RAW-INF_2023.08.01_Adeline Caroline and Jo

Speakers: Caroline Halford, Joanne Walker, & Adeline Rosenberg

Caroline Halford (00:00):

Hello, and welcome to InformED, a podcast series where you will hear industry experts share their thought-provoking insights and lessons in the field of medical communications.

Caroline Halford (00:10):

This series is brought to you by ISMPP and is generously sponsored by MedThink SciCom. The opinion shared by the presenters today are our own, and do not represent those of our employers. My name is Caroline Halford, and I'm the Development Director for Medical Education at Springer Healthcare, which is part of the Springer Nature Group.

Caroline Halford (00:30):

Most of my time at Springer has been spent overseeing the open-access Adis journals, who've become known for publishing a range of digital features alongside their articles. I will be your guest host for today's episode, and my colleagues and I, were part of an ISMPP U Webinar in June, entitled, *Digital Features: Are They Really Worth the Effort.*

Caroline Halford (00:52):

Now, this podcast is a follow-up to that webinar and will allow us to answer some of the questions that we received from the audience, but we were unable to do so during the live webinar. So, joining me today are Jo Walker and Adeline Rosenberg. Jo and Adeline, please could you introduce yourselves.

Joanne Walker (01:09):

Thanks, Caroline. I'm Jo Walker, I'm Co-founder and Publishing Director at Becaris Publishing. So, I'm looking forward to continuing our conversation around sort of the Digital Features Webinar, and I'm now going to pass over to Adeline.

Adeline Rosenberg (01:23):

Thanks, both. My name's Adeline Rosenberg, and I'm a Senior Medical Writer in Patient Engagement at Oxford PharmaGenesis, and I'm really looking forward to being here today.

Caroline Halford (01:33):

Perfect, thank you both. So, without further ado, let's get started by answering the first question that we got from the audience after our ISMPP U Webinar.

Caroline Halford (01:43):

So, first question is — the question is more of a comment than a question: "We have to tighten up the terminology. Even in this presentation, we are talking about infographics, graphical abstracts, graphical summaries, et cetera, basically the same thing. It's confusing although it's easy for ourselves, and alignment on the terminology will help patients and others to more easily find the information that they're looking for."

Caroline Halford (02:20):

So, I think this is a really good question to get us started because I think this person that asked the question made a really good point, because publishers and other platforms use a lots of different features, lots of different terms for digital features.

Caroline Halford (02:34):

For example, when I was with the Adis journals, they called them "digital features," where I know the terminology in GPP 2022 calls them "digital enhancements." I've also seen them called "enhanced features," and actually, in our webinar, we asked the audience for their preferred feature term, and we got lots of different responses.

Caroline Halford (02:56):

So, there was no consensus even amongst us healthcare, medical comms professionals on what we should call them.

Caroline Halford (03:05):

So, to answer this, I will say to the audience, please look out for ISMPP announcements. We are working on something to try and refine the terms. So, keep your eyes peeled.

Caroline Halford (03:14):

Jo, Adeline, do you have any more comments on that before we move to the next question?

Joanne Walker (03:22):

Just from me, I think that we just need consensus. We need to start calling them one thing and then everyone go with that. That's just my comment, really. So, yeah, let's build consensus on what they should actually be called, and that's a really good starting point as well.

Adeline Rosenberg (03:39):

Yeah, and I think for me, I think sort of the first step towards building consensus is first hearing what people across the industry are using and what the majority are saying that we can then build a consensus from.

Caroline Halford (03:55):

Yeah, great point. Well, thank you both. Yeah, completely agree because I think if we're thinking about digital features and findability, then yeah, actually having a term that we can all use is going to be important.

Caroline Halford (04:06):

So, this leads me nicely onto the next question that we got from the audience, which is: "Do you consider podcasts a digital feature? And if so, are there any metrics?" Now, Jo, I'd like to ask this one to you please.

Joanne Walker (04:23):

Yes, I'm happy to answer. And, I mean, it's a really good question because podcasts and all these sort of digital features are really becoming a lot more popular. I know that several journals in particular, the Adis journals, and also, Taylor & Francis, SAGE, Future Science Group — all can now sort of publish a variety sort of podcast-type articles.

Joanne Walker (04:42):

And I know that the sort of the general opinion is if the podcast is a discussion of an article, it's part of the article, then that is a digital feature. But Adis also do the sort of more standalone podcast articles, where it's a brand-new article, but it's published in a podcast format and often, in sort of Adis's case, is accompanied with a sort of peer-reviewed talking points or script or something so that people can sort of listen to the podcast article and also read it as well.

Joanne Walker (05:15):

And I know that Adis have some really good metrics on how people are sort of using that content, how they're listening to it, where they listen to it, how many people read it, how many people listen to it, that sort of thing. So, Caroline, did you have any sort of particular sort of stats that you wanted to share or if you can recall?

Caroline Halford (05:36):

Yes, actually, I'm so glad that we were asked this question about podcasts because, the standalone podcast articles from my experience have been one of the most widely engaged with digital innovative article types that I've seen.

Caroline Halford (05:50):

And the metrics that we have seen are often attributed to several factors. And one of them, is it's the multi-format of the education. So, the fact is that the podcast is published on ... the audio is on SpringerLink, but it's also on Spotify, Deezer, Google Play, Apple Music.

Caroline Halford (06:15):

But the important point is, is that the full text transcripts is also published on PubMed and SpringerLink, and all the indexing sites. And the feedback and the metrics that we get is that it's this combination of the audio, and the text that bring the engagement.

Caroline Halford (06:33):

Not just the engagement because feedback that we get from our authors is that even though audio's great, lots of people are still readers, they still prefer to read and skim text rather than listen to the audio. So, providing that multi format is important, but also, the transcripts leads to increased findability.

Caroline Halford (06:54):

Because when you think about it, when we talk on a podcast, we're talking in plain language. We're not using highly technical academic terms that might be used in the manuscript, and we Google in the same way. So, when we're Googling for scientific literature, we'll often Google in more collegiate terms, which means that you're more likely to pick up the transcripts on Google search and get back to the podcast.

Caroline Halford (07:21):

So, yeah, if I was to pick a digital innovation podcast, standalone podcast articles, which are not digital features, are actually one of the most popular ones.

Caroline Halford (07:36):

Adeline or Jo, do you have any more comments to make on this question before we move on?

Adeline Rosenberg (07:43):

No, I think you've covered it quite nicely.

Caroline Halford (07:47):

Okay, perfect. Alright then, so moving on to the next question. So, this is to do with plain language summaries. So, someone asked the question: "There were a couple of studies presented in our webinar about physician preferences for plain language summary formats."

Caroline Halford (08:04):

Adeline, I think you presented this section. Would you be able to expand on this preference? So, did the physician preference for PLS include text based PLS and infographic style PLS, or both?

Adeline Rosenberg (08:22):

So, there were a couple of different studies that were presented during the webinar that this question is referring to. And all of the references will be included in the transcript available on the ISMPP InformED webpage.

Adeline Rosenberg (08:35):

But in brief, from one study, more healthcare professionals found plain language summaries very or extremely useful, that was ahead of infographics and videos.[1]

Adeline Rosenberg (08:45):

Similarly, another group of general healthcare professionals preferred plain text, plain language summaries for ease of reading over graphical formats.[2] But interestingly, in a study of rare disease healthcare professionals, infographics were actually valued ahead of plain language summaries.[3]

Caroline Halford (09:05):

Oh, wow. So, that's interesting in itself, isn't it? That there's not one particular PLS format that will suit all audience types.

Adeline Rosenberg (09:14):

No, exactly. It's not going to be a one size fits all, and it's really going to be about listening to your audience, and tailoring your content to fit their needs.

Caroline Halford (09:25):

Well, thank you. Thank you for that extra information outline. That's really interesting. Okay, so going on to the next question, an audience member asked: "Regarding video extenders, what are the general

thoughts about placing the videos on both a broad platform like YouTube and on the journal website in order to drive more traffic to the original publication?" Jo, can I ask you this as the expert publisher?

Joanne Walker (09:54):

Yeah, happy to help, and I know that you and I disagree slightly on this, so maybe I'll be happy to give my opinion and then maybe you can give yours as well and the audience can decide for themselves.

Joanne Walker (10:03):

So, in my opinion, I think all videos should be ... or any video abstracts, that sort of thing should be, on YouTube to sort of really help their discoverability. YouTube is more or less, the PubMed as such for videos. So, videos should be put on YouTube to sort of really maximize this discoverability.

Joanne Walker (10:24):

And then publishers can then use that sort of embed code that YouTube provides, and then publish the videos alongside the original article as well on their journal platform. And then by doing so, you sort of have the one place original source video on the YouTube platform, but also, alongside the original article.

Joanne Walker (10:41):

And then you can capture metrics, readership views, that sort of thing, using YouTube the way that they can present their data as well. So, I think it's sort of, as I've said, it's like a PubMed Medline for videos, and I think they should all be on there in the first instance. But I know that you have slightly different opinion, and we can see what people think.

Caroline Halford (11:04):

Thank you for setting that up, Jo. Yeah, it's so interesting to hear you say that. And when you describe it like that, it's hard to argue with the rationale for putting videos on YouTube because we all know that people Google rather than using PubMed to search, and YouTube does come up in searches.

Caroline Halford (11:27):

So, yeah, in theory, I agree with you, I think that's a great place to host video abstracts. And if you do have the ability to put a widget in the article to link through to YouTube, I think that's great. However, in my experience when I've worked with portfolios that have used YouTube as well as the video platform, we see so much more traffic just purely on the article page.

Caroline Halford (12:06):

And in my personal opinion, I'd rather have that because I'd rather keep the audience for the article with the full text paper. So, that if people come across the video, they've always got that article alongside it. So, you've got the peer-reviewed text version and the multi-format video.

Caroline Halford (12:27):

So, the metrics I've seen from my own personal experience, it's better to keep it all on one platform, that maybe, with YouTube as a secondary home, as long as you have the appropriate links to make sure that anyone that finds the video can get back to the journal platform. But maybe, the thing that you are

describing actually, just means that you've got much better ways of embedding video content within the journal platform.

Joanne Walker (12:57):

I think it's also the best option for those journals that can't publish videos where the authors want to do a video, but the journal platform doesn't allow it, then they would just have to use YouTube as a place to put the video and then link to the original article.

Joanne Walker (13:14):

But yeah, as you said, I think as long as there's that link between the original article and the video, and that people know that the video is the video of that article, then I think as long as ... and then people can sort of find it hopefully, either by through the journal and the video, and then the video and then the journal article. But either way, they should find each other, hopefully, if it all works well.

Caroline Halford (13:36):

Yeah, no, perfect. No, that makes perfect sense. And it's a good point about as a home if there is no journal platform, it's a great place for authors to host their videos.

Caroline Halford (13:46):

Okay, thank you, Jo. So, next question: this question is, "Can you speak to DOIs of digital features when enhanced content is part of the same article, DOI, e.g., in supplementary materials or a graphical abstract figure. How can authors or sponsors obtain metrics about the feature independent of the article?"

Caroline Halford (14:10):

Now, I don't mind sort of speaking on this and then I'd love to hear your expertise as well. From my perspective, when enhanced content is part of the same article, it will share the same DOI. So, it's always citable with the same formats.

Caroline Halford (14:32):

But there are still ways that you can get metrics of the feature on its own, such as, for example, if you embed a video into the journal platform, there are often ways to obtain metrics from the publisher on, for example, how many people have clicked on the video, how long they've stayed on the video, or for example, if you're hosting on Figshare, you can see how many people click through to Figshare, and how long they stay on there.

Caroline Halford (14:57):

It's harder to do for, for example, an embedded infographic, where it might not be physically possible to see how many pairs of eyes hovered over that bit of the article. It's also sometimes possible to look at the impacts of a digital feature embedded in the article by looking at social attention.

Caroline Halford (15:15):

For example, sometimes, authors will talk about a digital feature on Twitter as part of an article or they'll share that particular bit of the article on Twitter, which will give you a sense that they've engaged with that feature and found it worthwhile to share.

Caroline Halford (15:32):

But thinking about features with their own DOIs, some publishers do share all of their features on Figshare and every Figshare page has its own DOI, which means that it does have its own citation. So, you can cite the feature alone if you want to, and actually this is what Pfizer have done for their own PLS, digital feature platform.

Caroline Halford (15:55):

I'd encourage anyone to look it up. If you look up Pfizer and Figshare on Google, you'll find it, it's free to access. Pfizer owns searchable platform where they host plain language summaries, and digital features associated with their published articles, such as PLS, infographics, et cetera.

Caroline Halford (16:15):

And each feature contains a link back to the published article. And in my opinion, linking back to what you've said, Jo, this is also a really good solution to publish features if the journal themselves can't host it.

Caroline Halford (16:29):

So, I know yeah, we're getting to the end of the podcast now. So, I want to move on to this question. Specifically thinking about PLS, one of our audience members asked: "It would be great if there was a separate designated PLS specific PubMed. It seems to muddy the waters if scientific or technical articles are mixed in with PLS on PubMed. Do you see the prospect of a PLS-only large repository or subsection for PubMed?"

Caroline Halford (16:54):

So, yeah, Jo and Adeline, over to you.

Adeline Rosenberg (17:07):

I'll take that first. So, yeah, firstly, I don't think that will muddy the waters at all. Primarily, because they are all clearly labeled what's the abstract and what's plain language summary, but also, because we know that people are accessing PubMed looking for information and coming across these technical abstracts, which can be a barrier to accessing information.

Adeline Rosenberg (17:27):

And so, having those plain language summaries in the same place where they're already looking just makes it that much easier to get to the information that they need.

Joanne Walker (17:39):

Yeah, I have to agree with that. I think again, PubMed is the natural place where people come across scientific content. So, having that plain language summary, and we think that plain language summaries are not just for patients, they're also for your HCP, your doctor who comes across an article, and if there's a really technical abstract, they might prefer to actually read the plain language summary because it just takes them a lot less longer to sort of process that information.

Joanne Walker (18:08):

Then they can then link through to the full article and then read that full scientific article. So, it's kind of a bridge between the sort of the technical scientific abstract, and then the full article as well.

Joanne Walker (18:22):

And I think it comes to the standalone PLSPs as well. Again, they are scientific content, and this is the place for PubMed, so that is where they should be indexed as well. And when it comes to the sort of the last part of the question, which was a sort of a PLS-only repository or subsection for PubMed, I know there's been a lot of work between sort of publishers and various other sort of companies and agencies, et cetera, looking at that.

Joanne Walker (18:50):

And I think it would be a fantastic idea, but it's very much still open to discussion. There's talks are underway, but it's a work in progress and trying to figure out all the different nuances of how you can sort of get these indexed and sort of compliantly, et cetera.

Joanne Walker (19:12):

So, I think in the first instance then, these should all then be in PubMed because that's just the natural home for this type of content. So, I think more ways should be done as well to try and get as much content as possible, and to make other publishers know that PLS can be indexed on PubMed as well. So, there's still work to be done there.

Adeline Rosenberg (19:30):

Yeah, completely agree.

Caroline Halford (19:31):

Okay. Jo, do you have any other comments that you want to add before we move on to the next question?

Joanne Walker (19:38):

Yeah, so I think the main thing in terms of metrics, I think that could be a sort of a whole new conversation about metrics of digital features. But I think the main thing is to sort of really for people who are sort of planning publications to think about what metric of the digital feature that they want to measure and how they can do that with the publisher or with the journal, and how the journal can help them sort of capture that information.

Joanne Walker (20:01):

Or if that journal can't capture that specific information, can they then think about using Figshare or other sort of YouTube or videos, et cetera. And then thinking about the metrics that that platform provides. So, I really just think it depends on what you want to know upfront.

Joanne Walker (20:16):

You need to plan for that rather than sort of trying to reactively think, "Oh, I wonder how many have done it." And then you can't actually measure that, which sort of maybe ... I know everyone always talks about sort of ROI on these sort of digital features as well. So, I think that knowing what metrics you want to measure up front is just key.

Caroline Halford (20:35):

Yeah, that's an excellent point actually. So much easier to decide that at the beginning, then you can work with the different platforms to see if that's possible. Thank you, Jo. That's a great comment there.

Caroline Halford (20:47):

Okay, so moving on to a different topic here: we had a question from an audience member, it's another comment: "Publishers need to better understand that digital features are shown upfront to maximize accessibility. Stop burying them in the supplementing material where nobody could find them."

Joanne Walker (21:10):

Okay, Jo, can I ask you to address this, please?

Joanne Walker (21:15):

Yeah, so this is a tricky question. I mean, it's one that is so important. Again, it's ROI for these features, we need to make everything discoverable and accessible, that sort of thing. And I know that publishers do have that in mind when they publish these features, but they're often sort of constrained by their journal platforms.

Joanne Walker (21:35):

Many of the systems that publishers work on are quite outdated, and then if they want to do an update with that company, it can be quite costly, not very cost-effective. If you have an article, you want to publish a video, but you only have that one article and that one video, and it could cost thousands to actually publish that video on the platform, it doesn't really make it make it cost-effective. So, it's kind of a chicken and egg situation really.

Joanne Walker (22:03):

I think also publishers really need to take a sort of step back sometimes and think about how their content is read by their readers. They need to take that reader journey and think, right, so I'm coming across an article, what's the best way for me to find the digital feature, the infographic, that sort of thing.

Joanne Walker (22:21):

So, I think yeah, publishers just need to do that, but again, cost for that time, et cetera. So, I think it's all very much a work-in-progress. I know there's that specific tag on PubMed, for instance, where you can tag plain language summary so that they're findable on PubMed.

Joanne Walker (22:40):

So, you can just publish or share that information with the indexing in the metadata with PubMed. And then PubMed sort of tag the articles accordingly. So, it'd be really good if any articles got an infographic, graphical abstract, could be tagged to say that they have that information.

Joanne Walker (22:56):

So, then people can go along if they want to find sort of ... if they're looking at breast cancer graphical abstract, they could then pull up all those articles on breast cancer that have a graphical abstract. But

again, this would have to be a work-in-progress, and could be part of this sort of ecosystem that we're looking to develop for publishing digital features.

Joanne Walker (23:15):

I don't know if you had any sort of thoughts, Adeline. You are probably coming more from the reader perspective as well.

Adeline Rosenberg (23:22):

Yes. I mean, speaking from experience, if you are constrained to only including your digital features in the supplement, which is still better than not doing them at all, you can always signpost or signal to their existence in the supplement. Even in the abstract, just ending with a sentence saying, a plain language summary is available in the supplement.

Adeline Rosenberg (23:40):

And then that way, readers know to go look in the supplement to find it. And also, if it's in the abstract, that sentence will be pulled through to PubMed. So, even if the digital feature in the supplement is not on PubMed itself, there's at least a signpost to it from the PubMed page.

Caroline Halford (24:02):

That's a really good idea, Adeline. Yeah, I really like the thought of thinking laterally there. Yeah, no, brilliant. Thank you. Well, hopefully, people will take up that tip, great tip for discoverability.

Caroline Halford (24:14):

Okay. Moving on to the next question here. So, another question was, "Hello, lots of great insights, thank you. Is there a way we can identify which journals permit publishing digital features like a platform which lists out journals offering digital features?"

Caroline Halford (24:34):

Now, Adeline, you are sort of working with all the clients and the authors to do this every day. Can you give your insights please?

Adeline Rosenberg (24:44):

Yep, so there's not currently sort of one platform or directory or list that we'd necessarily recommend in terms of those that are offering digital features. But we do tend to just go for those that we know are enhancement friendly. So, the likes of Future Science Group, Becaris, Adis, SAGE, Taylor & Francis.

Adeline Rosenberg (25:04):

There's many other individual journals out there as well, but for the most part, we would defer to those portfolios that we know are already doing it well. And ultimately, just ask the publisher as well, if we are wanting to go to another journal that isn't necessarily on our list, we would ask them. It's one thing that Kelly [Soldavin] always says is, ask the publisher.

Caroline Halford (25:28):

Yes, Kelly's always quite right actually. I'm sure you'd agree, Jo. Yeah, just from my perspective, I know publishers aren't always the best at advertising, the fact that they can do digital features. But if you

reach out to them, you might be surprised that they might be able to do it, even if it's not necessarily in their instructions for authors. So, good advice, Adeline. Thank you.

Joanne Walker (25:55):

I think people are a little bit afraid to reach out to publishers or editors that they might get their head bitten off for asking a ridiculous question. But I think publishers, well, from my perspective anyway — I'm probably very biased.

Joanne Walker (26:06):

But I think publishers are friendly, they like having that communication with authors. So, it's in our business to please authors. So, I think even if the journal says they can't do it, at least the author knows that that option's not available to them. So, I think it's just in the first instance as, yeah, Kelly from Taylor & Francis says, just ask the publisher, that's what we're here for.

Caroline Halford (26:28):

Oh, thank you, Jo. I appreciate your insights. Yeah, that's great advice there. Okay, so this is the last question before we sign off. So, the last question from our webinar was, "Thanks so much for the very informative session. Do you think featured articles or editorials focusing on digital features would help to engage the interests in developing these features?"

Caroline Halford (26:53):

What do you have to say?

Adeline Rosenberg (26:55):

Absolutely.

Joanne Walker (26:57):

Yeah, of course. I think, yeah, from the webinar, when we started looking into the background of the webinar, there's over a hundred articles or references on digital features. So, I think that's very good over a nice systematic review or an article that summarizes all this information. And that's something that definitely, we need to do more of, through webinars, articles, podcasts, that sort of thing as well.

Adeline Rosenberg (27:27):

And it's something that we're also working on in progress currently. So, I'd say keep your eyes peeled for more content.

Caroline Halford (27:34):

Great. Thank you, Adeline. Well, I hope all the audience will keep their eyes peeled. Okay. So, thank you, both, for your answers and your insights, and for taking the time to answer all these questions from our ISMPP U Webinar.

Caroline Halford (27:48):

It looks like we're just about out of time. If you are interested in the original ISMPP U Webinar, please go to the ISMPP website, or find the link in the description or written transcript of this podcast. The webinar is free to members.

Caroline Halford (28:04):

Thank you for listening to InformED for Medical Communication Professionals. Please take a minute to subscribe to the show on your favorite podcast app, inform your colleagues, and rate our show highly if you like what you heard today.

Caroline Halford (28:20):
We hope you'll also join us at an upcoming ISMPP U Webinar or even consider becoming a member of our association. Just go to ismpp.org to learn more. I'm Caroline Halford, goodbye.

References

1. Lobban D, Oliver J, *et al.* Do healthcare professionals really value plain language summaries? Original abstracts from the 2022 European Meeting of ISMPP. *Curr Med Res Opin.* 2022;38(sup1):25-45. DOI: 10.1080/03007995.2022.2044117
2. Halford C, Evans M, *et al.* Plain language summary formats: opinions and preferences of healthcare professionals. Original abstracts from the 19th Annual Meeting of ISMPP. *Curr Med Res Opin.* 2023;39(sup1):5-39.
3. Gadiot R, Hanekamp E, *et al.* Medical information consumption and sharing practices in rare diseases – a clinician perspective. Original abstracts from the 18th Annual Meeting of ISMPP. *Curr Med Res Opin.* 2022;38(sup1):5-24. DOI: 10.1080/03007995.2022.2055262