:36.770 --> 00:21:37.970

Participant 8: I

88

00:21:41.500 --> 00:21:46.050

Participant 8: they, I think they serve 2 purposes. They're related, but distinct.

89

00:21:46.420 --> 00:21:47.000

Karen Gainey: Hmm.

90

00:21:47.000 --> 00:21:54.450

Participant 8: One is even for scientists to force message prioritization.

91

00:21:54.590 --> 00:22:03.980

Participant 8: What are the key takeaways from this study? And most authors are frankly, really bad at doing that, even in their own abstracts.

92

00:22:04.200 --> 00:22:05.140

Participant 8: So

93

00:22:05.260 --> 00:22:12.848

Participant 8: I really appreciate the okay, look, get what? What does somebody need to take away from this paper kind of element.

94

00:22:13.450 --> 00:22:21.810

Participant 8: I hope, to the degree possible that they also serve as plain language summaries.

95

00:22:22.130 --> 00:22:28.780

Participant 8: I will acknowledge that, especially for (journal X), which has a more (topic) focus.

96

00:22:29.000 --> 00:22:37.159

Participant 8: There are some topics here that are extremely difficult to put into plain language summaries like you're talking about, you know.

97

00:22:38.250 --> 00:22:42.040

Participant 8: survival curve, extrapolation, mathematics in in

98

00:22:42.320 --> 00:22:47.279

Participant 8: multi micro simulation models. I I'm sorry tech to tech tech.

99

00:22:47.730 --> 00:22:48.170

Karen Gainey: Gotcha.

100

00:22:48.170 --> 00:22:55.260

Participant 8: Plain language. Summary is going to be rather difficult for that. So

101

00:22:56.650 --> 00:23:09.140

Participant 8: what I have, I mean, I will own there was what I had in mind when we 1st put this policy in place. And there's what has actually happened. What I had in mind was to really be trying to enforce.

102

00:23:10.550 --> 00:23:17.720

Participant 8: Having authors go through the process of really clarifying what the takeaways of their papers were, and, if at possible, write them in plain language.

103

00:23:18.850 --> 00:23:25.029

Participant 8: I would say we are inconsistent in how well we enforce that, in part because of some of the back end. And I can get into

104

00:23:25.230 --> 00:23:27.289

Participant 8: how they're created in the back end of that.

105

00:23:27.290 --> 00:23:27.610

Karen Gainey: Yes.

106

00:23:27.610 --> 00:23:30.275

Participant 8: Because that's rarely it is relevant

107

00:23:32.140 --> 00:23:39.750

Participant 8: but also in part because some topics are relatively easy to do this for, and some topics are really hard to do this for.

108

00:23:39.870 --> 00:23:40.395

Participant 8: Yeah.

109

00:23:40.920 --> 00:23:41.590

Karen Gainey: Okay.

110

00:23:42.660 --> 00:23:43.430

Participant 8: The.

111

00:23:44.200 --> 00:23:49.799

Karen Gainey: Sorry is that getting back to that issue of the complexity of the article topic.

112

00:23:50.160 --> 00:23:57.420

Participant 8: Yes, I mean a lot of it's the complexity and not just complexity. It's hard to be plain language when you're talking methods.

113

00:23:58.870 --> 00:24:00.000

Karen Gainey: Right. Yep.

114

00:24:00.300 --> 00:24:01.889

Participant 8: Right. This is not a

115

00:24:02.520 --> 00:24:08.010

Participant 8: clinical trial of a thing. As long as we can describe the thing we can at least describe. We're trialing the thing.

116

00:24:08.010 --> 00:24:08.930

Participant 8: Yes, okay.

117

00:24:10.690 --> 00:24:16.830

Participant 8: Many of the papers we have are deeply methodological, and

118

00:24:17.020 --> 00:24:36.320

Participant 8: some of those message are frankly incomprehensible to me. I have a deputy editor, who is a modeler, and there are papers that are published in our journal which I could not tell you a whole lot about, because I they are. In a space of that I do not really understand. I'm a decision psychologist by training. So

119

00:24:36.450 --> 00:24:41.660

Participant 8: I you know, it's not that I have. Don't appreciate the modeling, but that's not the world I live in.

120

00:24:45.970 --> 00:24:48.550

Participant 8: So the process we currently use

121

00:24:50.420 --> 00:25:01.410

Participant 8: for better and worse. And it's both is that authors are supposed to include bullet point highlights

122

00:25:01.710 --> 00:25:09.260

Participant 8: of their key takeaway messages in the anonymized manuscript

123

00:25:09.800 --> 00:25:15.319

Participant 8: that, then, is not only available to the reviewers and the the associate editor who's handling the paper.

124

00:25:20.850 --> 00:25:24.120

Participant 8: Most people do that because it's in the author instructions.

125

00:25:24.630 --> 00:25:32.050

Participant 8: How much editing that gets is variable. I definitely have

126

00:25:32.370 --> 00:25:43.960

Participant 8: associate editors who are pretty good about going in and saying, Yeah, this this doesn't make any sense. You need to clarify this to authors, and there are others who don't necessarily pay that much attention to it.

127

00:25:48.220 --> 00:25:49.520

Participant 8: I

128

00:25:50.140 --> 00:25:58.560

Participant 8: sometimes do as decisions are going past me, but I will say that I am inconsistent in terms of how detailed I get into that

129

00:26:02.740 --> 00:26:13.010

Participant 8: My desired format would be 2 to 5 bullets

130

00:26:13.140 --> 00:26:20.999

Participant 8: no longer than one sentence in a given bullet, ideally fitting each bullet fitting on one line, but certainly no more than 2.

131

00:26:23.570 --> 00:26:30.790

Participant 8: I would say, we hit that standard about 75 or 80% of the time. But there's definitely 20% or so that get

132

00:26:30.920 --> 00:26:36.480

Participant 8: aren't necessarily that concise and and framed, and too many of them end up being

133

00:26:39.180 --> 00:26:42.459

Participant 8: methodological summaries rather than takeaways.

134

00:26:43.310 --> 00:26:48.319

Participant 8: Yep, we did this type of bullet as opposed to this is what

135

00:26:48.470 --> 00:26:56.850

Participant 8: the key takeaway of the study is. Now. Sometimes the key takeaway of the study is the methodology, and that's fine, but too often it ends up being sort of a mini, abstract

136

00:26:57.100 --> 00:26:59.780

Participant 8: rather than an actual sort of

137

00:27:00.220 --> 00:27:04.430

Participant 8: highlighting of what a reader should take away from it.

138

00:27:05.080 --> 00:27:06.170

Karen Gainey: Understand.

139

00:27:08.720 --> 00:27:16.290

Participant 8: But that's really, I mean, that's the model. I looked into some of the other journal

140

00:27:17.030 --> 00:27:24.867

Participant 8: models, you know, question findings, implications like there's a there's a few of those models that are out there.

141

00:27:25.990 --> 00:27:30.790

Participant 8: Decided that, especially for a methodological journal.

142

00:27:31.490 --> 00:27:34.330

Participant 8: Those were going to be a little bit too constraining.

143

00:27:35.260 --> 00:27:38.068

Participant 8: That's why we left it more open, ended

144

00:27:39.750 --> 00:27:46.692

Participant 8: but that's sort of the history here. And and now I'm gonna sort of bookmark that, and give you one other piece of background which is relevant.

145

00:27:48.310 --> 00:27:58.970

Participant 8: I I mean, I'm a communications. Researcher. Like my scientific field, is risk communication. I teach communications, classes. And

146

00:27:59.860 --> 00:28:05.319

Participant 8: I do lots of workshops on clear science communication. So there are

147

00:28:06.260 --> 00:28:16.650

Participant 8: in many ways. There's what I wish I could implement, but I'm not sure it'd be easy to do. Are you familiar with? I hope the answer to this is, yes, Randy Olson.

148

00:28:17.690 --> 00:28:18.940

Karen Gainey: I'm sorry. No.

149

00:28:18.940 --> 00:28:23.000

Participant 8: Okay, this is actually somebody you ought to know about. Okay.

150

00:28:23.110 --> 00:28:26.889

Participant 8: Randy Olson, OLSE. N.

151

00:28:26.890 --> 00:28:27.540

Karen Gainey: You know.

152

00:28:27.540 --> 00:28:40.760

Participant 8: Is a fascinating story. He was a tenured associate professor of Marine Biology at the University of Maine, in the United States, who at age 39,

153

00:28:40.810 --> 00:28:57.559

Participant 8: voluntarily quit left Academia, went to Los Angeles, went to film school and became a documentary film producer, and he has published at least 4 or 5 books from that background about science communication.

154

00:28:57.760 --> 00:29:01.820

Participant 8: And in particular, he advocates for

155

00:29:02.400 --> 00:29:13.020

Participant 8: teaching a simple structure to help. Scientists use basically the classic 3 act structure to tell science, so he talks about it as, and but and therefore.

156

00:29:13.790 --> 00:29:15.629

Karen Gainey: Yeah, that rings a bell.

157

00:29:15.900 --> 00:29:28.750

Participant 8: Okay. So he really emphasizes the there's your background. And then there's the critical. But what is the question? What is the novelty? etc, and that leading naturally into the therefore implications.

158

00:29:29.910 --> 00:29:31.550

Participant 8: I would love

159

00:29:32.010 --> 00:29:37.921

Participant 8: to really implement that kind of thing in a lot of the plain language highlights.

160

00:29:39.260 --> 00:29:42.639

Participant 8: at the moment. I don't have the bandwidth to do it.

161

00:29:44.450 --> 00:29:55.140

Participant 8: but if you ask me, what I wish was true, that's what I wish was true is that we would write, you know, 3, 4 sentence things that start from the critical background hit. Whatever the

162

00:29:55.650 --> 00:30:02.670

Participant 8: novelty, the research question is what what it is that makes this study a contribution, and then

163

00:30:02.940 --> 00:30:09.150

Participant 8: define that that implications, or that what what the scientific contribution is and.

164

00:30:09.150 --> 00:30:09.660

Karen Gainey: Right.

165

00:30:10.120 --> 00:30:11.490

Participant 8: He's I've been.

166

00:30:11.690 --> 00:30:14.319

Participant 8: I love his stuff. I teach it all the time.

167

00:30:14.470 --> 00:30:22.230

Participant 8: But that's sort of what motivated me. Going down this pathway is going. Okay, how? What can we implement in a in a general.

168

00:30:22.230 --> 00:30:22.920

Karen Gainey: Check it out.

169

00:30:23.230 --> 00:30:41.110

Karen Gainey: Thank you so much. I made some notes. I will check that out because I want actually want to be as a cream, a science communicator, health communicator. So thank you so much. Yeah, yeah, I love that. I love past public speaking. I'm 1 of those strange people.

170

00:30:41.630 --> 00:30:46.510

Participant 8: No, no, I appreciate it. It's been. It's an interesting journey to

171

00:30:50.890 --> 00:30:52.132

Participant 8: I don't want to put this

172

00:30:53.980 --> 00:31:02.120

Participant 8: I think there are a lot of academics who could be good public speakers, but who have had a lot of the the natural impulses trained out of them

173

00:31:02.360 --> 00:31:04.759

Participant 8: in the way in which we train academics.

174

00:31:06.270 --> 00:31:12.030

Participant 8: I. The classic Scientific Conference presentation is

175

00:31:12.950 --> 00:31:19.670

Participant 8: structurally not designed to support that kind of personal growth in terms of public speaking.

176

00:31:20.730 --> 00:31:21.590

Karen Gainey: Yes.

177

00:31:21.810 --> 00:31:49.179

Karen Gainey: I found it. I actually did the 3 min thesis a couple of years ago at my uni, and I thought I'd love it, and I found it so difficult having to memorize a prepared speech. I'm usually, and keeping to a set time. I'm usually so much better when I can just speak from my passion and experience. And that's when I'm at my best. And I did it, and I didn't get anywhere.

178

00:31:49.220 --> 00:31:53.329

Karen Gainey: I did. Well, I think, on the day, but it wasn't enjoyable.

179

00:31:53.640 --> 00:31:54.190

Participant 8: Yeah.

180

00:31:55.950 --> 00:31:57.499

Participant 8: Again. Again, a total aside.

181

00:31:57.810 --> 00:31:58.260

Karen Gainey: Sorry.

182

00:31:58.260 --> 00:32:03.660

Participant 8: My experience. No, no, no, no, my my experience is that I don't like memorization.

183

00:32:04.680 --> 00:32:06.669

Participant 8: but there's a middle ground.

184

00:32:06.810 --> 00:32:07.310

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

185

00:32:07.310 --> 00:32:10.890

Participant 8: That is grounded in improvisation.

186

00:32:11.630 --> 00:32:15.629

Participant 8: So one of the things that I have done is actually take improv comedy classes.

187

00:32:16.120 --> 00:32:16.569

Karen Gainey: I, I.

188

00:32:16.570 --> 00:32:17.040

Participant 8: As.

189

00:32:17.040 --> 00:32:20.370

Karen Gainey: Thought about that? Yeah, as it.

190

00:32:20.885 --> 00:32:21.400

Participant 8: Yes.

191

00:32:21.400 --> 00:32:22.800

Karen Gainey: Paid.

192

00:32:23.380 --> 00:32:32.630

Participant 8: And and it's it's changed the way in which I do. QA. It's changed the way in which I do lots teaching where it's I know

193

00:32:33.330 --> 00:32:38.879

Participant 8: the outline of the script. I know where I'm going to go, but I am not.

194

00:32:40.100 --> 00:32:40.600

Karen Gainey: Rigid.

195

00:32:40.600 --> 00:32:48.169

Participant 8: Summarizing. I'm not structured necessarily in what the next step is, and I find it very much that middle space in which you can. You can

196

00:32:49.720 --> 00:32:56.620

Participant 8: have the organicness of the way you might talk in a 1-on-one conversation, and yet you're still

197

00:32:57.060 --> 00:33:02.729

Participant 8: using your preparation to shape the course of what you're going to say to get to the particular points that you want to make.

198

00:33:02.880 --> 00:33:07.090

Karen Gainey: Yes, rather than purely structural, purely reactionary.

199

00:33:07.090 --> 00:33:07.450

Participant 8: Right.

200

00:33:07.450 --> 00:33:09.860

Karen Gainey: Your structured reactionary.

201

00:33:10.110 --> 00:33:10.780

Participant 8: Right.

202

00:33:10.780 --> 00:33:11.210

Karen Gainey: That bad.

203

00:33:11.210 --> 00:33:19.370

Participant 8: You know in many. The reason why improv does it is because improv is all about. They call it at least the teachers that I've had call it, you know, finding the game of the scene

204

00:33:19.690 --> 00:33:27.490

Participant 8: coming to to find what is the story that needs to be created in the moment, and that

205

00:33:27.930 --> 00:33:38.069

Participant 8: metaphor, I think, captures the idea of you're trying to find a shared moment of understanding

206

00:33:38.280 --> 00:33:41.739

Participant 8: in a science communication process. It's not one directional. It's bidirectional.

207

00:33:42.140 --> 00:33:44.230

Karen Gainey: And that's connecting with your audience.

208

00:33:44.230 --> 00:33:44.950

Participant 8: Correct.

209

00:33:45.270 --> 00:33:52.282

Karen Gainey: Hmm, so anyway, this is all, all by millions of of background in this this space. But I mean.

210

00:33:52.750 --> 00:34:00.890

Participant 8: I think, from my standpoint I conceptually

211

00:34:01.050 --> 00:34:10.639

Participant 8: believe that most scientific journals ought to have something like a highlight or a plain language, summary, etc. I do think that those are.

212

00:34:11.120 --> 00:34:14.180

Participant 8: Again. There are different audiences here. There is

213

00:34:18.969 --> 00:34:22.030

Participant 8: clarifying the takeaways of the paper.

214

00:34:22.940 --> 00:34:39.660

Participant 8: And there is using words and structuring that information in ways to facilitate broader dissemination of that information. Both are relevant. And and I'm not quite sure whether the highlights as different journals implement them, accomplish both of those equally well.

215

00:34:40.330 --> 00:34:40.949

Karen Gainey: Okay.

216

00:34:41.530 --> 00:34:42.210

Participant 8: I think.

217

00:34:42.210 --> 00:34:43.250

Karen Gainey: Yeah. Yes. Sure.

218

00:34:43.880 --> 00:34:45.920

Participant 8: I was just gonna say, though, I think.

219

00:34:45.929 --> 00:34:46.299

Karen Gainey: Make it.

220

00:34:46.300 --> 00:34:47.170

Participant 8: And our discount.

221

00:34:47.320 --> 00:34:52.300

Participant 8: I think the hardest part is just the practical.

222

00:34:52.600 --> 00:34:54.829

Participant 8: How do you do this? If you're not

223

00:34:54.989 --> 00:34:59.970

Participant 8: Jama, and have staff who go off and make these things for the person

224

00:35:00.640 --> 00:35:10.640

Participant 8: actually doing this with any kind of fidelity and and speed is, it's work, and we don't have staff to do that. So the question is, how does it get done?

225

00:35:10.960 --> 00:35:16.289

Karen Gainey: Yeah, yeah, that's a common thing. I've heard. That

226

00:35:17.390 --> 00:35:22.140

Karen Gainey: gap between what you'd really, ideally like to implement. And what's realistic.

227

00:35:22.290 --> 00:35:22.630

Participant 8: Yeah.

228

00:35:23.070 --> 00:35:26.849

Participant 8: And I. By the way, I have the same conversation around graphical abstracts

229

00:35:27.080 --> 00:35:32.810

Participant 8: which we will publish, but we will not create. And so then it becomes.

230

00:35:33.436 --> 00:35:44.320

Participant 8: You know, we'll give you a template. We'll nudge you and I serve as a content filter, so we check them before we'll publish them, and there are certainly some that I reject and say, no, that's not.

231

00:35:44.600 --> 00:35:46.190

Participant 8: That's not okay.

232

00:35:46.760 --> 00:35:50.690

Participant 8: But you know it's not what I would do if I had the resources.

233

00:35:51.130 --> 00:35:54.730

Karen Gainey: Yeah. Do you mean infographics? Or is there some other.

234

00:35:55.140 --> 00:35:55.710

Participant 8: So.

235

00:35:55.710 --> 00:35:56.130

Karen Gainey: I mean.

236

00:35:56.130 --> 00:36:07.100

Participant 8: The what we present present as a template is basically a 3 panel image template.

237

00:36:07.210 --> 00:36:19.169

Participant 8: And the idea is that the panel one would be a bullet point or 2 about what the problem is. Panel 2 would be something about a core finding panel. 3 would be something more in the implication space

238

00:36:20.280 --> 00:36:29.510

Participant 8: words, but minimal words, sometimes with icons, but not what I would call a full blown infographic, and certainly not a

239

00:36:29.870 --> 00:36:31.210

Participant 8: data graphic.

240

00:36:31.790 --> 00:36:32.540

Karen Gainey: Yes.

241

00:36:33.859 --> 00:36:34.580

Participant 8: Yeah.

242

00:36:34.920 --> 00:36:37.490

Karen Gainey: Okay, that makes sense. Do you get many of those.

243

00:36:38.100 --> 00:36:41.749

Participant 8: No, I get a handful, but I won't say we'll get many.

244

00:36:42.110 --> 00:36:42.790

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

245

00:36:43.010 --> 00:36:45.219

Karen Gainey: Do you think? Do you see any commonality

246

00:36:45.350 --> 00:36:50.059

Karen Gainey: between the in terms of the ones you get topic or authors.

247

00:36:50.940 --> 00:36:54.370

Karen Gainey: or anything else, or just not enough to draw.

248

00:36:56.260 --> 00:37:01.019

Participant 8: I think I mean the

249

00:37:01.450 --> 00:37:09.810

Participant 8: there are some authors who are much more oriented towards public dissemination of their work, broader dissemination, who just do all of this stuff more of it.

250

00:37:09.810 --> 00:37:10.150

Participant 8: Right?

251

00:37:10.630 --> 00:37:19.889

Participant 8: I think that's the common element, like the people who have good plain language, you know. Good highlights are also the ones who are more likely to be dropping a graphical, abstract, and.

252

00:37:20.030 --> 00:37:20.560

Karen Gainey: Right.

253

00:37:20.560 --> 00:37:24.930

Participant 8: And being on blue sky talking about it, or like it's all.

254

00:37:24.930 --> 00:37:25.460

Karen Gainey: Yep.

255

00:37:25.930 --> 00:37:26.909

Participant 8: Seated with each other.

256

00:37:27.200 --> 00:37:44.984

Karen Gainey: Yeah, that makes a lot of sense. That was one of the areas I wanted to get into other formats. So that's something people mentioned, because I talked to people with chronic illnesses. They mentioned the use of different formats to provide different options.

257

00:37:45.380 --> 00:37:45.960

Participant 8: Hmm.

258

00:37:45.960 --> 00:37:56.449

Karen Gainey: And so I just want to explore how popular that is, with different journals and plans. Success, any feedback that sort of thing.

259

00:37:58.350 --> 00:38:00.640

Karen Gainey: And if you think it's it's worthwhile doing.

260

00:38:03.440 --> 00:38:09.589

Karen Gainey: I I have mixed feelings about the graphical abstracts we had to negotiate with our publisher to have them be visible.

261

00:38:09.710 --> 00:38:11.420

Participant 8: Outside the Paywall.

262

00:38:11.910 --> 00:38:12.300

Karen Gainey: Okay.

263

00:38:12.300 --> 00:38:17.000

Participant 8: So you can see the graphical abstract when you see the abstract without paying for the article.

264

00:38:21.296 --> 00:38:23.289

Participant 8: It's okay.

265

00:38:24.000 --> 00:38:31.299

Participant 8: But honestly, it's a decent amount of work, and I'm not sure how much it actually facilitates people

266

00:38:32.570 --> 00:38:36.400

Participant 8: learning more about the paper than they would by reading the abstract.

267

00:38:38.660 --> 00:38:42.370

Participant 8: I mean, part of the problem here is, deliver every. So

268

00:38:42.680 --> 00:38:49.429

Participant 8: if whether we're talking about a graphical abstract, whether we're talking about highlights. If it's behind the paywall you're really limiting, who's going to see it?

269

00:38:49.430 --> 00:38:49.940

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

270

00:38:53.100 --> 00:38:54.260

Participant 8: And

271

00:38:58.570 --> 00:39:01.019

Participant 8: I I guess I will put it this way. The

272

00:39:03.280 --> 00:39:12.240

Participant 8: journal model which we do not follow, but which I think I like the best personally is journals that

273

00:39:12.540 --> 00:39:16.870

Participant 8: when they do, their email tables of contents releases.

274

00:39:17.440 --> 00:39:22.250

Participant 8: they don't put the abstracts in there. But they do put the highlights. And so you actually get the

275

00:39:22.430 --> 00:39:29.930

Participant 8: title author list and the highlights in the email as a way of sort of very quickly

276

00:39:30.470 --> 00:39:33.251

Participant 8: giving you a summary of what this paper is.

277

00:39:34.900 --> 00:39:37.160

Participant 8: I've seen a few journals do that.

278

00:39:37.160 --> 00:39:37.590

Karen Gainey: Okay.

279

00:39:38.840 --> 00:39:44.069

Participant 8: obviously, it makes it longer. If you had a really big table of contents it might get burdensome. But

280

00:39:44.350 --> 00:39:52.250

Participant 8: that's the one place where like, okay, this is, this is facilitating a broader audience, being able to understand what this paper is about.

281

00:39:52.520 --> 00:39:57.459

Karen Gainey: Yeah, yeah, okay, I. Yeah. Haven't seen that before.

282

00:39:57.710 --> 00:40:03.760

Karen Gainey: But I'm just saying your point. Yeah, okay, wood. All right.

283

00:40:03.900 --> 00:40:17.690

Karen Gainey: I just want to jump back to a couple of things to understand you mentioned before, about one of the barriers to rolling out what you'd really like to do was bandwidth. Can you tell me what you mean by that.

284

00:40:18.130 --> 00:40:23.300

Participant 8: So I I mean, I receive a

285

00:40:23.570 --> 00:40:29.160

Participant 8: fraction of my university effort covered by the

286

00:40:29.550 --> 00:40:32.455

Participant 8: contract to run the Journal office.

287

00:40:33.640 --> 00:40:40.690

Participant 8: roughly for me that works about about a day a week being covered for journal activities.

288

00:40:40.690 --> 00:40:41.410

Karen Gainey: Okay.

289

00:40:41.410 --> 00:40:46.669

Participant 8: When you look at all the different journal activities that have to get done in a week, all the manuscript

290

00:40:46.890 --> 00:40:57.419

Participant 8: decisions, all the larger conversations, etc. There's just not that much time to dive into particular papers, and to do the level of.

291

00:40:58.060 --> 00:41:06.409

Participant 8: you know, editing and support, and back and forth that I might otherwise want to do. And the same thing is true with my editorial manager in terms of you know.

292

00:41:06.510 --> 00:41:12.240

Participant 8: she needs got 5 papers. They need to go off to production. And there is like, it's just the queue is always

293

00:41:12.600 --> 00:41:20.090

Participant 8: pushing back and in the absence of additional resource.

294

00:41:21.360 --> 00:41:29.410

Participant 8: This tends to get cut. I mean, there's sort of sort of the only way to put it is, you know, that what I would like to do is have somebody who has

295

00:41:29.660 --> 00:41:35.810

Participant 8: was the time and the knowledge to be

296

00:41:36.200 --> 00:41:39.389

Participant 8: reading papers as they're getting accepted, do we?

297

00:41:39.570 --> 00:41:44.630

Participant 8: Even if not necessarily always drafting them fresh? It's just taking what the authors have drafted and.

298

00:41:44.630 --> 00:41:45.099

Karen Gainey: His name.

299

00:41:45.423 --> 00:41:50.310

Participant 8: You know, working with

300

00:41:51.240 --> 00:42:01.819

Participant 8: putting it in particular formats, refining it, etc. I mean, relatively basic science editing skills. But you have to have good science editing skills to pull that off, and you have to have the time to do it.

301

00:42:02.180 --> 00:42:07.430

Karen Gainey: Yep, yeah, no, thank you. That makes sense. That makes sense.

302

00:42:08.920 --> 00:42:11.337

Karen Gainey: So I actually forgot I did.

303

00:42:11.940 --> 00:42:19.289

Karen Gainey: make a note initially. You were involved with both journals, but I forgot to look up the instructions for

304

00:42:19.410 --> 00:42:21.180

Karen Gainey: your second journal.

305

00:42:21.180 --> 00:42:21.820

Participant 8: The same format.

306

00:42:21.820 --> 00:42:24.949

Karen Gainey: Is yes. Same. Author instructions.

307

00:42:24.950 --> 00:42:30.490

Participant 8: Yeah. And in fact, if you look at our journal website, we.

308

00:42:31.580 --> 00:42:45.872

Participant 8: I mean, there's a few very specific things that are different, because one's an open access journal and the other one's not so. Things about creative commons, licensing, etc, apply to one, but not the other. But beyond that manuscript formatting is the same.

309

00:42:46.390 --> 00:42:51.690

Participant 8: All the all the Bacon's constructions are are almost identical. From one journal to the next.

310

00:42:51.690 --> 00:42:57.949

Karen Gainey: Gotcha all right, and are are the highlights outside the pay walls normally or.

311

00:43:00.380 --> 00:43:05.550

Participant 8: I you know what. Let me not guess. This is a

312

00:43:06.780 --> 00:43:09.570

Participant 8: very simple task for me to do while I'm here.

313

00:43:20.500 --> 00:43:22.569

Participant 8: Of course I have to log in to do it.

314

00:43:29.150 --> 00:43:30.550

Karen Gainey: That's all right. I can.

315

00:43:31.200 --> 00:43:40.069

Karen Gainey: I can check alright. While we're doing that I'll just check what we've covered.

316

00:43:40.756 --> 00:43:48.840

Karen Gainey: Cause you've this is great because you've actually covered a lot of what I had written down. Which is why I like to

317

00:43:49.390 --> 00:43:56.650

Karen Gainey: to just find out that general question. At the start.

318

00:43:58.170 --> 00:44:02.619

Participant 8: I'm trying to see what actually shows up outside the Paywall, because I got my browser all set up to

319

00:44:03.040 --> 00:44:04.970

Participant 8: get me past the Paywall, anyway.

320

00:44:05.980 --> 00:44:06.850

Participant 8: Here we go.

321

00:44:07.670 --> 00:44:12.899

Participant 8: Yes, and in fact, I can show you.

322

00:44:21.190 --> 00:44:23.710

Participant 8: So this is an article from

323

00:44:24.020 --> 00:44:27.360

Participant 8: this is our February issue, and you have

324

00:44:27.500 --> 00:44:29.709

Participant 8: the abstract, and then you have the highlights.

325

00:44:31.660 --> 00:44:33.020

Karen Gainey: All right.

326

00:44:34.590 --> 00:44:36.719

Karen Gainey: That's 4 bullet points.

327

00:44:36.970 --> 00:44:39.520

Participant 8: Yep, gotcha, this is a pretty

328

00:44:39.520 --> 00:44:44.000

Participant 8: decent one, from my standpoint. I mean, this is a hard, methodological.

329

00:44:44.000 --> 00:44:44.890

Karen Gainey: Mostly paper.

330

00:44:44.890 --> 00:44:48.369

Karen Gainey: Yeah, I see what you mean. Yeah, okay.

331

00:44:48.986 --> 00:44:57.610

Participant 8: And yet I appreciate the 1st 2 bullets are both defining problems.

332

00:44:59.840 --> 00:45:06.390

Participant 8: 3rd one is sort of basically a finding here. And then the last one's more. An implications bullet.

333

00:45:06.900 --> 00:45:07.690

Karen Gainey: Gotcha.

334

00:45:07.860 --> 00:45:11.860

Participant 8: So I'm I'm quite comfortable with this as a highlight set.

335

00:45:12.360 --> 00:45:13.870

Participant 8: Given this type of paper.

336

00:45:14.540 --> 00:45:17.171

Karen Gainey: See what you mean. Yeah, okay.

337

00:45:19.690 --> 00:45:33.020

Karen Gainey: what did you? What were your thoughts on choosing? Because it sounds like what you've done in setting this up has all been quite deliberate. What were your thoughts on choosing that label highlights

338

00:45:34.500 --> 00:45:35.900

Karen Gainey: for that summary.

339

00:45:39.310 --> 00:45:40.530

Participant 8: Trying to remember

340

00:45:42.150 --> 00:45:43.220

Karen Gainey: It's okay. If you can't.

341

00:45:48.320 --> 00:45:56.491

Participant 8: We talked about some of the other words. I'd seen some highlights is a word that some of the other journals do use for this.

342

00:45:58.360 --> 00:46:00.470

Participant 8: I think for me.

343

00:46:01.910 --> 00:46:07.669

Participant 8: Again it reflected my interest in finding those core takeaway messages.

344

00:46:08.350 --> 00:46:11.390

Participant 8: and really sort of saying, This is this is the

345

00:46:11.510 --> 00:46:14.730

Participant 8: not a summary. This is a the the

346

00:46:14.980 --> 00:46:20.230

Participant 8: things more than anything else you should remember or process from about this paper.

347

00:46:20.847 --> 00:46:25.759

Participant 8: And that was why I wanted. I think the highlights captures that like this is.

348

00:46:25.960 --> 00:46:28.910

Participant 8: if you remember nothing else. Remember this type of stuff.

349

00:46:29.160 --> 00:46:33.829

Karen Gainey: Okay, yeah, i i i understand.

350

00:46:34.370 --> 00:46:35.340

Karen Gainey: Cool

351

00:46:38.290 --> 00:46:45.969

Karen Gainey: So I just want to go back to the a peer review.

352

00:46:48.460 --> 00:46:58.719

Karen Gainey: I forgot to make a note. But I think, from what I could see in the author instructions, the highlights are not mandatory.

353

00:46:59.360 --> 00:47:04.889

Karen Gainey: Is that right? Or there a field that has to be included.

354

00:47:06.740 --> 00:47:12.960

Participant 8: It's not a field in the sense that it's a it's not in the form.

355

00:47:13.130 --> 00:47:13.450

Karen Gainey: Right.

356

00:47:13.450 --> 00:47:19.469

Participant 8: But it is an expected element in the anonymized main document.

357

00:47:19.470 --> 00:47:22.996

Karen Gainey: Sorry right in the main document. Right?

358

00:47:24.460 --> 00:47:35.349

Karen Gainey: so is it expected? Or so, if someone didn't include them, would it be sent back before going to peer review? Or do you know how.

359

00:47:35.750 --> 00:47:42.490

Participant 8: That is an excellent question. In theory.

360

00:47:42.730 --> 00:47:43.444

Karen Gainey: Okay.

361

00:47:45.740 --> 00:47:54.269

Participant 8: We are supposed to be catching, that I would say that sometimes we

362

00:47:55.200 --> 00:48:02.000

Participant 8: flag it, and certainly, if we're sending it back for anything else, and we notice that the highlights aren't there. We will

363

00:48:02.190 --> 00:48:03.730

Participant 8: get them to do that, too.

364

00:48:05.370 --> 00:48:06.360

Participant 8: I.

365

00:48:06.690 --> 00:48:08.690

Participant 8: I cannot say that we are

366

00:48:09.470 --> 00:48:14.829

Participant 8: 100% consistent in terms of saying, we won't send something out for peer review until we get the highlights.

367

00:48:15.413 --> 00:48:18.950

Participant 8: I will say that there are certainly times when

368

00:48:26.300 --> 00:48:40.619

Participant 8: One of the things that we put in a initial decision letter is to flag that the highlights are either not there or were not done appropriately, and to then ask the people to make changes in revised manuscripts.

369

00:48:41.650 --> 00:48:50.450

Karen Gainey: Okay, that that's yeah. Please understand, I'm not judging.

370

00:48:50.450 --> 00:48:50.989

Participant 8: No, no, no.

371

00:48:51.745 --> 00:48:52.500

Karen Gainey: And.

372

00:48:52.500 --> 00:49:00.540

Participant 8: I am quite open in in acknowledging that there is what I wish the journal would do, and there's what we actually managed to pull off, and it.

373

00:49:00.540 --> 00:49:02.650

Karen Gainey: Oh, I und I understand.

374

00:49:02.830 --> 00:49:10.423

Karen Gainey: I mean, I think, what journal editors achieve in the time you've got is amazing.

375

00:49:10.930 --> 00:49:11.790

Participant 8: It's it's.

376

00:49:11.790 --> 00:49:13.280

Karen Gainey: My hat off to you. Really.

377

00:49:13.280 --> 00:49:20.600

Participant 8: Well, let's put it this way. I have gotten really fast at processing abstracts.

378

00:49:20.600 --> 00:49:21.380

Karen Gainey: Right.

379

00:49:24.650 --> 00:49:32.769

Participant 8: And just as a total aside, the the thing that's driving me nuts right now is the volume of

380

00:49:33.980 --> 00:49:38.909

Participant 8: likely AI generated likely fraudulent manuscripts that we are seeing.

381

00:49:38.910 --> 00:49:39.840

Karen Gainey: Really.

382

00:49:41.260 --> 00:49:43.118

Participant 8: Let's put it this way.

383

00:49:43.730 --> 00:49:52.000

Participant 8: our year over year. Manuscript submission numbers in 2024 versus 2023 were up by about

384

00:49:56.600 --> 00:49:58.100

Participant 8: 40%.

385

00:49:58.360 --> 00:50:03.489

Karen Gainey: Almost entirely attributable to artists, to manuscripts that were instantly rejected.

386

00:50:08.610 --> 00:50:09.590

Karen Gainey: Wow!

387

00:50:10.750 --> 00:50:11.500

Participant 8: Oops!

388

00:50:11.660 --> 00:50:16.450

Karen Gainey: I thought you were going to say something like 23%. And I was still going to say, Wow!

389

00:50:17.610 --> 00:50:19.660

Karen Gainey: Oh, my goodness!

390

00:50:19.660 --> 00:50:24.629

Participant 8: I think we went from 4 50 to 7, 20 in one year.

391

00:50:27.000 --> 00:50:33.789

Karen Gainey: How do you tell? I've had someone else say this, and I asked them the same question, how do you tell.

392

00:50:36.040 --> 00:50:39.940

Participant 8: In our case, and I'm sure this is not true for other journals.

393

00:50:41.070 --> 00:50:47.970

Participant 8: The vast vast majority of them come from one or 2 countries. The

394

00:50:49.020 --> 00:50:56.850

Participant 8: topics are radically out of scope for our journal, and very obviously so and

395

00:50:57.210 --> 00:51:04.229

Participant 8: at least half to 2 thirds look like they're all coming out of the same template. The cover letters are the same.

396

00:51:04.550 --> 00:51:04.940

Karen Gainey: Okay.

397

00:51:04.940 --> 00:51:11.059

Participant 8: The structures are the same, the abstracts are the same. I mean, it literally looks like somebody stamping stuff out of a template.

398

00:51:11.940 --> 00:51:12.750

Karen Gainey: Right.

399

00:51:13.320 --> 00:51:18.570

Karen Gainey: So it's gone beyond just chat. Gpt to just a of.

400

00:51:19.310 --> 00:51:20.740

Participant 8: Yeah, I don't. I don't get the model.

401

00:51:20.740 --> 00:51:21.270

Karen Gainey: Great.

402

00:51:21.280 --> 00:51:27.096

Participant 8: I I don't quite know why they're doing it, because they're not succeeding at it.
But

403

00:51:27.820 --> 00:51:35.989

Participant 8: yeah, it's just like there's some borderline ones that are more tricky. But after

404

00:51:36.750 --> 00:51:41.840

Participant 8: after 25, or 30 of these it got to be a joke. It's like, Oh, here's another one.

405

00:51:42.410 --> 00:51:43.230

Karen Gainey: Well.

406

00:51:43.531 --> 00:51:47.449

Participant 8: The for us the weird ones are the ones that are have these

407

00:51:51.820 --> 00:51:55.520

Participant 8: almost nonsensical titles.

408

00:51:57.180 --> 00:52:02.480

Participant 8: That usually refer to some animal name. In describing an algorithm.

409

00:52:05.940 --> 00:52:06.770

Karen Gainey: Okay.

410

00:52:07.520 --> 00:52:15.330

Participant 8: So literally, we'll see things like, you know, pooping crane algorithm.

411

00:52:16.520 --> 00:52:19.740

Karen Gainey: Oh, hey?

412

00:52:20.010 --> 00:52:29.660

Karen Gainey: Sure, does he tiger optimization algorithms like no old fussy crane optimization. Algorithm. Yeah, yeah.

413

00:52:29.660 --> 00:52:30.200

Participant 8: What?

414

00:52:30.200 --> 00:52:34.280

Karen Gainey: Yup, yup highly cited. Yep, good.

415

00:52:34.860 --> 00:52:35.440

Participant 8: Okay.

416

00:52:35.660 --> 00:52:47.299

Karen Gainey: All right. Well, on the, on the topic of AI. Do you guys have a policy or or or anything around that for

417

00:52:47.430 --> 00:52:50.820

Karen Gainey: the use in pls or perfect, come up.

418

00:52:51.880 --> 00:52:59.040

Participant 8: We I, this is on my, I really want to do this more than we have list.

419

00:53:00.300 --> 00:53:02.930

Participant 8: now, I'm trying to find where the heck. I put this

420

00:53:05.020 --> 00:53:12.690

Karen Gainey: So I know it's a hot bed topic at the moment, with generative AI and evidence synthesis.

421

00:53:13.510 --> 00:53:14.660

Participant 8: Yeah.

422

00:53:16.990 --> 00:53:21.269

Participant 8: here's what I think is true. And now I got to see where the freak I've put it into our

423

00:53:21.420 --> 00:53:21.965

Participant 8: our

424

00:53:24.820 --> 00:53:26.410

Participant 8: I think it's in the in our

425

00:53:26.590 --> 00:53:30.808

Participant 8: see? Now you're making me go like, is this actually in there? I don't know if it's in there.

426

00:53:32.870 --> 00:53:42.253

Participant 8: What I think we have am not immediately finding is a policy that says

427

00:53:43.550 --> 00:53:44.540

Participant 8: But one

428

00:53:45.690 --> 00:53:56.609

Participant 8: reviewers can't use AI because they should not be uploading the manuscripts into AI, right. These are confidential manuscripts that should not, that should not be happening.

429

00:53:58.650 --> 00:53:59.630

Participant 8: From.

430

00:54:01.110 --> 00:54:04.909

Participant 8: Certainly I'm in agreement with the idea that AI is not an author.

431

00:54:05.891 --> 00:54:13.298

Participant 8: What I think we have, although again, I'm like, there is. That policy is a policy that says,

432

00:54:14.430 --> 00:54:19.120

Participant 8: Any use of AI should be disclosed.

433

00:54:22.810 --> 00:54:28.289

Participant 8: I'm now pausing because I'm not a hundred percent certain. I know where that policy is, and I should know that

434

00:54:29.030 --> 00:54:33.583

Participant 8: But I mean.

435

00:54:38.590 --> 00:54:43.880

Participant 8: I don't have a clean answer for this right now. The

436

00:54:49.910 --> 00:54:57.180

Participant 8: especially for the modeling side. You can get AI to write code for you.

437

00:54:58.220 --> 00:54:59.080

Participant 8: And

438

00:55:00.970 --> 00:55:09.170

Participant 8: if somebody dives into that code they can usually tell, because there's certain structures that the AI is using to generate, etc.

439

00:55:10.570 --> 00:55:16.631

Participant 8: but I don't know how often our reviewers are actually diving that deep into the materials.

440

00:55:20.750 --> 00:55:28.749

Participant 8: similarly, as you mentioned, reviews are are certainly one space in which there's a plausible scenario in which AI is generating

441

00:55:29.110 --> 00:55:31.020

Participant 8: text, etc.

442

00:55:32.870 --> 00:55:36.970

Participant 8: So I mean, my short answer is, Yeah, I'm worried about it.

443

00:55:37.160 --> 00:55:39.714

Participant 8: No, I don't have clean answers.

444

00:55:41.500 --> 00:55:44.210

Participant 8: I tend to think that we get

445

00:55:48.210 --> 00:55:52.320

Participant 8: we have history of relatively.

446

00:55:54.700 --> 00:55:57.322

Participant 8: That's the right word. I'm looking for here.

447

00:56:00.400 --> 00:56:02.810

Participant 8: Careful and thorough reviewers.

448

00:56:03.490 --> 00:56:07.200

Participant 8: This society is very like we'd get

449

00:56:07.460 --> 00:56:14.050

Participant 8: a lot of good reviews and so I hope

450

00:56:14.580 --> 00:56:24.339

Participant 8: that if there's tortured language, if there's other kinds of things that would be markers of AI in the paper, that those might well get caught by the reviewers.

451

00:56:24.770 --> 00:56:25.470

Karen Gainey: Right.

452

00:56:26.440 --> 00:56:28.780

Karen Gainey: But I'm not a hundred percent certain delicious.

453

00:56:28.950 --> 00:56:32.560

Participant 8: Right? Certainly, because this is, you know it.

454

00:56:33.360 --> 00:56:51.780

Participant 8: We just don't get many. I mean, I get them as an author sometimes, but like I've seen reviews that are like 2 small paragraphs of minor points, and whatever like. I don't see those in this journal like I get pages upon pages, upon pages of comments from people. Because that's the culture within this

455

00:56:51.930 --> 00:56:59.130

Participant 8: this field, and I hope that that, then, is a defense against

456

00:56:59.300 --> 00:57:03.229

Participant 8: AI generated papers. But it's not a certain thing.

457

00:57:03.610 --> 00:57:05.119

Karen Gainey: Of course. Yeah.

458

00:57:05.966 --> 00:57:19.090

Karen Gainey: What do you think about using authors using or a journal using AI as a tool to produce highlights.

459

00:57:19.460 --> 00:57:21.869

Participant 8: Yeah, I thought you were. Gonna ask me about that.

460

00:57:25.290 --> 00:57:28.332

Karen Gainey: I have really mixed feelings honestly.

461

00:57:33.120 --> 00:57:40.129

Participant 8: I mean, obviously, there's the question. If you have to have a human in the loop to check that there's too much of a possibility that

462

00:57:42.460 --> 00:57:48.300

Participant 8: something goes wrong, and you flip a negation or something like there's there's too many ways in which that could get

463

00:57:50.780 --> 00:57:55.140

Participant 8: distorting what the actual message of the paper is, I mean, honestly, we see this in

464

00:57:55.610 --> 00:58:00.219

Participant 8: journal, you know, in press releases from academic institutions about the

465

00:58:00.330 --> 00:58:07.529

Participant 8: papers generated by their researchers too often, anyway, where it's literally a human misreads the paper or doesn't actually

466

00:58:07.710 --> 00:58:14.040

Participant 8: summarize it accurately. And then the misinformation spreads from that point forward.

467

00:58:14.040 --> 00:58:14.400

Karen Gainey: Oh, yeah.

468

00:58:15.902 --> 00:58:19.560

Participant 8: I would say again.

469

00:58:21.110 --> 00:58:23.959

Participant 8: if we had resources. If we had volume.

470

00:58:25.480 --> 00:58:39.629

Participant 8: Would that be a reasonable strategy? It might be, I mean, honestly, if I were. I'll pick on (journal V), which has, I don't know how many papers they publish every month. A year ago I was in a meeting with

471

00:58:39.800 --> 00:58:42.730

Participant 8: at the Council of Science editors, and one of the

472

00:58:43.520 --> 00:58:51.960

Participant 8: deputy editors for (journal V) was there, and he said at the time, and it may be more now. At the time they were getting 1,200 papers a month.

473

00:58:52.480 --> 00:58:53.170

Karen Gainey: Wow!

474

00:58:54.530 --> 00:58:58.209

Participant 8: Like, okay, if you're working at that scale.

475

00:58:59.320 --> 00:59:06.219

Participant 8: and you want to do anything in the way of, you know plain language summaries fine like, I could totally imagine implementing an AI based

476

00:59:06.720 --> 00:59:08.140

Participant 8: gotta be obviously

477

00:59:08.410 --> 00:59:22.650

Participant 8: proprietary for the confidentiality reasons. But they wanna implement that as a drafting mechanism where there's gonna be a human coming along and reading the paper and saying, Is this a good summary of this? And tweaking it.

478

00:59:22.970 --> 00:59:25.279

Participant 8: Yeah, I could be. I could see that. But.

479

00:59:25.280 --> 00:59:25.610

Karen Gainey: Oh!

480

00:59:25.610 --> 00:59:30.140

Participant 8: I think that the slippery slope here is. It's all too easy to get. Trust the AI too much.

481

00:59:30.560 --> 00:59:31.320

Karen Gainey: Right.

482

00:59:33.310 --> 00:59:36.770

Participant 8: And so

483

00:59:37.940 --> 00:59:45.780

Participant 8: I mean, we're not going to do it because we don't have the resources to do it. And I'm certainly not going to be uploading these confidential papers into a generic AI product out there.

484

00:59:48.510 --> 00:59:57.160

Participant 8: so that's where I am is that I don't see it changing our processes anytime soon. But I understand, certainly, for journals that may have the larger resources and

485

00:59:58.250 --> 01:00:01.250

Participant 8: volume issues that that might turn out to be a useful thing.

486

01:00:01.900 --> 01:00:03.659

Karen Gainey: Either way. It's a big undertaking.

487

01:00:03.660 --> 01:00:08.190

Participant 8: It's a big undertaking and and a I mean.

488

01:00:08.540 --> 01:00:12.499

Participant 8: it's all about the quality control. And I mean, I'm having the same conversation. So I don't.

489

01:00:12.720 --> 01:00:17.889

Participant 8: I haven't researched this in the scientific communication space, but I have a postdoc who's researching this in the

490

01:00:18.160 --> 01:00:20.420

Participant 8: medical communication space like, how do you.

491

01:00:20.420 --> 01:00:20.880

Karen Gainey: Okay.

492

01:00:20.880 --> 01:00:27.530

Participant 8: What happens when you have an AI generating a report for your your mammogram.

493

01:00:28.610 --> 01:00:32.149

Participant 8: and it's reading the images. And it's telling you what the

494

01:00:32.970 --> 01:00:36.540

Participant 8: what the results are. And you know it's we have the same problems like.

495

01:00:36.650 --> 01:00:42.460

Participant 8: it may be good. It might see things that wouldn't get otherwise seen. It may be more precise, but

496

01:00:43.350 --> 01:00:44.210

Participant 8: but.

497

01:00:44.640 --> 01:00:45.849

Karen Gainey: Yeah, it's not.

498

01:00:45.960 --> 01:00:52.789

Participant 8: At least at this stage, at the level which I'm comfortable, saying, I will trust it to be consistent

499

01:00:53.180 --> 01:00:55.959

Participant 8: in a way that doesn't need a human in the loop checking it.

500

01:00:56.540 --> 01:00:59.910

Karen Gainey: Right? So it sounds like you're thinking about the implications.

501

01:00:59.910 --> 01:01:00.550

Participant 8: Yeah.

502

01:01:00.550 --> 01:01:05.099

Karen Gainey: Of its use. Yeah, yeah. And erring on the side of caution

503

01:01:05.350 --> 01:01:08.650

Karen Gainey: at the moment. And it's also resource, driven too.

504

01:01:08.650 --> 01:01:12.410

Participant 8: It's resource driven, and it's caution driven.

505

01:01:12.750 --> 01:01:21.899

Participant 8: You know, we have all the checks in this process, because there's too much of an opportunity for

506

01:01:22.310 --> 01:01:30.449

Participant 8: even unintentional, let alone malicious distortions to then propagate in the scientific record and cause major problems. Yeah.

507

01:01:31.390 --> 01:01:39.789

Participant 8: you know, until we get to the stage in which I think that's being done so reliably that we can start to trust it. I don't. I don't feel comfortable going there.

508

01:01:40.260 --> 01:01:44.330

Karen Gainey: Yep, yep, that that that's that's

509

01:01:45.606 --> 01:01:50.540

Karen Gainey: I understand your position, I think. Quite.

510

01:01:50.770 --> 01:01:59.231

Karen Gainey: quite well. Do you think you've had any authors. Sorry, I'm just getting a migraine.

511

01:01:59.760 --> 01:02:00.250

Participant 8: I'm so sorry.

512

01:02:00.250 --> 01:02:06.930

Karen Gainey: Close. The no, no, the sun's just starting to shine in my eyes. I'm just going to quickly shut the blinds.

513

01:02:06.930 --> 01:02:07.470

Participant 8: Okay.

514

01:02:08.710 --> 01:02:10.480

Karen Gainey: It's just midday here.

515

01:02:16.870 --> 01:02:22.839

Karen Gainey: That should be better, all right. Sorry. It's just a bit darker, but

516

01:02:23.290 --> 01:02:28.626

Karen Gainey: a lot easier. Do you think you've had authors.

517

01:02:29.380 --> 01:02:34.030

Karen Gainey: use AI with their highlights, or hard to tell.

518

01:02:41.200 --> 01:02:42.420

Participant 8: I would say it's hard to tell.

519

01:02:42.530 --> 01:02:46.549

Participant 8: I could I imagine it? Yeah.

520

01:02:46.810 --> 01:02:51.470

Participant 8: no, I have not seen any that I think were obviously AI generated.

521

01:02:52.540 --> 01:02:57.999

Participant 8: I don't think we've. I also don't think I've been looking closely enough to really ask that question.

522

01:02:58.410 --> 01:02:59.070

Karen Gainey: Okay?

523

01:03:00.000 --> 01:03:05.349

Karen Gainey: If they had, would they? Would that constitute needing to disclose.

524

01:03:06.636 --> 01:03:10.220

Participant 8: From my standpoint. Yes, in the sense that

525

01:03:10.640 --> 01:03:18.919

Participant 8: you're using a resource that is shaping the message that you are creating. Now you take responsibility for that.

526

01:03:19.190 --> 01:03:19.550

Karen Gainey: Hmm.

527

01:03:22.600 --> 01:03:28.720

Participant 8: And again, if they use it, that's on them, like if they upload their stuff, and maybe they've won a proprietary

528

01:03:29.030 --> 01:03:34.859

Participant 8: one within their institution, or something like that, like fine. I mean, we use all kinds of things to shape our

529

01:03:36.856 --> 01:03:40.779

Participant 8: co-author shaped our reviews. We give it to our friends. They like.

530

01:03:40.780 --> 01:03:41.120

Karen Gainey: Hmm.

531

01:03:41.120 --> 01:03:42.340

Participant 8: I don't see it

532

01:03:42.690 --> 01:03:48.779

Participant 8: radically different from an author standpoint. If you want to use that to improve your writing, you know.

533

01:03:49.170 --> 01:03:58.390

Participant 8: use grammarly to fix your grammar. You can use it like like, I don't have a problem with that as long as we're sort of clear about you. You know, you're still responsible for the accuracy of this.

534

01:03:58.390 --> 01:04:02.870

Karen Gainey: Yes, understood. Okay, cool. Thank you.

535

01:04:03.810 --> 01:04:05.270

Karen Gainey: All right.

536

01:04:06.160 --> 01:04:11.563

Karen Gainey: I covered heaps.

537

01:04:13.620 --> 01:04:23.639

Karen Gainey: just thinking about what really strikes me is how much thought you've put into this area. And

538

01:04:23.920 --> 01:04:46.529

Karen Gainey: when you're talking about, when you took over the editorial role in 2021 and you set up the highlights were. Did you do that just yourself, or was it in conjunction with I mean, how much of that was? You, and how much of it was with (Publisher)?

539

01:04:48.330 --> 01:04:48.979

Participant 8: And so.

540

01:04:48.980 --> 01:04:50.050

Karen Gainey: Relationship.

541

01:04:51.110 --> 01:05:01.390

Participant 8: I was changing multiple things at once when I came on. So at the same time as we're implementing the highlights, we were switching from single anonymized to double anonymized review.

542

01:05:02.120 --> 01:05:07.810

Participant 8: That obviously did require a (Publisher) to be involved in thinking about the mechanics of that

543

01:05:08.980 --> 01:05:18.250

Participant 8: So we just sort of implemented a 1 time. Look, we're gonna do. We're gonna make changes. We're gonna do this. We're gonna do this. We're gonna do this etc.

544

01:05:18.580 --> 01:05:26.469

Participant 8: And so certainly (Publisher) was part of it. I don't remember if they

545

01:05:27.950 --> 01:05:39.669

Participant 8: provided any specific guidance or not, in part because I had done my own research, and looking at what other journals were doing anyway. So I don't remember what I remembered from (Publisher) versus what I saw when I did. My own looking.

546

01:05:39.880 --> 01:05:48.760

Karen Gainey: Cool. Okay, cool. So we those guidelines. Was that all you and your research? Or was that anyone.

547

01:05:48.760 --> 01:05:53.840

Participant 8: In terms of the the wording of the what we put as our instructions for the highlights. That's me.

548

01:05:54.030 --> 01:06:00.419

Karen Gainey: That's you. Okay, have you? Reviewed them since then, or is that pretty much?

549

01:06:01.108 --> 01:06:03.340

Karen Gainey: What you'd 1st established.

550

01:06:03.860 --> 01:06:08.780

Participant 8: I don't think we've done a detailed review since then. I'm just looking at what we've got right now.

551

01:06:12.000 --> 01:06:15.070

Participant 8: I may have edited at 1 point in time.

552

01:06:28.600 --> 01:06:31.759

Participant 8: I think, I added the point. I'm just looking at it now.

553

01:06:32.780 --> 01:06:33.980

Participant 8: Here I can share.

554

01:06:43.540 --> 01:06:47.850

Participant 8: I think I added, the point about not

555

01:06:49.760 --> 01:06:57.260

Participant 8: presenting background information and referencing methods only when the methods are key takeaway. Because I started getting too many

556

01:06:58.020 --> 01:07:02.770

Participant 8: people basically putting bullet points for their methods and bullet points for.

557

01:07:02.770 --> 01:07:03.230

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

558

01:07:03.230 --> 01:07:06.980

Participant 8: Background information which is not really what I was wanting, aiming for.

559

01:07:06.980 --> 01:07:12.969

Karen Gainey: Gotcha. Yeah, you mentioned that. So sounds like that was a big issue.

560

01:07:13.430 --> 01:07:19.249

Participant 8: I would say big. There were a few obvious cases I looked at like this. You just took your abstract and like

561

01:07:20.360 --> 01:07:23.549

Participant 8: condensed it more like. No, this is not the point.

562

01:07:23.890 --> 01:07:29.560

Karen Gainey: Okay, gotcha so one of the things

563

01:07:29.680 --> 01:07:34.159

Karen Gainey: I noticed. I don't know if it was there.

564

01:07:38.940 --> 01:07:52.619

Karen Gainey: yes, the final sentence. When appropriate, we encourage key points that refer specifically to the audience audiences who will benefit

565

01:07:52.740 --> 01:08:04.760

Karen Gainey: from understanding the article's findings, etc. So that suggests that there's multiple audiences for these highlights.

566

01:08:04.880 --> 01:08:13.479

Karen Gainey: so can you help me understand what you see as the the audiences who who.

567

01:08:13.480 --> 01:08:18.929

Participant 8: So it'll depend upon the paper. So for these methodological papers.

568

01:08:19.290 --> 01:08:30.670

Participant 8: sometimes the audiences are other modelers or other decision aid developers like other scientists who now need to implement these techniques in their research work.

569

01:08:32.470 --> 01:08:37.749

Participant 8: Sometimes, certainly, for Md. And policy and practice. We have policymaker audiences, you know.

570

01:08:38.520 --> 01:08:44.749

Participant 8: you know, where they're not gonna do it. But they need to understand something from the paper about

571

01:08:45.720 --> 01:08:48.839

Participant 8: what good quality research needs to be. You know.

572

01:08:49.029 --> 01:08:52.929

Participant 8: caveats of existing work, whatever

573

01:08:54.760 --> 01:08:57.609

Karen Gainey: Oh, sorry, no, I meant who would read the highlights.

574

01:08:58.279 --> 01:08:59.829

Participant 8: Well, I think that's the question. Like.

575

01:08:59.830 --> 01:09:00.410

Karen Gainey: Oh, okay.

576

01:09:00.410 --> 01:09:16.479

Participant 8: Our our policy makers, or, let's say, staff of policymakers reading this as a way of understanding the models that they're getting from a scientist, or maybe being given something to sort of guide them. There are.

577

01:09:17.279 --> 01:09:22.170

Participant 8: again, lots of the scientific record isn't necessarily written for that type of audience, but

578

01:09:22.569 --> 01:09:27.120

Participant 8: some papers are, and I can certainly imagine some papers that are really

579

01:09:27.810 --> 01:09:36.180

Participant 8: practical guidance that has broader potential implications. I was not

580

01:09:39.740 --> 01:09:42.429

Participant 8: specifically thinking about

581

01:09:43.200 --> 01:09:57.682

Participant 8: patient or non-scientist audiences as a key audience for most papers, although there certainly are some papers I can imagine where that might be the case.

582

01:10:00.620 --> 01:10:10.030

Participant 8: I'm thinking off the top of my head about papers that say, that are highlighting

583

01:10:13.530 --> 01:10:21.469

Participant 8: challenges in shared decision making where I could imagine a highlight basically saying something like, you know, both

584

01:10:21.600 --> 01:10:29.610

Participant 8: clinicians and patients should take care to look at blah blah. So to improve the decision making process, or something like that.

585

01:10:29.610 --> 01:10:31.370

Karen Gainey: Yes, gotcha.

586

01:10:32.320 --> 01:10:50.970

Karen Gainey: Yeah, that's that's why I was so fascinated by your journals because it's not just about diseases or a specific cohort of patients, if you like. It was quite unique. So

587

01:10:51.100 --> 01:10:58.780

Karen Gainey: understanding the audience that these highlights are aimed at, or the scope

588

01:11:01.530 --> 01:11:11.530

Karen Gainey: seems to be from my perspective, really important in understanding how that might be linked to other decisions. You've made. Yeah.

589

01:11:11.530 --> 01:11:18.280

Participant 8: I mean, I will say my 1st motivation is

590

01:11:19.250 --> 01:11:24.559

Participant 8: improving the clarity of science communication from scientist to scientist.

591

01:11:25.200 --> 01:11:29.990

Participant 8: From scientist to practitioner. Actually, that's probably the bigger one.

592

01:11:29.990 --> 01:11:30.379

Karen Gainey: Oh no!

593

01:11:30.380 --> 01:11:33.200

Participant 8: Sense that when we're publishing methodological papers.

594

01:11:34.470 --> 01:11:53.150

Participant 8: I want the health educator in the hospital who pulls up the paper about how to do good decision aids to implement this in the work that they're making. I want this in, you know, for the modeler, the health economist in the Government, who has to make a cost effectiveness model. To do

595

01:11:53.370 --> 01:11:59.699

Participant 8: would work by taking this paper and then applying its knowledge in the model that they then have to build

596

01:11:59.930 --> 01:12:05.730

Participant 8: so really, clearly getting across.

597

01:12:06.350 --> 01:12:19.519

Participant 8: What should change in practice? What should be what are the takeaways of this type of methodological work seems very critical to its larger impact. And that's in many ways. My 1st

598

01:12:19.680 --> 01:12:22.670

Participant 8: goal in these take in these highlights is to

599

01:12:23.650 --> 01:12:28.004

Participant 8: clarify what those takeaways should be as best as possible.

600

01:12:28.440 --> 01:12:29.070

Karen Gainey: Yes.

601

01:12:29.070 --> 01:12:30.150

Participant 8: Wind.

602

01:12:31.430 --> 01:12:36.429

Participant 8: The work has direct relevance to patients to

603

01:12:36.910 --> 01:12:45.202

Participant 8: policymakers, etc. I also want these to be me able to to communicate to them. Hey, this is what you need to take away from this.

604

01:12:48.360 --> 01:12:53.889

Participant 8: I will, say I. And again, this is just more sort of my personal background. I

605

01:12:55.220 --> 01:13:05.239

Participant 8: I think the bigger problem is a lack of clarity about the takeaway even more than the literacy level. And the plain language issues

606

01:13:05.400 --> 01:13:06.439

Participant 8: that people can.

607

01:13:06.440 --> 01:13:07.349

Karen Gainey: More about that.

608

01:13:08.010 --> 01:13:14.669

Participant 8: I don't think most scientists actually do a good job of thinking about what is the takeaway?

609

01:13:15.010 --> 01:13:21.600

Participant 8: What is the most important thing that we have learned from this paper. So I'm gonna stitch together a few different things here.

610

01:13:21.840 --> 01:13:27.630

Participant 8: One of the more interesting papers in my academic record is a paper

611

01:13:28.260 --> 01:13:30.579

Participant 8: published in the Journal science Communication

612

01:13:30.690 --> 01:13:36.810

Participant 8: on an adaptation of an improv theater exercise for message prioritization.

613

01:13:38.260 --> 01:13:41.339

Participant 8: Basically, it's called half-life. Your message.

614

01:13:41.450 --> 01:13:45.029

Participant 8: The idea is this, you get somebody to

615

01:13:45.710 --> 01:13:51.189

Participant 8: talk, have a have an idea that they want to communicate. You set a timer for 60 seconds.

616

01:13:51.740 --> 01:13:54.230

Participant 8: and you talk out loud about that

617

01:13:55.830 --> 01:13:57.930

Participant 8: when the 6 timer goes off

618

01:13:58.700 --> 01:14:05.730

Participant 8: you don't analyze it. You immediately reset the timer to 30 seconds, and you do it again.

619

01:14:06.110 --> 01:14:15.070

Participant 8: and then, when that's done. You reset the timer to 15 seconds, and you do it again. If you really want to push it, you set the timer to 8 seconds, and you do it again.

620

01:14:15.250 --> 01:14:18.799

Participant 8: and then, when you're done, you reflect upon what you learned

621

01:14:19.239 --> 01:14:32.730

Participant 8: pretty consistently. What I find is that when they do the 60 second version. People don't actually say what they want to say. They spend too much time in the background. They don't actually get to the point. They start in the wrong place whatever.

622

01:14:32.900 --> 01:14:40.410

Participant 8: and that they figure that out when they're forced to condense more and more and more right, and

623

01:14:41.180 --> 01:14:43.309

Participant 8: that to me is the skill that

624

01:14:43.490 --> 01:14:46.229

Participant 8: really is at the heart of effective science communication.

625

01:14:46.400 --> 01:14:50.520

Participant 8: Truly knowing what the core nugget, the most important thing

626

01:14:50.910 --> 01:14:58.559

Participant 8: that needs to be communicated is so part of my goal with the highlights is basically to force that process on authors.

627

01:15:00.300 --> 01:15:06.899

Participant 8: Strip it down even. No, you don't even get 375 words you get, maybe a hundred.

628

01:15:07.410 --> 01:15:13.689

Participant 8: maybe 51 sentence at a time. What's the takeaway?

629

01:15:14.110 --> 01:15:19.299

Participant 8: And like really push them to strip it down to that level.

630

01:15:19.740 --> 01:15:24.549

Karen Gainey: I understand. Do you think that gets through to authors.

631

01:15:24.990 --> 01:15:26.469

Participant 8: Some yes, some don't.

632

01:15:26.750 --> 01:15:27.160

Karen Gainey: Okay.

633

01:15:27.160 --> 01:15:35.880

Participant 8: I do think some authors, the ones who do it well, really actually pause and say.

634

01:15:36.000 --> 01:15:38.239

Participant 8: because it's different than what is the result.

635

01:15:38.800 --> 01:15:39.840

Karen Gainey: Exactly.

636

01:15:40.870 --> 01:15:45.679

Participant 8: And they they make that leap and they go. Okay. So there's the result. And then there's the lesson.

637

01:15:46.040 --> 01:15:51.849

Participant 8: and they figure that out and they condense it down, and the and the good ones really do

638

01:15:52.020 --> 01:15:55.369

Participant 8: essentially say, Hey, this is what you need to learn from this.

639

01:15:57.740 --> 01:16:03.129

Participant 8: I think there are some authors who don't really understand the difference. I think there are some authors who

640

01:16:03.720 --> 01:16:12.519

Participant 8: I think there's some authors who don't pay very much attention to their abstracts, let alone their highlights and just sort of slap that on together at the last minute.

641

01:16:16.390 --> 01:16:22.830

Participant 8: I think one of the the services that we do in in in having submission guidelines is

642

01:16:22.960 --> 01:16:28.470

Participant 8: essentially creating a structure that nudges authors towards going through that process.

643

01:16:29.540 --> 01:16:31.279

Karen Gainey: What do you think makes the difference

644

01:16:31.580 --> 01:16:35.120

Karen Gainey: between authors that get this and the ones that don't

645

01:16:39.820 --> 01:16:42.530

Karen Gainey: like? Is it skill-based, attitudinal?

646

01:16:43.250 --> 01:16:45.090

Participant 8: Yes, yes, to all.

647

01:16:45.987 --> 01:16:48.019

Participant 8: I think there's

648

01:16:48.910 --> 01:16:56.699

Participant 8: I definitely think there's an attitudinal, almost identity piece of this. I think there are some academics, who truly perceive themselves as

649

01:16:56.810 --> 01:17:07.929

Participant 8: publicly engaged scholars where information their job is not done until the information is communicated to audiences that can use it. That may be peers, but but

650

01:17:08.520 --> 01:17:14.297

Participant 8: they don't believe that their work is done until that that communication has succeeded.

651

01:17:14.830 --> 01:17:22.450

Participant 8: and those those are the people who are writing pieces in the conversation about their research. And those are the same people who are, you know.

652

01:17:23.140 --> 01:17:29.309

Participant 8: doing good highlights and and having clear understandings of of how their work fits into the larger

653

01:17:29.860 --> 01:17:37.279

Participant 8: scientific literature. I also think there's a skill component. There are many ways in which

654

01:17:39.800 --> 01:17:44.350

Participant 8: well, when I teach this stuff to my students. I say, even

655

01:17:45.020 --> 01:17:51.080

Participant 8: in like master's level, we need to acknowledge that we have self-selected

656

01:17:52.600 --> 01:17:58.869

Participant 8: you, based upon your ability to write in academies in which the larger.

657

01:17:59.810 --> 01:18:14.130

Participant 8: the bigger club that you can get in terms of beating people over the head with all the different facts and knowledge that you have has enabled you to get the A's. That have enabled you to get to where you are, which, of course, is completely not the way to communicate to anybody in the rest of your life.

658

01:18:16.645 --> 01:18:19.920

Participant 8: And and that's hard

659

01:18:20.050 --> 01:18:28.578

Participant 8: like, is it literally is they have to unlearn all the skills that that they learn to write papers that would get them the A's

660

01:18:29.040 --> 01:18:34.550

Participant 8: And when I do this there are every year there are students who sort of

661

01:18:34.860 --> 01:18:43.759

Participant 8: make that transition really quickly. They're like, Oh, thank God! Now I don't have to go that I can go back to being like a normal person. And there are those who just

662

01:18:44.410 --> 01:18:45.500

Participant 8: struggle

663

01:18:45.840 --> 01:18:51.220

Participant 8: to let go of these schemas that they have built up over time, that, you know this is the way you

664

01:18:51.420 --> 01:18:52.840

Participant 8: talk about science.

665

01:18:53.080 --> 01:18:54.160

Karen Gainey: Right?

666

01:18:54.530 --> 01:18:55.150

Karen Gainey: Yes.

667

01:18:55.150 --> 01:18:57.599

Participant 8: And don't even get me started on passive voice.

668

01:18:58.350 --> 01:18:59.316

Karen Gainey: Oh, okay.

669

01:19:02.020 --> 01:19:03.490

Karen Gainey: Yeah. Okay.

670

01:19:04.700 --> 01:19:09.339

Participant 8: I mean that that to me it's both skill and it's attitude. I think the ones with the right attitudes

671

01:19:09.580 --> 01:19:12.650

Participant 8: often make the effort to learn the skills.

672

01:19:16.810 --> 01:19:22.650

Participant 8: We are starting to see more reinforcement of that in academic careers where people get

673

01:19:22.880 --> 01:19:29.380

Participant 8: at least some degree of positive reinforcement for being a clearer communicator of their work in different ways.

674

01:19:29.580 --> 01:19:33.159

Karen Gainey: Okay at the undergrad level. And.

675

01:19:33.410 --> 01:19:40.810

Participant 8: No, I actually mean it at the faculty level, in the sense of we now have, at least in in the universities that I'm familiar with

676

01:19:41.314 --> 01:19:45.860

Participant 8: maybe not in as formal a way as other things. But you know, if you are

677

01:19:46.140 --> 01:19:53.649

Participant 8: being cited by journalists, if you are able to be, have your work have a broader public impact. People notice that.

678

01:19:53.970 --> 01:19:54.350

Karen Gainey: Oh!

679

01:19:54.650 --> 01:20:01.019

Participant 8: And so, you know, just sort of cranking out one more paper in the in a journal

680

01:20:01.410 --> 01:20:04.970

Participant 8: isn't the only way to build your scientific reputation.

681

01:20:06.230 --> 01:20:09.079

Karen Gainey: That sounds like, yeah, that's a positive thing.

682

01:20:09.080 --> 01:20:09.490

Participant 8: Yes.

683

01:20:10.390 --> 01:20:16.610

Karen Gainey: Different a change in ideology of what is a good academic.

684

01:20:17.900 --> 01:20:31.170

Participant 8: I will own that I sit in a public health school, which is probably on the fringe of most academic disciplines in terms of its orientation towards larger public communication. For obvious reasons. But

685

01:20:31.350 --> 01:20:41.150

Participant 8: still I think the larger trend is there. I mean, I again, I own that I I'm at the University of Michigan. It has all kinds of

686

01:20:42.160 --> 01:20:43.980

Participant 8: unique characteristics.

687

01:20:45.260 --> 01:20:52.020

Participant 8: We were talking about broad skill, development in science communication 2 decades ago.

688

01:20:52.644 --> 01:20:56.119

Participant 8: which is not the case in many places.

710

01:22:15.506 --> 01:22:17.119

Karen Gainey: all right.

711

01:22:17.650 --> 01:22:25.369

Karen Gainey: I think we've kind of covered. It. Just wanted to touch on one extra thing. If you've got another 5 min.

712

01:22:25.370 --> 01:22:25.940

Participant 8: Sure.

713

01:22:27.201 --> 01:22:33.360

Karen Gainey: Outsourcing pls. What are your thoughts? Good, bad, indifferent.

714

01:22:34.210 --> 01:22:36.319

Participant 8: Outsourcing, meaning, what.

715

01:22:37.110 --> 01:22:45.970

Karen Gainey: Do you? Have you heard of the service that Wiley offers without sourcing pls for authors.

716

01:22:48.530 --> 01:22:49.650

Participant 8: I have

717

01:22:49.870 --> 01:22:56.920

Participant 8: vaguely heard, but I'm not sure I know the specific details. So clarify exactly how it works, and then I'll have a

718

01:22:57.060 --> 01:22:58.200

Participant 8: better response.

719

01:22:58.760 --> 01:23:12.359

Karen Gainey: Well, you've got to pay for it, so I don't know a lot of details, but from their author instructions there's a link from many of their journals that you can go to where

720

01:23:12.730 --> 01:23:23.629

Karen Gainey: you, so I don't know how much it costs, but you can pay. It's it's under their editing services or language editing.

721

01:23:23.740 --> 01:23:24.510

Karen Gainey: so I think.

722

01:23:24.510 --> 01:23:26.700

Participant 8: Oh, so they're treating it like a language editing thing.

723

01:23:26.700 --> 01:23:34.899

Karen Gainey: Not a language editing or sorry I should write down what it's called. I can send you a link to it if you like.

724

01:23:35.290 --> 01:23:58.129

Karen Gainey: Some sort of editing services, and one of them is so one of them is formatting. One of them is a plain language summary. So you upload your manuscript, and they give you a timeframe. They'll give you a quote, and they'll produce a plain language summary as a result of that.

725

01:23:58.530 --> 01:24:06.759

Karen Gainey: So it's a looks to be a 3rd party with an affiliation to Wiley. I'm yeah, that's my guess.

726

01:24:18.720 --> 01:24:22.440

Participant 8: I guess what I would say is I

727

01:24:33.590 --> 01:24:34.300

Participant 8: well.

728

01:24:39.120 --> 01:24:40.906

Participant 8: jeez sort of how do I put this?

729

01:24:47.470 --> 01:24:53.260

Participant 8: Any editor who isn't the underlying author is going to be

730

01:24:55.160 --> 01:24:58.999

Participant 8: imperfect at really understanding what the point of the paper is.

731

01:25:00.040 --> 01:25:02.610

Participant 8: Sometimes they'll get it right, sometimes they won't.

732

01:25:09.960 --> 01:25:11.330

Participant 8: I also

733

01:25:14.240 --> 01:25:19.949

Participant 8: I don't know. I guess my my gut reaction is, if you really don't understand your own work

734

01:25:20.690 --> 01:25:28.729

Participant 8: so poorly that you need help to write a simple couple of sentences about the takeaways from your paper.

735

01:25:28.900 --> 01:25:34.799

Participant 8: I have larger questions about your authorship of what you're submitting.

736

01:25:37.850 --> 01:25:38.750

Karen Gainey: Fair enough.

737

01:25:39.540 --> 01:25:49.500

Participant 8: Like you're we ought to all be able to do an elevator speech for our own research.

738

01:25:51.200 --> 01:26:01.500

Participant 8: And if you can't do that and language aside. Because there's real challenges with language shifts. Obviously. But you want to be able to know

739

01:26:01.600 --> 01:26:10.250

Participant 8: what's the problem. Why is this important? What did we find kind of things at a very nuanced level.

740

01:26:11.220 --> 01:26:15.710

Participant 8: and all I'm asking for is for you to write that down concisely.

741

01:26:15.940 --> 01:26:16.270

Karen Gainey: Right.

742

01:26:17.250 --> 01:26:23.099

Participant 8: So I mean, I suspect this is a moneymaker for

743

01:26:23.880 --> 01:26:28.060

Participant 8: the people who do the service, because it's just not that hard to do.

744

01:26:30.580 --> 01:26:36.010

Participant 8: And I would hope that authors could do it themselves, because that would be a marker of them, really understanding their own work.

745

01:26:36.260 --> 01:26:40.920

Karen Gainey: Right. Yep, fair enough, all right.

746

01:26:41.560 --> 01:26:42.530

Karen Gainey: Well.

747

01:26:42.680 --> 01:27:04.980

Karen Gainey: can I ask you what you think? Oh, I did mean to ask you, what are your thoughts on involving consumers in plain language summaries or your highlights. I guess it's perhaps not so relevant for your journal because consumers or patients aren't really the primary target audience.

748

01:27:05.080 --> 01:27:10.940

Karen Gainey: But can I get your thoughts on that or other

749

01:27:11.170 --> 01:27:18.290

Karen Gainey: end? Users say policy makers, or medical practitioners?

750

01:27:20.430 --> 01:27:21.530

Participant 8: So

751

01:27:33.080 --> 01:27:36.329

Participant 8: I'm making this up as I go. So that's why I'm pausing.

752

01:27:36.330 --> 01:27:37.010

Karen Gainey: Yeah, yeah.

753

01:27:44.210 --> 01:27:47.280

Participant 8: I don't know. What strikes me is that

754

01:27:51.540 --> 01:27:55.629

Participant 8: I am skeptical, that most consumers

755

01:27:56.220 --> 01:27:59.209

Participant 8: would actually get what they need.

756

01:27:59.420 --> 01:28:03.519

Participant 8: even from a well-written, plain language summary of a paper.

757

01:28:07.430 --> 01:28:10.910

Participant 8: I am a huge proponent

758

01:28:11.130 --> 01:28:21.250

Participant 8: of the model that the conversation is implemented for dissemination of academic knowledge to broader public audiences I've written for the conversation multiple times. I am just.

759

01:28:21.860 --> 01:28:26.099

Participant 8: I love the model and part of what I love about it is

760

01:28:26.920 --> 01:28:29.949

Participant 8: now you actually have a piece that is

761

01:28:30.900 --> 01:28:34.340

Participant 8: written for that broader public audience.

762

01:28:34.990 --> 01:28:47.720

Participant 8: It's structure aligns with that audience. It's long enough that you can provide tutorial and background information to help them make sense, which you wouldn't do necessarily in a plain language, summary

763

01:28:48.210 --> 01:28:56.911

Participant 8: of the actual journal article, you can contextualize work in terms of the larger. Why are we even studying this type of stuff?

764

01:28:57.630 --> 01:28:58.949

Participant 8: all of which.

765

01:28:59.380 --> 01:29:05.419

Participant 8: then, might lead somebody to want to read the paper, or at least to get the takeaways from that paper.

766

01:29:05.700 --> 01:29:06.100

Karen Gainey: Yep.

767

01:29:06.100 --> 01:29:10.709

Participant 8: But like, if I want to talk to patients, they need more.

768

01:29:12.720 --> 01:29:15.870

Participant 8: And what a plain language summary from one paper is going to do.

769

01:29:16.280 --> 01:29:17.470

Karen Gainey: Yeah, okay.

770

01:29:18.970 --> 01:29:29.400

Participant 8: And if oh, up, let's say a patient who's interested in I don't know. You know.

771

01:29:29.740 --> 01:29:40.340

Participant 8: cutting edge cancer research is referenced to that paper as part of a larger story. Yeah, then.

772

01:29:41.970 --> 01:29:46.449

Participant 8: yeah, that plain language summary might be useful. But my guess is probably

773

01:29:47.340 --> 01:29:54.109

Participant 8: either. The main point of the takeaway has already been told to them in the whatever it is that's referring them to this.

774

01:29:55.880 --> 01:29:56.760

Participant 8: Or

775

01:29:57.020 --> 01:30:06.819

Participant 8: they need more than what the plain language summary is going to say. They're actually gonna need to read the paper. They're going to dive into the data, etc. In which case

776

01:30:07.450 --> 01:30:09.679

Participant 8: they may or may not succeed at that. But.

777

01:30:10.130 --> 01:30:13.140

Participant 8: you know, making a good plain language summary isn't going to solve that problem.

778

01:30:14.070 --> 01:30:15.790

Karen Gainey: Yeah, okay, Gotcha.

779

01:30:16.920 --> 01:30:21.880

Karen Gainey: So what do you think the purpose, then, is

780

01:30:22.510 --> 01:30:25.080

Karen Gainey: or should be, for the plain language summary.

781

01:30:26.630 --> 01:30:28.100

Karen Gainey: Is there a purpose.

782

01:30:31.340 --> 01:30:33.169

Karen Gainey: And so, okay, if you say no.

783

01:30:33.700 --> 01:30:34.260

Participant 8: I mean.

784

01:30:34.260 --> 01:30:37.130

Karen Gainey: Completely invalidate my whole Phd. But.

785

01:30:37.130 --> 01:30:37.860

Participant 8: Yeah.

786

01:30:37.860 --> 01:30:38.210

Karen Gainey: Okay.

787

01:30:38.210 --> 01:30:38.540

Participant 8: With that.

788

01:30:38.540 --> 01:30:38.910

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

789

01:30:38.910 --> 01:30:43.530

Participant 8: Of just putting my thesis, I think.

790

01:30:44.260 --> 01:30:45.980

Karen Gainey: No, I am being serious.

791

01:30:45.980 --> 01:30:50.230

Participant 8: No, I know you are, and I think my answer is, I think we

792

01:30:52.260 --> 01:30:54.859

Participant 8: at least I start from a presumption that

793

01:30:55.150 --> 01:30:59.910

Participant 8: part of the reason we use plain language in

794

01:31:00.850 --> 01:31:06.200

Participant 8: we should be using plain language in most communication is because plain language is good for everybody.

795

01:31:07.650 --> 01:31:17.150

Participant 8: And a huge amount of the benefit of science and scientific publication is knowledge, dissemination

796

01:31:17.690 --> 01:31:24.819

Participant 8: from one scientist to another, from scientist to practitioner, etc. And plain language summaries

797

01:31:24.940 --> 01:31:32.600

Participant 8: that actually provide the critical information that those other readers need, serves that purpose.

798

01:31:34.380 --> 01:31:46.740

Participant 8: There are abstract scientific abstracts that are incomprehensible. But if you actually strip it down to a couple of bullet points, you're like, okay. I may not understand that, but I know it's important, and I want it like I get it. Now.

799

01:31:46.740 --> 01:31:47.500

Karen Gainey: Right? Okay.

800

01:31:47.750 --> 01:31:52.469

Participant 8: That's important like, that's really important from the larger scientific benefit.

801

01:31:55.720 --> 01:32:02.640

Participant 8: I am a highly numerate, highly scientific literate patient.

802

01:32:03.166 --> 01:32:10.443

Participant 8: like, if I want, you know, I will dive into the scientific literature, and some, if something is affecting me or my family.

803

01:32:16.180 --> 01:32:25.620

Participant 8: But again, there's a difference between writing something. For truly broad audience

804

01:32:25.800 --> 01:32:31.330

Participant 8: versus writing, something that maximizes the ability for a

805

01:32:36.860 --> 01:32:40.699

Participant 8: person with some degree of skill and intention.

806

01:32:40.880 --> 01:32:46.269

Participant 8: but who may not have the domain, specific knowledge of an expert in that particular thing

807

01:32:46.765 --> 01:32:52.420

Participant 8: to be able to take away from it. Like, I'm not an expert in genetics, but

808

01:32:52.590 --> 01:33:00.519

Participant 8: good plain language summaries about, let's say, the implications of particular genetic mutations on.

809

01:33:00.900 --> 01:33:13.859

Participant 8: you know. Does this affect fertility? Does this? Does it get pressed down? Does it get? Are we talking about, you know, changing somebody's risk tenfold? Are we talking about changing it a tiny bit like I can get that.

810

01:33:14.240 --> 01:33:15.850

Karen Gainey: Yes, yeah.

811

01:33:15.850 --> 01:33:16.510

Karen Gainey: To me.

812

01:33:16.870 --> 01:33:27.880

Participant 8: And maybe it doesn't apply to me. But, like, you know, is this a giant transformative finding? Or is that okay? That's incremental change, like I can get that. And so I think there is a goal

813

01:33:28.750 --> 01:33:34.310

Participant 8: for plain language summaries I get. Maybe the terminology is wrong.

814

01:33:35.230 --> 01:33:35.600

Participant 8: She

815

01:33:41.370 --> 01:33:54.159

Participant 8: scientific abstracts the formal scientific abstract has a very specific purpose like it's the thing that's in the indexing that's searchable, that allows you to get as much as you can about the actual paper itself.

816

01:33:56.940 --> 01:34:04.790

Participant 8: But if we want to sort of be guiding people to help them extract out the best information that they can from it, without necessarily reading the paper.

817

01:34:05.320 --> 01:34:06.669

Participant 8: We need something else.

818

01:34:06.920 --> 01:34:09.369

Karen Gainey: I don't know whether that's something else is.

819

01:34:10.160 --> 01:34:21.849

Participant 8: What you would call plain language summary. I'm not sure whether it's the highlights that I have, but it's it's a. It serves a different communication purpose that broadens the audience. Who can understand it

820

01:34:22.570 --> 01:34:29.620

Participant 8: and abstracts away from what was done to why we care.

821

01:34:39.500 --> 01:34:41.449

Participant 8: and that to me is the heart of it.

822

01:34:41.640 --> 01:34:45.809

Participant 8: The scientific abstract is what was done and what was found

823

01:34:47.750 --> 01:34:51.009

Participant 8: but the highlights of the plain language summary is why we care.

824

01:34:51.430 --> 01:34:53.179

Karen Gainey: That's gold.

825

01:34:59.250 --> 01:35:07.920

Karen Gainey: That may well become a theme title I get. I get that.

826

01:35:08.130 --> 01:35:10.250

Karen Gainey: Yep, sums it right up. Hey?

827

01:35:11.350 --> 01:35:12.230

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

828

01:35:12.230 --> 01:35:16.259

Participant 8: And we can argue about whether we found the right way to do that. But that's the purpose.

829

01:35:16.520 --> 01:35:17.270

Karen Gainey: Right?

830

01:35:17.640 --> 01:35:18.430

Karen Gainey: Right?

831

01:35:18.950 --> 01:35:24.829

Karen Gainey: Yep, I think it's it was interesting. When I

832

01:35:25.030 --> 01:35:34.720

Karen Gainey: I surveyed. I only got to survey 19 people that read pls. But of those 19, 18 had a degree

833

01:35:34.920 --> 01:35:41.120

Karen Gainey: bachelor degree or higher, with 3, having postgraduate education, and

834

01:35:41.420 --> 01:35:45.080

Karen Gainey: it got me reevaluating who really reads pls.

835

01:35:46.440 --> 01:35:52.330

Karen Gainey: And I wish I had done a formal health literacy

836

01:35:53.830 --> 01:35:58.149

Karen Gainey: assessment at the beginning, so I can't quantify their health literacy.

837

01:35:58.250 --> 01:36:00.729

Karen Gainey: But I think we can infer it was very high.

838

01:36:01.346 --> 01:36:07.043

Karen Gainey: And there was a there was a specific reason why most of them read pls. And,

839

01:36:08.480 --> 01:36:19.060

Karen Gainey: yeah, it's not consistent with our with the traditional view of pls, which is that they're for a very general audience for the general public.

840

01:36:19.960 --> 01:36:26.719

Karen Gainey: And I think I'm taking the view or trying to understand. Do we need to challenge that.

841

01:36:28.060 --> 01:36:31.760

Participant 8: I would. I think that's I don't think

842

01:36:32.360 --> 01:36:35.719

Participant 8: the broader general public ever sees them. For the most part.

843

01:36:35.920 --> 01:36:36.330

Karen Gainey: No.

844

01:36:36.330 --> 01:36:41.130

Participant 8: And if they're not seeing them, then let's just acknowledge that.

845

01:36:41.130 --> 01:36:46.540

Karen Gainey: That's exactly right. And I'm even challenging that it's like you're in my head.

846

01:36:46.930 --> 01:36:50.150

Karen Gainey: I'm even challenging that term.

847

01:36:51.220 --> 01:36:52.880

Participant 8: Point, linguist, summary.

848

01:36:53.475 --> 01:36:53.850

Karen Gainey: But.

849

01:36:53.850 --> 01:36:56.740

Participant 8: But you know the the interesting piece here is

850

01:36:59.280 --> 01:37:04.119

Participant 8: again. I'm over generalizing from the my own experiences, and I'll acknowledge that. But

851

01:37:08.290 --> 01:37:11.020

Participant 8: the closest. I come as an author

852

01:37:11.550 --> 01:37:16.270

Participant 8: to doing the task that we might think of as making a plain language summary

853

01:37:16.730 --> 01:37:22.020

Participant 8: for research. That I have done isn't a journal article.

854

01:37:22.250 --> 01:37:23.950

Participant 8: It's the conversation piece.

855

01:37:26.190 --> 01:37:33.480

Participant 8: It's me sitting down and saying, why should a newspaper reader care about this?

856

01:37:36.600 --> 01:37:41.490

Participant 8: Which, by the way, all right, I'm gonna I'm gonna share with you

857

01:37:41.710 --> 01:37:45.060

Participant 8: my, the most read thing that I have ever written.

858

01:37:46.566 --> 01:37:53.880

Participant 8: Which is a piece in the conversation from Jeez 8 years ago. Now I guess it was about

859

01:37:55.550 --> 01:38:04.940

Participant 8: it wasn't even necessarily my research. It was just drawing upon my knowledge base about why I simultaneously

860

01:38:05.300 --> 01:38:09.570

Participant 8: know that eating raw cookie dough is dangerous, and I do it anyway.

861

01:38:11.760 --> 01:38:14.100

Karen Gainey: I'm a dietician. That sounds fascinating.

862

01:38:16.309 --> 01:38:19.360

Participant 8: And you know, I.

863

01:38:20.240 --> 01:38:25.310

Participant 8: The background of this was that there was a flower recall happening in the United States.

864

01:38:25.600 --> 01:38:33.339

Participant 8: and the Food and drug administration. Put out a basically very broad. Don't ever eat raw cookie dough. It's dangerous kind of.

865

01:38:33.820 --> 01:38:38.970

Participant 8: Health message, and I wrote a piece for the conversation that

866

01:38:39.160 --> 01:38:47.450

Participant 8: basically said the the opening line was the following, 3 statements are all true one, eating raw cookie dough.

867

01:38:48.510 --> 01:38:54.960

Participant 8: even controlling, even trying to dealing with issues of raw eggs, has real health risks.

868

01:38:55.650 --> 01:38:56.340

Participant 8: 2.

869

01:38:56.470 --> 01:39:01.210

Participant 8: I'm a public health expert and risk communication expert

870

01:39:01.380 --> 01:39:04.869

Participant 8: 3. My family and I eat raw cookie dough on a regular basis.

871

01:39:06.060 --> 01:39:14.420

Participant 8: and then just went through that argument like I. I didn't back away from the risk, but I talked about that piece has so conversation tracks.

872

01:39:14.520 --> 01:39:20.270

Participant 8: uses the embedded trackers to track it. That piece has been viewed at least 450,000 times.

873

01:39:23.410 --> 01:39:32.189

Participant 8: nothing I will ever write in my scientific career will ever come close to having the impact of Michael Gato piece.

874

01:39:32.470 --> 01:39:33.929

Karen Gainey: Well, I'm going to look it up.

875

01:39:35.070 --> 01:39:40.859

Karen Gainey: So I'm planning a piece for the conversation. When this article is published.

876

01:39:41.080 --> 01:39:42.390

Participant 8: Oh, they'll be interested.

877

01:39:43.237 --> 01:39:46.290

Karen Gainey: Yeah. Well, I've been holding off because I haven't had enough.

878

01:39:46.770 --> 01:39:52.565

Karen Gainey: I mean, I've got other ideas, but I don't know how popular they'll be

879

01:39:53.130 --> 01:39:56.240

Karen Gainey: But yeah, yeah, when Mike.

880

01:39:56.440 --> 01:40:07.430

Karen Gainey: latest qual study is published, I want to pitch something with wrapping up everything. Unfortunately, it won't include this stuff, but maybe at the end.

881

01:40:10.920 --> 01:40:15.170

Karen Gainey: was it in the (Country). Conversation? Oh, great thanks.

882

01:40:16.600 --> 01:40:17.430

Karen Gainey: Yeah. (Country).

883

01:40:17.430 --> 01:40:20.150

Participant 8: I don't know whether it got picked up in the Australian version or not.

884

01:40:20.150 --> 01:40:25.109

Karen Gainey: I'll search for it. Let me just grab that. Do you mind if I just screenshot that.

885

01:40:25.110 --> 01:40:25.850

Participant 8: Yeah. Go ahead.

886

01:40:26.490 --> 01:40:35.160

Karen Gainey: So I can get the exact headline. Fantastic. I'll check that out alright. Fantastic.

887

01:40:36.520 --> 01:40:39.390

Participant 8: There's my my intro.

888

01:40:41.900 --> 01:40:44.574

Karen Gainey: And I love how they

889

01:40:45.400 --> 01:40:47.630

Karen Gainey: They have links.

890

01:40:48.260 --> 01:40:49.199

Participant 8: Yeah, I do, too.

891

01:40:49.883 --> 01:40:51.250

Karen Gainey: Yeah. Yeah.

892

01:40:51.250 --> 01:40:53.849

Participant 8: To me is in many ways the perfect

893

01:40:55.740 --> 01:41:07.209

Participant 8: broad public communication about science. Like you. Don't try and replicate the paper. You contextualize the paper, and you give them the link to the paper if they want to go look at it themselves right.

894

01:41:07.700 --> 01:41:09.600

Karen Gainey: Make it interesting and fun.

895

01:41:09.780 --> 01:41:18.390

Participant 8: Exactly. And and you're not trying to summarize all of it. Oftentimes you're pulling at very specific pieces of it and and setting them in the larger context of of

896

01:41:19.123 --> 01:41:26.240

Participant 8: You know, current events or or reasons why people might care about it. I mean

897

01:41:26.380 --> 01:41:31.670

Participant 8: I again, I I am a huge fan of the conversation. I think their model is incredibly good.

898

01:41:31.920 --> 01:41:34.459

Participant 8: not just from a practical standpoint, but from a

899

01:41:34.660 --> 01:41:43.420

Participant 8: dissemination standpoint. I notice how many times I'm clicking around online. And then I'm reading a paper. Oh, this is really interesting, copied from the conversation.

900

01:41:44.630 --> 01:41:47.149

Participant 8: etc, because of their republishing rights.

901

01:41:47.360 --> 01:41:58.599

Karen Gainey: Yeah, yeah, it's you really go down a rabbit hole? And I'm I'm not, at least in Australia. My topic area has really been covered, so

902

01:41:58.840 --> 01:42:03.209

Karen Gainey: it either they're not interested or there's some opportunity. I don't know.

903

01:42:03.420 --> 01:42:10.310

Participant 8: I would bet it's just a I mean, they publish what people pitch them. So it's just a question of who pitches what.

904

01:42:10.600 --> 01:42:11.940

Karen Gainey: Yeah, yeah.

905

01:42:12.050 --> 01:42:14.990

Karen Gainey: Well, I liked yours because you framed it as a story.

906

01:42:15.480 --> 01:42:20.040

Karen Gainey: So that's a great tool. Yeah, yeah.

907

01:42:22.100 --> 01:42:32.410

Karen Gainey: I guess just to wrap up. What do you think, or what would you like to be? The future of plain language, summaries, or highlights in health and medical publishing.

908

01:42:46.780 --> 01:42:51.910

Participant 8: Okay, well, I guess I'll tell the story so

909

01:42:52.980 --> 01:42:54.770

Participant 8: I can turn off the recording if you like.

910

01:42:54.770 --> 01:43:00.620

Participant 8: No, no, this is this is. This is a I tell the story all the time. It's just a question. It's a it I'm recognizing. It's

911

01:43:01.010 --> 01:43:07.206

Participant 8: just very salient to me, and I'm trying to wrestle with. Is that really my answer is that just because this is the 1st thing that's popping to mind?

912

01:43:12.270 --> 01:43:19.210

Participant 8: about 15 years ago, maybe even longer than that.

913

01:43:20.950 --> 01:43:29.810

Participant 8: There was a very popular bestselling book called Made to Stick by Chip and Dan Heath.

914

01:43:33.770 --> 01:43:38.360

Participant 8: I happen to know Chip Heath from many years ago.

915

01:43:38.730 --> 01:43:46.949

Participant 8: and I ended up using that book as an anchor for one of the classes that I teach on health communication as a basically as a

916

01:43:47.330 --> 01:43:52.810

Participant 8: how do we leverage the techniques of marketing to make health messaging more memorable.

917

01:43:54.620 --> 01:43:56.870

Participant 8: Stories being one example of that, etc.

918

01:43:57.240 --> 01:44:07.770

Participant 8: But the book starts out, and the very 1st full chapter focuses not on

919

01:44:10.420 --> 01:44:13.590

Participant 8: broader techniques of message making messages memorable.

920

01:44:13.750 --> 01:44:16.330

Participant 8: But it focuses on simple.

921

01:44:18.230 --> 01:44:23.669

Participant 8: and they literally say, there are 2 things you need to do to have your message stick with somebody. One

922

01:44:23.810 --> 01:44:28.879

Participant 8: is to be simple, and 2 is everything else, because you can't do anything else. If you're not simple.

923

01:44:28.880 --> 01:44:29.530

Karen Gainey: Right.

924

01:44:30.890 --> 01:44:33.379

Participant 8: And they tell the story, and I will

925

01:44:34.200 --> 01:44:37.030

Participant 8: overly simplify this. But they tell the story

926

01:44:37.390 --> 01:44:41.609

Participant 8: of the way the US. Military trains officers.

927

01:44:43.100 --> 01:44:44.710

Participant 8: To give orders.

928

01:44:44.870 --> 01:44:47.229

Karen Gainey: And the core problem that.

929

01:44:47.980 --> 01:44:55.839

Participant 8: Orders are often very concrete and specific, but they may or may not be applicable by the time the order gets to where it needs to be acted upon.

930

01:44:56.160 --> 01:44:56.950

Karen Gainey: Okay.

931

01:44:58.000 --> 01:45:10.119

Participant 8: And so the military trains officers. When they write orders they write the full order, and then there was a separate part of the order, that is, and I quote the commander's intent.

932

01:45:10.800 --> 01:45:11.670

Karen Gainey: Hmm.

933

01:45:11.670 --> 01:45:15.559

Participant 8: The commander's intent is a 1 sentence

934

01:45:15.750 --> 01:45:22.150

Participant 8: description of, if you accomplish nothing else. This is what your goal is.

935

01:45:25.810 --> 01:45:29.850

Participant 8: That metaphor is to me the core

936

01:45:30.020 --> 01:45:32.630

Participant 8: of what plain language summaries should be.

937

01:45:33.490 --> 01:45:38.499

Participant 8: What if you know nothing else about this paper?

938

01:45:39.020 --> 01:45:41.099

Participant 8: What do you need to take away?

939

01:45:41.970 --> 01:45:48.819

Participant 8: How should this change your knowledge? How should this change your practice? How should what? What is the why should we care.

940

01:45:49.870 --> 01:45:51.080

Participant 8: About this work.

941

01:45:54.380 --> 01:46:00.539

Participant 8: Again. I don't think our system

942

01:46:01.810 --> 01:46:07.409

Participant 8: makes people work to really do that prioritization work. To really say.

943

01:46:08.410 --> 01:46:14.070

Participant 8: You mean nothing else. If you get down to one sentence, if you get down to 8 seconds of time.

944

01:46:14.250 --> 01:46:18.240

Participant 8: what is the thing that you must take away from this work.

945

01:46:18.240 --> 01:46:19.890

Karen Gainey: Hmm! Gotcha.

946

01:46:20.190 --> 01:46:24.809

Participant 8: And that to me is the most important thing that

947

01:46:25.140 --> 01:46:32.770

Participant 8: whether we call it plain language summaries, whether it's highlights, we can argue about format. But that is to me the most important thing

948

01:46:32.920 --> 01:46:33.580

Participant 8: that

949

01:46:33.680 --> 01:46:41.489

Participant 8: we need to do and to broaden the impact of science communication both to other scientists and to other audiences.

950

01:46:42.040 --> 01:46:47.000

Participant 8: It's it's because once you once you know, why actually should care.

951

01:46:47.160 --> 01:46:54.890

Participant 8: you'll do the extra work to understand the methods or to to get the background to to have the larger story

952

01:46:55.220 --> 01:46:59.890

Participant 8: of a particular piece of research. But if we don't know why we care, then we won't do that work.

953

01:47:01.540 --> 01:47:03.429

Karen Gainey: Something's just occurred to me.

954

01:47:08.400 --> 01:47:10.080

Karen Gainey: Can I posit something.

955

01:47:12.870 --> 01:47:14.460

Karen Gainey: I know for me.

956

01:47:16.020 --> 01:47:19.310

Karen Gainey: When I write my plain language summaries. I do it at the end

957

01:47:20.530 --> 01:47:24.710

Karen Gainey: like the abstract, because that's when we've got all the information,

958

01:47:29.000 --> 01:47:31.430

Karen Gainey: IE. When the results are in

959

01:47:31.660 --> 01:47:35.720

Karen Gainey: written the discussion I've at least written the full draft manuscript.

960

01:47:37.490 --> 01:47:39.069

Karen Gainey: Should it be done earlier.

961

01:47:39.520 --> 01:47:43.630

Participant 8: Yes, when I try to write a paper.

962

01:47:43.630 --> 01:47:44.360

Karen Gainey: Hmm.

963

01:47:46.010 --> 01:47:48.910

Participant 8: I I'm not always formal about it.

964

01:47:50.490 --> 01:47:53.380

Participant 8: but I should know the answer to that question

965

01:47:55.400 --> 01:47:58.209

Participant 8: before I even touch the intro or the discussion.

966

01:48:01.020 --> 01:48:02.990

Participant 8: I should be able to write that.

967

01:48:03.640 --> 01:48:05.840

Participant 8: based upon methods and results alone.

968

01:48:06.810 --> 01:48:07.170

Karen Gainey: Because of.

969

01:48:07.170 --> 01:48:08.200

Participant 8: I should know.

970

01:48:09.060 --> 01:48:11.900

Participant 8: From those why I care.

971

01:48:12.970 --> 01:48:20.190

Participant 8: And the discussion and the intro is just setting that up in larger structures. I don't know what that takeaway is.

972

01:48:20.650 --> 01:48:27.880

Participant 8: then it's quite possible and often the case, that in the effort to write the introduction or write the discussion, I actually lose it.

973

01:48:28.580 --> 01:48:30.750

Karen Gainey: That's exactly what's occurred to me.

974

01:48:32.470 --> 01:48:35.979

Participant 8: That's hard to do. You want to write the rest of the paper?

975

01:48:37.010 --> 01:48:47.630

Participant 8: But when like, when I I do this to myself, but I also do it with the students and and trainees that I work with, and colleagues like I. The thing I most want to see in a paper is

976

01:48:49.290 --> 01:48:54.169

Participant 8: the outline of the results. What are the tables?

977

01:48:54.360 --> 01:48:56.170

Participant 8: Were the main findings?

978

01:48:56.320 --> 01:49:00.690

Participant 8: And then we look at that as a set. And we say, Okay, what's the storyline here.

979

01:49:02.370 --> 01:49:03.810

Participant 8: What is a complete record?

980

01:49:04.190 --> 01:49:07.030

Participant 8: What's the storyline? What matters.

981

01:49:08.130 --> 01:49:16.780

Participant 8: And what I find, and I drive my students nuts because of this is that I often say

982

01:49:17.040 --> 01:49:23.020

Participant 8: you've got 6 or 8 or 10 tables here, but only one of them matters.

983

01:49:24.050 --> 01:49:24.510

Karen Gainey: Right.

984

01:49:24.510 --> 01:49:29.670

Participant 8: Because the story of the paper is one. This is the story of the paper, and everything else is just secondary to that.

985

01:49:29.870 --> 01:49:33.339

Participant 8: and when they lose that they

986

01:49:34.030 --> 01:49:37.850

Participant 8: write a paper. That's a complete report, but it's not very persuasive.

987

01:49:41.610 --> 01:49:52.159

Participant 8: for better and worse. One of the things that really high-end journals do by their word count limitations is force you to get real about what is the point.

988

01:49:53.500 --> 01:49:56.990

Participant 8: And I just had the experience of writing a

989

01:49:57.180 --> 01:50:00.149

Participant 8: 600 word research letter for Jama.

990

01:50:00.820 --> 01:50:04.150

Participant 8: Let me just say that that is a message prioritization task

991

01:50:04.300 --> 01:50:07.859

Participant 8: getting an entire research study crammed into 600 words.

992

01:50:09.360 --> 01:50:10.749

Karen Gainey: Oh, 600.

993

01:50:10.750 --> 01:50:11.420

Participant 8: 600.

994

01:50:11.420 --> 01:50:12.830

Karen Gainey: 1,600.

995

01:50:12.830 --> 01:50:16.790

Participant 8: 600 words start to finish.

996

01:50:19.130 --> 01:50:21.540

Karen Gainey: What sort of research, study.

997

01:50:21.540 --> 01:50:23.429

Participant 8: So you will appreciate this.

998

01:50:25.960 --> 01:50:29.290

Participant 8: Is a collaboration with a pathologist

999

01:50:30.830 --> 01:50:33.279

Participant 8: in which we compared we gave.

1000

01:50:33.610 --> 01:50:37.320

Participant 8: This is hypothetical. So we gave general public.

1001

01:50:39.043 --> 01:50:47.259

Participant 8: People who have a prostate, a copy of what somebody would receive from a prostate biopsy report.

1002

01:50:48.920 --> 01:50:56.059

Participant 8: Using the exact form used in our university, and the same the form that's used in the local Va. Hospital.

1003

01:50:56.340 --> 01:51:02.809

Participant 8: or a patient-centered format that is much simpler, and abstracts out the key information.

1004

01:51:03.610 --> 01:51:04.170

Participant 8: Okay.

1005

01:51:05.525 --> 01:51:12.369

Participant 8: hold on. I'm going to actually pull this up so I can get the numbers exactly right, just because it's worth.

1006

01:51:14.200 --> 01:51:18.510

Participant 8: Oh, being exact about this.

1007

01:51:23.980 --> 01:51:24.750

Participant 8: So

1008

01:51:26.500 --> 01:51:31.230

Participant 8: 3 formats randomized into one of them. You get the form. Then we just ask you some questions about it.

1009

01:51:32.170 --> 01:51:32.740

Karen Gainey: Okay.

1010

01:51:33.400 --> 01:51:33.980

Karen Gainey: At first.st

1011

01:51:33.980 --> 01:51:38.060

Participant 8: Question, does the did the report say that you have cancer?

1012

01:51:39.380 --> 01:51:40.160

Participant 8: That's it.

1013

01:51:40.900 --> 01:51:45.150

Participant 8: Patient-centered report, 93% got that right.

1014

01:51:46.770 --> 01:51:47.300

Karen Gainey: Okay.

1015

01:51:47.550 --> 01:51:51.510

Participant 8: University report, 32% got that right?

1016

01:51:56.060 --> 01:51:56.800

Karen Gainey: Wow!

1017

01:52:01.020 --> 01:52:05.420

Participant 8: Are you high risk, low risk or moderate risk?

1018

01:52:08.640 --> 01:52:11.310

Participant 8: 93%. Get it right with the patients that informed

1019

01:52:12.830 --> 01:52:15.899

Participant 8: somewhere between 30 and 40% get it right with the other forms.

1020

01:52:16.300 --> 01:52:17.539

Karen Gainey: Are you kidding.

1021

01:52:20.230 --> 01:52:21.919

Participant 8: And this is why it's in Jama.

1022

01:52:23.380 --> 01:52:24.240

Karen Gainey: Wow!

1023

01:52:24.500 --> 01:52:27.619

Participant 8: But that's the point right? I don't need to tell you anything else.

1024

01:52:28.230 --> 01:52:28.630

Karen Gainey: Yeah, that.

1025

01:52:28.630 --> 01:52:42.659

Participant 8: We didn't do secondary analyses. We didn't look at demographics. In fact, we intentionally didn't do demographic analyses. All we did was say, this is a randomized trial. Here's the report. You don't know whether whether you have cancer or not. We're done.

1026

01:52:50.250 --> 01:52:54.929

Participant 8: and that, to me is the perfect example of a clean takeaway paper.

1027

01:52:55.540 --> 01:53:01.790

Karen Gainey: Yeah, yeah, because that's that just hits you in the face.

1028

01:53:02.020 --> 01:53:02.690

Participant 8: Right?

1029

01:53:04.540 --> 01:53:05.100

Participant 8: Right?

1030

01:53:06.200 --> 01:53:09.180

Participant 8: And so then the conversation, like our implications, are.

1031

01:53:09.600 --> 01:53:16.004

Participant 8: we should include patient centered copy versions of these forms because people don't understand them. We're done like

1032

01:53:16.360 --> 01:53:22.000

Participant 8: mean, you shouldn't even have to spell that out. But yes, that's your conclusion. That's the conclusion.

1033

01:53:22.430 --> 01:53:24.489

Karen Gainey: Patient-centred reports are good.

1034

01:53:24.700 --> 01:53:26.420

Participant 8: Station center reports are good.

1035

01:53:26.420 --> 01:53:27.050

Karen Gainey: It's.

1036

01:53:27.310 --> 01:53:29.170

Participant 8: Okay, that's it. We're done.

1037

01:53:29.620 --> 01:53:32.840

Participant 8: But but that to me is what really

1038

01:53:33.300 --> 01:53:41.800

Participant 8: good science communication is about is this 600 word thing is going to change somebody's mind about whether or not this report is something that a patient can read.

1039

01:53:42.410 --> 01:53:44.969

Participant 8: and that's all it's going to do. But it will do that.

1040

01:53:45.210 --> 01:53:52.990

Karen Gainey: And is it worthwhile going to the effort of implementing that sort of change in their organization?

1041

01:53:54.040 --> 01:53:57.809

Participant 8: I think it is, I mean from my standpoint, as an.

1042

01:53:57.810 --> 01:54:00.789

Karen Gainey: No, I think that's obvious. It answers that question.

1043

01:54:00.790 --> 01:54:04.719

Participant 8: Yeah. Well, I'm sorry. I thought you were talking about the the from a journal standpoint. I mean.

1044

01:54:04.720 --> 01:54:07.339

Karen Gainey: No, no, no! From a reader.

1045

01:54:07.550 --> 01:54:12.250

Participant 8: Yeah. From a and point you you let the study good studies

1046

01:54:14.210 --> 01:54:19.199

Participant 8: every study. Some studies are easier to explain to the public than others. This is an easy one.

1047

01:54:21.350 --> 01:54:24.570

Participant 8: but in the end, from a

1048

01:54:25.330 --> 01:54:28.699

Participant 8: journal standpoint, from a scientific communication standpoint.

1049

01:54:30.600 --> 01:54:36.679

Participant 8: we all ought to be asking ourselves, how has this advanced our understanding of the world.

1050

01:54:38.370 --> 01:54:43.080

Participant 8: Why should this piece? Why is this piece of science worth

1051

01:54:43.670 --> 01:54:46.180

Participant 8: my time to under? Read and understand?

1052

01:54:46.783 --> 01:54:59.240

Participant 8: I, 1 of my pet Peeves is people who write scientific papers that says, no one has studied this as if the fact that nobody has studied this is a reason in and of itself to do the work. Yeah, no.

1053

01:54:59.970 --> 01:55:00.580

Karen Gainey: Yep.

1054

01:55:00.710 --> 01:55:03.669

Participant 8: No, that's not. That's not a sufficient answer.

1055

01:55:03.670 --> 01:55:04.320

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

1056

01:55:05.890 --> 01:55:08.249

Karen Gainey: Some things are just gaps because they're.

1057

01:55:08.590 --> 01:55:21.620

Participant 8: Not actually important or interesting, or whatever, and other things are maybe really complicated, but really, effectively communicated.

1058

01:55:22.490 --> 01:55:25.520

Participant 8: Why we should care I will give you. I'll close with a

1059

01:55:25.720 --> 01:55:32.090

Participant 8: good example of this. Many years ago at a science communication training, I saw oh.

1060

01:55:33.230 --> 01:55:39.950

Participant 8: a. It wasn't a 3 min thesis, but it was close to it. Kind of presentation of

1061

01:55:41.680 --> 01:55:57.750

Participant 8: somebody who was in isn't, and one of the engineering fields trying to explain, using lasers in

1062

01:55:57.880 --> 01:56:06.129

Participant 8: measuring stuff, in combustion engines, and I was like eyes glazing over like what the whatever he was like.

1063

01:56:07.100 --> 01:56:08.069

Participant 8: Here's the issue.

1064

01:56:12.640 --> 01:56:18.579

Participant 8: We all understand the idea that having an efficient engine is a good thing

1065

01:56:19.410 --> 01:56:25.370

Participant 8: like use less gas, get more energy, spend less money. Everybody wins.

1066

01:56:26.250 --> 01:56:32.400

Participant 8: So we want to design engines to burn as much as possible of whatever the fuel is.

1067

01:56:32.980 --> 01:56:37.290

Participant 8: But it's really hard to measure stuff inside an engine.

1068

01:56:40.730 --> 01:56:43.319

Participant 8: but it turns out that if you

1069

01:56:45.390 --> 01:56:51.920

Participant 8: add a little bit of the same stuff that you use in fireworks to make them turn different colors.

1070

01:56:52.360 --> 01:57:00.660

Participant 8: You can measure, use the frequency of light that they emit to measure temperature, which is a good way of measuring how well they're burning.

1071

01:57:00.860 --> 01:57:06.839

Participant 8: And so we're using lasers to measure the temperature in these engines. And I was like, this is cool.

1072

01:57:07.130 --> 01:57:13.099

Karen Gainey: Yeah, I'm engaged as a 3rd 4th party. That's yeah. That's engaged.

1073

01:57:13.100 --> 01:57:15.580

Participant 8: I don't know what the details are. I'm sure.

1074

01:57:15.580 --> 01:57:16.180

Karen Gainey: Yeah.

1075

01:57:16.180 --> 01:57:20.090

Participant 8: I'm distorting it in some ways, but I understand why I care.

1076

01:57:20.090 --> 01:57:30.450

Karen Gainey: Yeah, exactly. And you're like, that's cool. That's interesting. That has value in the real world. And I get why, you're doing it

1077

01:57:30.830 --> 01:57:32.590

Karen Gainey: right? Yeah, that.

1078

01:57:32.930 --> 01:57:38.530

Participant 8: Task right. There is what I think every journal author

1079

01:57:38.640 --> 01:57:42.540

Participant 8: should be, not just encouraged, but essentially forced to do.

1080

01:57:44.570 --> 01:57:50.019

Participant 8: And how do we support them in doing that? That, to me, is what the goal of applying language summary is to get that to happen.

1081

01:57:50.480 --> 01:57:53.940

Participant 8: How much it strips out jargon.

1082

01:57:54.040 --> 01:58:04.940

Participant 8: It's going to depend upon the situation. I think there are some things that are just impossible to do that way, but I bet we can still get somewhere towards plain language when we just talk about why, it matters.

1083

01:58:05.950 --> 01:58:13.409

Karen Gainey: Okay, that is a good thank you. That's been a really great summary

1084

01:58:15.630 --> 01:58:19.380

Karen Gainey: I can't tell you how much I've enjoyed talking to you,.

1085

01:58:19.380 --> 01:58:20.029

Participant 8: This is fine.

1086

01:58:20.030 --> 01:58:37.959

Karen Gainey: And I hope my enthusiasm I'm always concerned. I mean, I'm doing thematic, reflexive analysis. And I'm always concerned about how much my passion and enthusiasm for this area biases these interviews, and I have to remember to try and contain it.

1087

01:58:37.960 --> 01:58:44.600

Karen Gainey: I don't think I hope it's relatively obvious. I have done a lot of thinking in this area long before we are talking.

1088

01:58:44.600 --> 01:58:47.109

Karen Gainey: Oh, a Tad, a Tad!

1089

01:58:47.550 --> 01:59:13.831

Karen Gainey: And I appreciate that. It was very clear. And you've given me a lot to think about. I've made some notes of some things to look up some resources, and I'm gonna look up your piece in that conversation. For sure. And yeah, there's some things that I'm sure will help me in my future, so I hope we can stay in touch.

1090

01:59:14.230 --> 01:59:15.029

Participant 8: Happy, to.

1091

01:59:15.030 --> 01:59:19.480

Karen Gainey: Been absolutely fantastic, and thank you for your time.

1092

01:59:19.660 --> 01:59:20.330

Participant 8: You're welcome.

1093

01:59:20.590 --> 01:59:27.090

Karen Gainey: Really appreciate it. And just to to I'll ask you again, would you like to have a look at the interview transcript

1094

01:59:27.230 --> 01:59:27.810

Karen Gainey: to.

1095

01:59:27.810 --> 01:59:36.449

Participant 8: You are welcome to send it to me. I don't think there's anything I've said here that I wouldn't say publicly in general, so I'm I have no concerns about it.

1096

01:59:37.020 --> 01:59:40.449

Karen Gainey: Okay. Well, I won't add it to your list.

1097

01:59:40.450 --> 01:59:40.940

Participant 8: Fair enough.