

WEBVTT

00:00:42.000 --> 00:00:43.000

00:00:43.000 --> 00:00:44.000

00:00:44.000 --> 00:00:45.000

00:00:45.000 --> 00:00:46.000  
> MILDRED CHO: Good morning.

00:00:46.000 --> 00:00:49.000  
I see that there are people still trickling in.

00:00:49.000 --> 00:00:59.000  
I will slowly start the introduction to let people join.

00:00:59.000 --> 00:01:14.000  
Happy that you're here joining us today for a session on publishing in bioethics journals what you need to know.

00:01:14.000 --> 00:01:23.000  
I'm Mildred Cho on publishing and grant writing that I will announce at the end of this session.

00:01:23.000 --> 00:01:30.000  
TraineeHub provides a central location for trainees and early career scholars.

00:01:30.000 --> 00:01:42.000  
If you are new to this that means ethical and legal and implications of genomics.

00:01:42.000 --> 00:02:05.000  
It is run by for trainees and assisting in Webinars and workshops on other ends of topics chosen by TraineeHub community.

00:02:05.000 --> 00:02:15.000  
It is sponsored by provides to support health research and events like this to serve scholars, scientist, policymakers, journalist, trainees, members of the publics and others to gain in ELSI issues.

00:02:15.000 --> 00:02:18.000  
Please visit [ELSIhub.org](http://ELSIhub.org) for related references that you will see on the chat box.

00:02:18.000 --> 00:02:31.000

To join the ELSI scholar directory.

00:02:31.000 --> 00:02:40.000

Also you can sign up for newsletters and other events for this one at ELSIhub.org and get news on LinkedIn and Twitter.

00:02:40.000 --> 00:02:43.000

House cleaning if you wish to use closed captioning use the CC button on the bottom of the screen.

00:02:43.000 --> 00:02:47.000

We have a professional live captioner present.

00:02:47.000 --> 00:02:56.000

If you don't turn them on the live captions will not appear.

00:02:56.000 --> 00:03:05.000

For questions please use the Q&A button that you will find also at the bottom of your screen to writing the questions at any point during the session.

00:03:05.000 --> 00:03:14.000

The chat box is available for further engagement and will be posting links for resources referenced in the discussion there in the chat box.

00:03:14.000 --> 00:03:24.000

The recording of today assist session, very important to note the recording of this session will be available on ELSI hub following the session.

00:03:24.000 --> 00:03:29.000

If you have any questions at any time please e-mail [info@ELSIhub.org](mailto:info@ELSIhub.org).

00:03:29.000 --> 00:03:45.000

Now let me introduce our moderator Dr. Maya Sabatello.

00:03:45.000 --> 00:04:14.000

Dr. Sabatello is an Associate Professor of medical sciences of the certainty of precision center of genomics and thicks of Columbia University where she also codirects precision medicine ethics, politics and culture.

00:04:14.000 --> 00:04:18.000

A form litigator and ethical and social policy issues to biomedical technologies and gee know mistake information and big data and social structure and marginalized communities and individual rights and Dr. Sabatello NIH funded mixed method and community-based research program focus on ramification and data and

00:04:18.000 --> 00:04:26.000

Nonclinical setting.

00:04:26.000 --> 00:04:37.000

Adolescent and family and precision research medicine.

00:04:37.000 --> 00:04:44.000

Dr. Sabatello serves as a member of ASHG implication committee and review board of NIH research programs.

00:04:44.000 --> 00:04:48.000

Co-chairs and community engagement in genomics working group as well.

00:04:48.000 --> 00:04:49.000

So I will hand it over to you Maya.

00:04:49.000 --> 00:04:52.000

00:04:52.000 --> 00:04:54.000

> MAYA SABATELLO: Thank you so much, Mildred.

00:04:54.000 --> 00:04:59.000

Hi, everybody.

00:04:59.000 --> 00:05:08.000

I'm delighted to join you in this Webinar in bioethics journal.

00:05:08.000 --> 00:05:14.000

It is a first of the series of events on issues that we're planning for trainees and scholars.

00:05:14.000 --> 00:05:26.000

It plays the critical role of ELSI research and scholars themselves.

00:05:26.000 --> 00:05:39.000

The obvious peer review publication are resources and challenging issues and providing insurance for scientific quality.

00:05:39.000 --> 00:05:44.000

Publication in journal is a great way to have a voice in the area and uses of misuses of genetics and other new technologies in clinical, research, and daily live settings.

00:05:44.000 --> 00:06:01.000

To think of the ramification of individuals, communities and associate at large.

00:06:01.000 --> 00:06:06.000

Peer review publications are critical for professional development and

important process to self-reflect on our work as well as to provide a list of feedback is part of an interdisciplinary dialogue.

00:06:06.000 --> 00:06:13.000

Today's event is peer review on ethics journal.

00:06:13.000 --> 00:06:19.000

The next Webinar is schedule in scientific journals.

00:06:19.000 --> 00:06:25.000

A later session, which will be scheduled we will focus on authorship issues.

00:06:25.000 --> 00:06:43.000

We will begin with bioethics journals and components of ELSI research.

00:06:43.000 --> 00:06:53.000

It includes the ethics and thinking about the rights and wrongs of bio medicine as well as consideration of ethical principles in behavioral and research settings relate to broader social phenomenon and laws and policies.

00:06:53.000 --> 00:07:03.000

Moreover as a field and bio EM THIJs benefits in interdisciplinary works and methods.

00:07:03.000 --> 00:07:12.000

Therefore finding the right place for the work requires consideration of many factors, including content, approach, goals, audience, processes, and more.

00:07:12.000 --> 00:07:24.000

So today we're fortunate to have two experts in bioethics in publishing.

00:07:24.000 --> 00:07:28.000

Professor David Magnus and Dr. Holly Tabor the age of imperial bioethics and provide about the issues.

00:07:28.000 --> 00:07:30.000

How to choose the right bioethics journal for your work.

00:07:30.000 --> 00:07:37.000

What are the processes and challenges.

00:07:37.000 --> 00:07:43.000

What are some of the issues that we need to be mindful of working and submitting for publication.

00:07:43.000 --> 00:07:49.000

With that framework allow me to briefly introduce our go speakers.

00:07:49.000 --> 00:07:57.000

Dr. David Magnus is a Professor of Medicine and ethics.

00:07:57.000 --> 00:08:05.000

Professor of pediatrics and medicine and bio engineers and associate dean at Stanford university.

00:08:05.000 --> 00:08:14.000

He is the director for Stanford in bioethics and member of the clinics ethics committee.

00:08:14.000 --> 00:08:21.000

Past president of the associate of bioethics director and editor and chief of bioethics.

00:08:21.000 --> 00:08:41.000

Advice chair of the Irb or NIH research initiative.

00:08:41.000 --> 00:08:50.000

He is a member of the Stanford cell research oversight committee and has extensive experience on research and bioethics and research and the ethics of comparative research genetics genomics.

00:08:50.000 --> 00:08:55.000

Issue in patient communication and artificial intelligence and machine learning in bio medicine.

00:08:55.000 --> 00:09:11.000

Dr. Holly Tabor is Associate Professor of medicine at Stanford University.

00:09:11.000 --> 00:09:15.000

She is the Associate Director for clinical ethics and is the co-chair of the ethics committees at Stanford hospital and Lucille Children's Hospital.

00:09:15.000 --> 00:09:22.000

Ethical research and health care for people with disabilities.

00:09:22.000 --> 00:09:28.000

Received her PhD in epidemiology in Stanford in 2002.

00:09:28.000 --> 00:09:39.000

2005 to 2008 was medical ethics.

00:09:39.000 --> 00:09:43.000

Prior to her work at Stanford she spent 8 years as a faculty member for Seattle research and University of Washington.

00:09:43.000 --> 00:09:45.000

With that I will turn the floor to my colleagues.

00:09:45.000 --> 00:09:46.000

Dr. David Magnus.

00:09:46.000 --> 00:09:47.000

00:09:47.000 --> 00:09:49.000

>> DAVID MAGNUS: Thank you so much.

00:09:49.000 --> 00:09:50.000

I'm going to just share screen.

00:09:50.000 --> 00:09:56.000

Okay.

00:09:56.000 --> 00:09:58.000

Does this looking?

00:09:58.000 --> 00:10:07.000

Thanks very much for having me.

00:10:07.000 --> 00:10:13.000

Always a pleasure to talk about publishing because it is something that I spent a lot of time to talk about.

00:10:13.000 --> 00:10:21.000

Disclosure I was the editor and chief for about a decade now.

00:10:21.000 --> 00:10:32.000

I'm also chair of the advisory board.

00:10:32.000 --> 00:10:36.000

They don't have an editor and chief but I'm a head of the advisory board and serves as board of editors.

00:10:36.000 --> 00:10:38.000

Let me start by saying what the functions of the journal are.

00:10:38.000 --> 00:10:50.000

Journals do different things.

00:10:50.000 --> 00:10:57.000

They serve a registration function like time stamping when articles come in which are important for publishing precedence in publishing.

00:10:57.000 --> 00:11:04.000

They archive and giving people access to past research and vet articles for quality.

00:11:04.000 --> 00:11:07.000

That's why we have the peer and editorial review process and interest review for the process.

00:11:07.000 --> 00:11:14.000

Disseminate the article.

00:11:14.000 --> 00:11:17.000

The last two points are credibly important for producing style and copy editing and type setting.

00:11:17.000 --> 00:11:23.000

Otherwise people can write their things and post them online.

00:11:23.000 --> 00:11:31.000

Increasingly, one thing that is interesting and I think I gave a reference of the article.

00:11:31.000 --> 00:11:37.000

There is talk about trying to pry apart the journal to have different groups play different parts of that role.

00:11:37.000 --> 00:11:44.000

Things like achieve is an example of something that is doing some of those things but not all of them.

00:11:44.000 --> 00:11:48.000

Just a broad landscape of bio ethic journals.

00:11:48.000 --> 00:11:52.000

There is empirical and nonempirical.

00:11:52.000 --> 00:11:56.000

That mostly means qualitative and social science research.

00:11:56.000 --> 00:12:00.000

There are some journal that specialize in publishing those things.

00:12:00.000 --> 00:12:05.000

Holly will talk about those in a minute.

00:12:05.000 --> 00:12:08.000

Journals that don't publish them as often will sometimes publish those works.

00:12:08.000 --> 00:12:18.000

There are nonempirical.

00:12:18.000 --> 00:12:21.000

Most primarily publish nonempirical which is a conceptual or normative nature or legal nature.

00:12:21.000 --> 00:12:32.000

Sometimes the lines can be hard to draw.

00:12:32.000 --> 00:12:40.000

Of course sometimes articles that are superficially start off as empirical can transform as normative.

00:12:40.000 --> 00:13:10.000

We often publish them like that that started their life like empirical pieces before a normal piece.

00:13:10.000 --> 00:13:20.000

In terms of the landscape and niches that different journals occupy these are different factors and article lengths and vary as journals as short pieces and a couple of thousands words and length to journals like Kennedy Institute journal which publish 15,000-word pieces and also a continuum of disciplinary and interdisciplinary.

00:13:20.000 --> 00:13:26.000

There are some that are philosophical and aimed as philosophers that do bioethics and others that are meant to reach a broader interdisciplinary audience.

00:13:26.000 --> 00:13:35.000

They vary somewhat by topic.

00:13:35.000 --> 00:13:37.000

Like our journal and Hastings and other journals and the journal of clinical ethics.

00:13:37.000 --> 00:13:39.000

There is some variation and format.

00:13:39.000 --> 00:13:51.000

I will talk about our format a little bit.

00:13:51.000 --> 00:13:56.000

There is a distinction at least for now at least for open access journals and charge author fees and subscription journals.

00:13:56.000 --> 00:14:03.000

There is also the impact of the journal in thinking of where you want to publish and the evaluation.

00:14:03.000 --> 00:14:13.000

There is a lot of different ways of measuring impact and a lot of controversy about the different ways it is utilized.

00:14:13.000 --> 00:14:21.000

I do think one thing it is very important to distinguish the evaluation of scholars or individual articles from the evaluation of journals that publish them.

00:14:21.000 --> 00:14:25.000

Unfortunately promotions and communities inflate these and is highly problematic.

00:14:25.000 --> 00:14:38.000

I wrote a piece of overthrowing the impact factor about this.

00:14:38.000 --> 00:14:40.000

There are a number of pieces that are critical about some of the common bibliometric tools.

00:14:40.000 --> 00:14:48.000

It is not the only bibliometric measure.

00:14:48.000 --> 00:14:54.000

There is a five year impact factor and Eigan factor.

00:14:54.000 --> 00:14:58.000

Our journal and bioethics is the top bioethics journals by most of these bibliometric measures.

00:14:58.000 --> 00:15:06.000

Not all and there are different ways to look at that.

00:15:06.000 --> 00:15:10.000

There are separate tools that are meant for and designed for libraries and what they wanted to subscribe to.

00:15:10.000 --> 00:15:16.000

Which is what these bibliometric tools were for.

00:15:16.000 --> 00:15:39.000

There are other bibliometric tools and articles as opposed to journals like the H index.

00:15:39.000 --> 00:15:46.000

Publishers and other folks are looking at alt metrics and are transparent and these are the things that how often is your article cited by blog post and how often is it tweeted out and how much impact is it having in social media, Facebook pages and all those kinds of things.

00:15:46.000 --> 00:15:48.000

That is called Alt metrics and paid attention to in the public industry.

00:15:48.000 --> 00:15:53.000

Researchship.

00:15:53.000 --> 00:15:59.000

readership.

00:15:59.000 --> 00:16:02.000

This is fairly good number.

00:16:02.000 --> 00:16:13.000

They all matter for the publishers.

00:16:13.000 --> 00:16:17.000

I can tell you that what our impact factor last year came out we were the number five impact number in tailor advances in the many advances journals.

00:16:17.000 --> 00:16:19.000

That gives us and is important for research and things like that.

00:16:19.000 --> 00:16:26.000

My journal, being more specific.

00:16:26.000 --> 00:16:31.000

The American Journal of Bioethics we typically publish to besides editorial.

00:16:31.000 --> 00:16:39.000

We publish target articles that are 5,000 to 7,000 words in length.

00:16:39.000 --> 00:16:45.000

We have special issues and publish more of those and make it shorter around 4,000 to 5,000 words.

00:16:45.000 --> 00:16:49.000

We also publish open peer commentaries and commentaries on the articles themselves.

00:16:49.000 --> 00:16:55.000

Those are up to 1500 words.

00:16:55.000 --> 00:16:57.000

Those open peer commentaries are VITed.

00:16:57.000 --> 00:16:58.000

invited.

00:16:58.000 --> 00:17:06.000

I recommend that you sign up.

00:17:06.000 --> 00:17:18.000

You can send an e-mail to the editor at American Journal of Bioethics.

00:17:18.000 --> 00:17:20.000

Reach us and get put on the list for fourth coming target articles and submit proposals to be invited to write an open peer article.

00:17:20.000 --> 00:17:34.000

What are we looking for a target article?

00:17:34.000 --> 00:17:42.000

We want well written papers that are fairly substantial and 5,000 and 7,000-word length is substantial.

00:17:42.000 --> 00:17:48.000

It is not just for a philosophy audience it needs to be disciplinary and different disciplinaries can read.

00:17:48.000 --> 00:17:55.000

Scientist, physicians, philosopher, lawyers can read.

00:17:55.000 --> 00:18:00.000

We want things that are original and also looking for topics that generate open peer commentaries.

00:18:00.000 --> 00:18:04.000

An article that you think nobody is going to disagree or have anything to say about this.

00:18:04.000 --> 00:18:08.000

Even if it is a really good article it not a good fit for a job.

00:18:08.000 --> 00:18:09.000

We do publish empirical papers.

00:18:09.000 --> 00:18:17.000

Rarely.

00:18:17.000 --> 00:18:24.000

We send empirical submissions to our daughter journal and bioethics that you will hear in a moment.

00:18:24.000 --> 00:18:35.000

We publish neural ethic pieces and send those to our daughter journals.

00:18:35.000 --> 00:18:46.000

We will talk about the latest journal and as NOERNL avenue for a daughter journey that we send things too.

00:18:46.000 --> 00:18:52.000

For the commentaries, if they are not invited we invite them to write commentaries and have small other folks that are experts.

00:18:52.000 --> 00:18:56.000

Proposals are reviewed and evaluated on the range of perspectives and proposals.

00:18:56.000 --> 00:19:03.000

We get a lot of proposals and we reject most of them.

00:19:03.000 --> 00:19:08.000

So we get a lot of overlapping or similar proposals and hard to choose among them.

00:19:08.000 --> 00:19:16.000

The track records of those do matter in some of those kinds of choices.

00:19:16.000 --> 00:19:23.000

I do want to say one thing that we changed in response to the growing challenges of the traditional methods of operating.

00:19:23.000 --> 00:19:29.000

Usually journals are passive and waiting for whatever comes in and waiting for articles to show up from authors.

00:19:29.000 --> 00:19:33.000

This passive approach has some advantages and undesirable consequences.

00:19:33.000 --> 00:19:38.000

We might not get timely articles to publish on and cutting edge.

00:19:38.000 --> 00:19:42.000

Chat GPT is a hot issue.

00:19:42.000 --> 00:19:49.000

We wanted to reach out to top people in the field to do that.

00:19:49.000 --> 00:19:58.000

We have a special issue that is sending out in peer commentaries in a couple of weeks.

00:19:58.000 --> 00:20:03.000

The other reality is that medical schools want high impact and largely

scientific medical journals.

00:20:03.000 --> 00:20:10.000

Ours is seen as relatively high.

00:20:10.000 --> 00:20:29.000

That shift means that there is most bioethics literary, I'm guilty.

00:20:29.000 --> 00:20:34.000

I'm publishing empirical research and in scientific or medical journals in short or policy form type PPT that I can publish in science or nature genetics or nature bio tech or jam art in the journal.

00:20:34.000 --> 00:20:38.000

Those are in the nature less normative.

00:20:38.000 --> 00:20:45.000

This shift has led to more work in the people in the field.

00:20:45.000 --> 00:20:51.000

We decided to change that by actively recruiting people that are leaders to write that article.

00:20:51.000 --> 00:20:56.000

Reaching out to people like Sandra Lee.

00:20:56.000 --> 00:20:57.000

She did a piece as part of this effort in precision medicine.

00:20:57.000 --> 00:21:16.000

It is also challenging.

00:21:16.000 --> 00:21:19.000

If you wait for whatever comes over the voice of scholars in underrepresented people like BIPOC and member that are disabled and gender diversity have been left out.

00:21:19.000 --> 00:21:22.000

We do have special issues on different topics.

00:21:22.000 --> 00:21:27.000

We have a series called frontiers articles.

00:21:27.000 --> 00:21:29.000

These are ones that we're researching out and inviting people to produce those things.

00:21:29.000 --> 00:21:35.000

We're actually asking them to publish.

00:21:35.000 --> 00:21:41.000

It still goes through a peer review process but often expedited.

00:21:41.000 --> 00:21:58.000

For an example tied to the meeting we have an issue that came out in the journal.

00:21:58.000 --> 00:22:02.000

That was a good example of internal process that ELSI/ELSIhub had for selecting among the submissions to pick a handful of articles that would be published as target articles in this special issue.

00:22:02.000 --> 00:22:16.000

Then somebody from ELSIhub was identified as a peer reviewer.

00:22:16.000 --> 00:22:19.000

We used our associate revised and large call and we got a lot of responses.

00:22:19.000 --> 00:22:22.000

It is a pretty large volume.

00:22:22.000 --> 00:22:38.000

The similarly for DEI issues.

00:22:38.000 --> 00:22:46.000

We've been trying to figure out ways to decrease diversity within the journal and to increase our content for in the space as well as focusing on issues of equity.

00:22:46.000 --> 00:22:47.000

I think COVID as well as death of black people and police.

00:22:47.000 --> 00:22:50.000

It is something that just happened.

00:22:50.000 --> 00:22:59.000

You have to consciously and reflectively do this.

00:22:59.000 --> 00:23:01.000

It is just too easy for unintentional bias to who gets included to the table and gender bias.

00:23:01.000 --> 00:23:11.000

I'm an old white male.

00:23:11.000 --> 00:23:20.000

A lot of my friends are fellow prominent people in the field and there is old white male and there is tendency to think of those people.

00:23:20.000 --> 00:23:21.000

People like me have to do the work to really make sure that we're trying to be open and inviting to have other voices in the room.

00:23:21.000 --> 00:23:25.000

This is the confession.

00:23:25.000 --> 00:23:27.000

I actually started looking at who is on our editorial board?

00:23:27.000 --> 00:23:39.000

Who is playing different roles?

00:23:39.000 --> 00:23:45.000

We made a decision to change the nature of who is playing those roles to increase the diversity of our boards and reviewers and authors as well as to increase the topics that we cover.

00:23:45.000 --> 00:23:54.000

I want to end by just mentioning something that I think is pointing to a potential future direction of publishing.

00:23:54.000 --> 00:23:59.000

Bioethics is wildly successful and I do worry we are the present and not the future.

00:23:59.000 --> 00:24:17.000

Some of these things I'm interested and the direction of the future can go.

00:24:17.000 --> 00:24:20.000

Bioethics open research, which is an F1000 platform that is owned by Taylor and Frances is an open access transparent features and achieve that includes peer review as part of the process.

00:24:20.000 --> 00:24:24.000

It is an interesting experiment in publishing.

00:24:24.000 --> 00:24:35.000

Bioethics research is a platform and has an ISN.

00:24:35.000 --> 00:24:40.000

It counts as a journal and has gate ways within it and American journal open research is a gateway within that platform.

00:24:40.000 --> 00:24:42.000

That is analogous to our daughter journals.

00:24:42.000 --> 00:24:47.000

We will sometimes send articles their way.

00:24:47.000 --> 00:24:51.000

It is an open access scholar publication.

00:24:51.000 --> 00:24:54.000

They are really trying to maximize the potential of use of research.

00:24:54.000 --> 00:24:57.000

It is a very innovative approach.

00:24:57.000 --> 00:25:09.000

Others are trying to do similar kinds of things.

00:25:09.000 --> 00:25:15.000

People submit their articles, once it is submitted there is an internal set of checks for conflicts of interest, style, scope.

00:25:15.000 --> 00:25:20.000

It is within the scope and this is review is done by the advisory board.

00:25:20.000 --> 00:25:27.000

There is no substantive peer review and it just gets published.

00:25:27.000 --> 00:25:29.000

A DOI is issued and index and Google scholar and then the peer review process happens.

00:25:29.000 --> 00:25:33.000

There is a peer review and user commenting.

00:25:33.000 --> 00:25:40.000

It is open for people to publish commentaries on it.

00:25:40.000 --> 00:25:44.000

Invited peer reviewers actually publish peer review with their own DOI's assigned.

00:25:44.000 --> 00:25:52.000

Then the authors can make revisions to their articles.

00:25:52.000 --> 00:26:03.000

Those revisions and all the different versions of the article as it changes can be revised and put published online.

00:26:03.000 --> 00:26:04.000

Then once the reviewers review has passed and gets two reviews it actually gets index in scopist and hub net and so on.

00:26:04.000 --> 00:26:16.000

That is the process.

00:26:16.000 --> 00:26:17.000

I think it is an interesting approach to publishing and we're going to see a lot more to the profound changes in the industry and talk more about in the question and answer session.

00:26:17.000 --> 00:26:23.000

Okay.

00:26:23.000 --> 00:26:24.000

Thank you very much.

00:26:24.000 --> 00:26:25.000

00:26:25.000 --> 00:26:26.000

>> HOLLY TABOR: Okay.

00:26:26.000 --> 00:26:28.000

I think it is my turn now.

00:26:28.000 --> 00:26:29.000

Maya, is that okay?

00:26:29.000 --> 00:26:31.000

Great.

00:26:31.000 --> 00:26:32.000

Can someone tell me if --

00:26:32.000 --> 00:26:33.000

>> MAYA SABATELLO: Yep.

00:26:33.000 --> 00:26:35.000

We can see it.

00:26:35.000 --> 00:26:38.000

Thank you, Holly.

00:26:38.000 --> 00:26:40.000

>> HOLLY TABOR: Can you see my slides, Maya.

00:26:40.000 --> 00:26:41.000

>> MAYA SABATELLO: We can see your slides.

00:26:41.000 --> 00:26:42.000

>> HOLLY TABOR: Thank you.

00:26:42.000 --> 00:26:45.000

David is hard to follow.

00:26:45.000 --> 00:26:49.000

I want to say thank you and so many names.

00:26:49.000 --> 00:27:00.000

I think our goal is to have this be useful to everyone today.

00:27:00.000 --> 00:27:06.000

I'm an assistant professor in the department of medicine in Stanford and bioethics of medicine.

00:27:06.000 --> 00:27:12.000

I'm the editor and chief.

00:27:12.000 --> 00:27:14.000

As David mentioned it is a daughter journal of a job.

00:27:14.000 --> 00:27:21.000

We do a different and important way.

00:27:21.000 --> 00:27:24.000

We do focus on publishing the empirical scholarship in qualitative and quantitative research.

00:27:24.000 --> 00:27:31.000

I will talk more about that in a second.

00:27:31.000 --> 00:27:34.000

Unlike AJOB we do not have target articles.

00:27:34.000 --> 00:27:36.000

Like AJOB we have a 4,000-word limit.

00:27:36.000 --> 00:27:40.000

We do have a rare exception for that.

00:27:40.000 --> 00:27:42.000

It is important to know when considering your work.

00:27:42.000 --> 00:27:48.000

We are published four times a year.

00:27:48.000 --> 00:27:51.000

We also allow suggestions of reviewers when people submit manuscripts.

00:27:51.000 --> 00:27:53.000

What are we looking for in an article?

00:27:53.000 --> 00:27:55.000  
This is from the journal website.

00:27:55.000 --> 00:27:59.000  
We can find this from there.

00:27:59.000 --> 00:28:04.000  
As you can see it is moderatorly brood.

00:28:04.000 --> 00:28:13.000  
It has value in the field and I will talk about that in audiences in the minute.

00:28:13.000 --> 00:28:21.000  
Areas are conceptual analyze and research and empirical research.

00:28:21.000 --> 00:28:33.000  
I think one of the key comments here is when in doubt you are encouraged to contact us or me directly.

00:28:33.000 --> 00:28:36.000  
We don't mind and actually appreciate reviewing some of those request in advance to save everybody time to guide people in the right place to submit their work.

00:28:36.000 --> 00:28:50.000  
What is empirical bioethics?

00:28:50.000 --> 00:28:53.000  
There are amazing scholars that have written substantial amounts and what is empirical bioethics and how does it fit in the landscape of bioethics and that is a longer talks.

00:28:53.000 --> 00:29:03.000  
I wanted to talk about a JOET.

00:29:03.000 --> 00:29:18.000  
Alex Kon talked about the original AJOB primary and different kinds of empirical research.

00:29:18.000 --> 00:29:25.000  
I really like this quote from Jim Dubbois about how empirical research and bioethics research is relevant to determine what is right or wrong, good or bad, respectful or disrespectful.

00:29:25.000 --> 00:29:30.000  
Caring or non-caring within a bioethics debate.

00:29:30.000 --> 00:29:42.000  
Best to speak of ethically relevant bioethics.

00:29:42.000 --> 00:29:46.000

This is a preface from Skip Nelson from the former editor of the journal when he became editor of the original journal.

00:29:46.000 --> 00:29:58.000

That has remained the same of the journals at the time.

00:29:58.000 --> 00:30:05.000

If you are an ELSI scholar or an ELSI trainee why would you consider submitting your work to AJOB empirical.

00:30:05.000 --> 00:30:09.000

I think about this a lot as someone that primarily trained in ELSI research and genetics.

00:30:09.000 --> 00:30:25.000

Part of it is the audiences and part of it is the format.

00:30:25.000 --> 00:30:37.000

One of the values of publishing in some of the genetics journals is that you have the opportunity to have your work shared more with people who are more likely to read traditional genetics journals and there is really really important for it.

00:30:37.000 --> 00:30:51.000

I think genetics audience benefit from having an ethical lens and think of the issue that some of us do for part of our work.

00:30:51.000 --> 00:31:01.000

I do think that AJOB provides a lot and we have scholars that review for editorial board and also read the AJOB empirical research.

00:31:01.000 --> 00:31:05.000

I think it allows bioethics focused audience in a way that can be really beneficial including and especially in the decisions of the field in emerging issues in ELSI.

00:31:05.000 --> 00:31:15.000

I think it is a different kind of audience in a way that is beneficial.

00:31:15.000 --> 00:31:24.000

If you look at the ELSI articles that have been published particularly over the last couple of years you can see the ELSI work that gets published there.

00:31:24.000 --> 00:31:26.000

I think we want very much and I like to think that we are one of the main journals where scholars and ELSI genetics can share their work.

00:31:26.000 --> 00:31:40.000

I think it is a really good thing.

00:31:40.000 --> 00:31:42.000

I think it is a kind of work to reach the genetics audience it is reasonable to think about that work geared towards more of the genetics journal instead.

00:31:42.000 --> 00:31:46.000

We can talk about that more in the discussion.

00:31:46.000 --> 00:31:48.000

Every journal now I think is having challenges in finding reviewers.

00:31:48.000 --> 00:31:55.000

I wanted to mention this.

00:31:55.000 --> 00:32:00.000

Some of you may be asked to be reviewers or given an opportunity to be a reviewer with a mentor if you are a trainee.

00:32:00.000 --> 00:32:07.000

If you are submitting the work reviewers will allow you to suggest reviewers.

00:32:07.000 --> 00:32:13.000

I think it is hard right now because people are busy and it is hard because of the pandemic and people are burned out.

00:32:13.000 --> 00:32:18.000

It makes it challenging for the process and makes it to take much longer for the review process to happen.

00:32:18.000 --> 00:32:23.000

It takes longer to resubmit and rejection and elsewhere.

00:32:23.000 --> 00:32:28.000

It takes longer to get things for publication.

00:32:28.000 --> 00:32:30.000

When someone asks you to be a reviewer please say yes or consider saying yes.

00:32:30.000 --> 00:32:43.000

Obviously there is an upper limit to that.

00:32:43.000 --> 00:32:49.000

I once got a certificate from a journal years ago for being a extremely exceptional reviewer and I was worried it was a sign I was

saying yes too often.

00:32:49.000 --> 00:32:57.000

It is an important activity to allow trainees about the publication process.

00:32:57.000 --> 00:33:00.000

Especially if they are given the opportunity to coreview and disclose that to the journal editor and mentor if they are training.

00:33:00.000 --> 00:33:05.000

Please consider saying yes.

00:33:05.000 --> 00:33:07.000

When you suggest reviewers you can't suggest people that have a conflict.

00:33:07.000 --> 00:33:15.000

Suggest people that are likely to understand your work.

00:33:15.000 --> 00:33:21.000

We have ways of finding your reviewers and we have a system to find good reviewers and suggestions are really important.

00:33:21.000 --> 00:33:26.000

Together we can help make the review process for effective and stream lined.

00:33:26.000 --> 00:33:33.000

That is something that I think about when I'm asked to review things these days.

00:33:33.000 --> 00:33:38.000

I want to talk about the trainees and important about the wonderful sessions that Sarah is organizing.

00:33:38.000 --> 00:33:41.000

It is not just important in ELSI.

00:33:41.000 --> 00:33:47.000

I can tell you that some people don't seem to know this.

00:33:47.000 --> 00:33:54.000

The first tip is make sure you follow the instructions and use the correct format for the journal.

00:33:54.000 --> 00:34:00.000

Sections and length the abstract, citations, figures, other kinds of things and word count.

00:34:00.000 --> 00:34:12.000

When we get a good article that is twice the word limit we send it back.

00:34:12.000 --> 00:34:21.000

So don't, you will get more prompt answers to your journals and look more serious if you make sure to take the time to follow the instructions.

00:34:21.000 --> 00:34:23.000

This is important if you got a rejection from another journal and said they're not interested and you don't take the time to reformat.

00:34:23.000 --> 00:34:24.000

It is a pain but it is really important.

00:34:24.000 --> 00:34:31.000

I still do this.

00:34:31.000 --> 00:34:34.000

Look at the recently published papers in that journal.

00:34:34.000 --> 00:34:40.000

Recently being the last one or two years.

00:34:40.000 --> 00:34:42.000

I have some kind of work that I try to look at some kinds of journals.

00:34:42.000 --> 00:34:47.000

They are not publishing qualitative work.

00:34:47.000 --> 00:34:49.000

It is not a good time to get something that doesn't publish that kind of work.

00:34:49.000 --> 00:34:55.000

I think that is an important part of that.

00:34:55.000 --> 00:34:58.000

Write a strong cover letter and contextualize what it is trying to do and why it is important.

00:34:58.000 --> 00:35:02.000

We do read those and are helpful.

00:35:02.000 --> 00:35:06.000

Reviewers suggestions and getting good reviewers with SXERZ.

00:35:06.000 --> 00:35:10.000

expertise.

00:35:10.000 --> 00:35:15.000

Sometimes they ask you to not act as reviewers.

00:35:15.000 --> 00:35:18.000

Sometimes there are people that you have a strong reason should not be reviewers.

00:35:18.000 --> 00:35:29.000

That cannot be a long list but one or two people.

00:35:29.000 --> 00:35:33.000

I also think that as part, especially when you are new to publishing and submitting your work looking examples and responses.

00:35:33.000 --> 00:35:38.000

Learning and taught trainees to respond to reviews.

00:35:38.000 --> 00:35:46.000

Both when taking the suggestion and when you are choosing not to take the suggestion.

00:35:46.000 --> 00:35:54.000

You can really learn a lot about how to do that and being respectful and addressing every point.

00:35:54.000 --> 00:36:00.000

If you are changing the text, copy the response and the change you made to the text in the response to reviewers.

00:36:00.000 --> 00:36:02.000

It saves time for the reviewers and advisory submit.

00:36:02.000 --> 00:36:09.000

If you have the opportunity I recommend doing that.

00:36:09.000 --> 00:36:13.000

It will help you write better papers and respond to better refuse and responses.

00:36:13.000 --> 00:36:15.000

Let's take a quick minute to talk about social media and publication.

00:36:15.000 --> 00:36:16.000

Social media is important now.

00:36:16.000 --> 00:36:25.000

David alluded to this.

00:36:25.000 --> 00:36:29.000

There is some empirical data that actually sharing published articles on Twitter increases the dissemination.

00:36:29.000 --> 00:36:34.000

This is one example of several article that's looks at this.

00:36:34.000 --> 00:36:39.000

This is not in the bioethics literature obviously.

00:36:39.000 --> 00:36:43.000

Learning how to use social media to share articles is a skill.

00:36:43.000 --> 00:36:47.000

It is a skill that we are not taught.

00:36:47.000 --> 00:36:50.000

There is a lot of criticism in social media and the last year.

00:36:50.000 --> 00:37:01.000

I'm very sympathetic to that.

00:37:01.000 --> 00:37:10.000

I think there is still an important role that social media and Twitter play in terms of dissemination and articles after you have them published.

00:37:10.000 --> 00:37:12.000

Taylor and Frances that is a publisher of AJOB and empirical has resources to how to use Twitter as researchers.

00:37:12.000 --> 00:37:14.000

I recommend people to look at that.

00:37:14.000 --> 00:37:18.000

The link is at the bottom of the slide.

00:37:18.000 --> 00:37:26.000

Hopefully we can put it in the chat.

00:37:26.000 --> 00:37:30.000

It is in the website and infographics and statistics and Taylor article.

00:37:30.000 --> 00:37:32.000

I blew it up to be able to see it.

00:37:32.000 --> 00:37:44.000

I like the statistics.

00:37:44.000 --> 00:37:50.000

50% of the authors are planning to share and 44% are offering the publication in social media.

00:37:50.000 --> 00:38:05.000

63% are planning to share the history.

00:38:05.000 --> 00:38:11.000

Not just for sharing your own article but finding out things that are coming out by following specific journals and other thought leaders, other people that are active social media users in the field of bioethics.

00:38:11.000 --> 00:38:21.000

To the degree that I use Twitter I use it for those purposes and I find it useful and helpful.

00:38:21.000 --> 00:38:25.000

For those related to medicine I think finding out about what is going on.

00:38:25.000 --> 00:38:33.000

Obviously that cannot be the only way to do it but a good reason to learn this skill.

00:38:33.000 --> 00:38:41.000

I went to a workshop on leadership training for women in academic medicine a few years ago.

00:38:41.000 --> 00:38:47.000

Rusty-Shelton was a speaker and was a great book.

00:38:47.000 --> 00:38:51.000

Mastering New Media Landscape.

00:38:51.000 --> 00:38:55.000

I like how he shares academic perspective and articles.

00:38:55.000 --> 00:39:01.000

If you are someone that likes to learn things by reading I recommend this book.

00:39:01.000 --> 00:39:06.000

I recommended to several other people that found it useful as well.

00:39:06.000 --> 00:39:09.000

Building on what David said in diversity, equity, and bias.

00:39:09.000 --> 00:39:13.000

I think it is importance and a lot of work to do.

00:39:13.000 --> 00:39:19.000

I don't pretend to be an expert.

00:39:19.000 --> 00:39:25.000

I try to learn and figure out how to improve and do better.

00:39:25.000 --> 00:39:28.000

I wanted to mention this article and citational racism.

00:39:28.000 --> 00:39:44.000

The link is in the bottom of the slide.

00:39:44.000 --> 00:39:47.000

I think there is all sorts of things we take for granted and how we do and cite things is one of the things that perpetuity biases and stigma that happens in academia and medicine more broadly.

00:39:47.000 --> 00:40:06.000

This is a scree shot from that article.

00:40:06.000 --> 00:40:15.000

Talking about how diversity must succeed near tokenism and thinking specifically in the case of this article and addressing citational and in this case how they're cited and flow and knowledge of the journals.

00:40:15.000 --> 00:40:21.000

The legacy of structural racism and field in decades.

00:40:21.000 --> 00:40:29.000

This is one of several really good articles of gender diversity and high impact articles.

00:40:29.000 --> 00:40:31.000

It won't surprise anybody that there is gender disparity.

00:40:31.000 --> 00:40:35.000

We're not even aware of that.

00:40:35.000 --> 00:40:45.000

I think it is the role of editors to think how to my at this gate that.

00:40:45.000 --> 00:41:01.000

It is also something we can do to do the work and citing articles is thinking about how we can be broad and inclusive in the kinds of things that we cite.

00:41:01.000 --> 00:41:05.000

This was really interesting article from 2021 about some of the biases that affect researchers trying to publish in this particular article

from Africa or other countries that are not in the Europe or United States in particular.

00:41:05.000 --> 00:41:10.000  
English is not the norm language.

00:41:10.000 --> 00:41:12.000  
A group of people were trying to start a different journal to promote education and researchers.

00:41:12.000 --> 00:41:38.000  
That is something that we think about a lot.

00:41:38.000 --> 00:41:49.000  
How we can encourage and support researchers who maybe didn't train in countries where they have the learning and exposure to know how to work our publication system effectively and how we can promote people's whose primary language is not English and access the opportunity to publish their work.

00:41:49.000 --> 00:41:57.000  
This is a good article about is there science beyond English and is there challenges for people where English is not their first language as well.

00:41:57.000 --> 00:42:06.000  
I don't know if anyone in this call doesn't have English as their primary language.

00:42:06.000 --> 00:42:08.000  
We are trying to help prepare publication to have their opportunity have their work considered for publication as well.

00:42:08.000 --> 00:42:10.000  
And finally I want to get to the Q&A.

00:42:10.000 --> 00:42:13.000  
Please reach out.

00:42:13.000 --> 00:42:16.000  
I think David has also said this.

00:42:16.000 --> 00:42:18.000  
This is all usually better to ask.

00:42:18.000 --> 00:42:22.000  
We don't mind taking questions.

00:42:22.000 --> 00:42:25.000  
I think that especially for trainees that is really important.

00:42:25.000 --> 00:42:29.000

Reach out to us and to the managing editor.

00:42:29.000 --> 00:42:38.000

Also reach out to your mentors to get advice about these things.

00:42:38.000 --> 00:42:41.000

I know that was really important for me when I was training and I think it is important for people that I'm mentoring that are trainees as well.

00:42:41.000 --> 00:42:42.000

I will stop to take Q&A.

00:42:42.000 --> 00:42:45.000

Thank you.

00:42:45.000 --> 00:42:50.000

>> MAYA SABATELLO: Thank you so much, Holly and David.

00:42:50.000 --> 00:42:56.000

That was fabulous and touches on so much issue that's are very important.

00:42:56.000 --> 00:43:00.000

I will take a couple of questions for both of you and then more questions that we've received from the audience.

00:43:00.000 --> 00:43:06.000

Folks, anyone that wants to send questions please do so.

00:43:06.000 --> 00:43:10.000

One is, how would you define a good review?

00:43:10.000 --> 00:43:13.000

We heard a lot about need for reviewers and review process.

00:43:13.000 --> 00:43:15.000

We heard about volunteer for review.

00:43:15.000 --> 00:43:17.000

What is a good review for you?

00:43:17.000 --> 00:43:20.000

>> DAVID MAGNUS: Well, I can start maybe.

00:43:20.000 --> 00:43:24.000

I think first it needs to be con instructive.

00:43:24.000 --> 00:43:27.000

It has to give feedback to the authors that are helpful.

00:43:27.000 --> 00:43:28.000

Things that are saying I don't like this aren't helpful.

00:43:28.000 --> 00:43:39.000

This is a great paper.

00:43:39.000 --> 00:43:42.000

Things that are substantive and demonstrate that there is a substantive evaluation of the article and constructive and helpful and improvement of the article.

00:43:42.000 --> 00:43:46.000

Think I that is the single most important thing.

00:43:46.000 --> 00:43:48.000

Second is transparent.

00:43:48.000 --> 00:43:53.000

Making sure that those two VIT.

00:43:53.000 --> 00:43:54.000

There is nothing more annoying and something that has an article.

00:43:54.000 --> 00:43:55.000

This has to change.

00:43:55.000 --> 00:43:57.000

This has to change.

00:43:57.000 --> 00:44:01.000

This has to change.

00:44:01.000 --> 00:44:04.000

You know except with revision.

00:44:04.000 --> 00:44:08.000

When those things don't fit together that is frustrating.

00:44:08.000 --> 00:44:12.000

Really think of your final recommendation.

00:44:12.000 --> 00:44:16.000

Minor advisory submit, reject.

00:44:16.000 --> 00:44:46.000

Make sure that the content of the feedback fits with that.

00:44:46.000 --> 00:44:55.000

And then into that, while there are sometimes rare cases that the feedback and something that they want to say to the editors is different than what they say to the authors, in general most of the comments and feedback we get in feedback to us would be beneficial to the authors themselves and so make sure as much it used to be very judicious to share to the editor that you don't share with the author as well.

00:44:55.000 --> 00:44:56.000

Some people leave the review part to us and say nothing and plan attitudes to the author and that is not helpful.

00:44:56.000 --> 00:44:57.000

> MAYA SABATELLO: Thank you.

00:44:57.000 --> 00:45:02.000

> HOLLY TABOR: I agree.

00:45:02.000 --> 00:45:06.000

I this I that I don't, there is different styles of review.

00:45:06.000 --> 00:45:10.000

I don't think there is one perfect way.

00:45:10.000 --> 00:45:15.000

As an editor we get used to people's specific styles.

00:45:15.000 --> 00:45:22.000

I think helping people make the paper better.

00:45:22.000 --> 00:45:25.000

Even if you are rejecting the paper or recommending rejection helping people make the paper better.

00:45:25.000 --> 00:45:30.000

Substantive things and both itself.

00:45:30.000 --> 00:45:37.000

If there is a problem with the study and realizing how it feels to get a crappy review.

00:45:37.000 --> 00:45:40.000

If you are saying something critical it is important to say something in the constructive way.

00:45:40.000 --> 00:45:45.000

We are trying to send articles that are not worth reviewing.

00:45:45.000 --> 00:45:48.000

There is an important part of respect to get a review.

00:45:48.000 --> 00:45:53.000

When I got critical review I appreciate that.

00:45:53.000 --> 00:45:55.000

I am not a fan review that try to word Smith and copy edit articles.

00:45:55.000 --> 00:46:08.000

There are people that like to do that.

00:46:08.000 --> 00:46:14.000

I'm not saying you can't do that, often times people are right that the recommendation they are making are good and important but I don't think that is so much of the best use of the time of the reviewers most of the time.

00:46:14.000 --> 00:46:15.000

Those are less substantive comments than the ones that David made.

00:46:15.000 --> 00:46:19.000

>> MAYA SABATELLO: Thank you.

00:46:19.000 --> 00:46:27.000

I want to bring you two questions that came from the audience.

00:46:27.000 --> 00:46:29.000

They are both relating to the suggestions that you've made of how interdisciplinary the work will be and important to the context.

00:46:29.000 --> 00:46:32.000

It involves membership.

00:46:32.000 --> 00:46:46.000

mentorship.

00:46:46.000 --> 00:47:01.000

If you are a new scholar, how can you pair with a more senior scholar in order to get published in bioethics journal.

00:47:01.000 --> 00:47:08.000

A related one is how do you find a match or a senior reviewer to get experience and get your hand in reviewing articles in bioethics journals.

00:47:08.000 --> 00:47:24.000

Both in the content of how to write and publish and review articles with a senior author.

00:47:24.000 --> 00:47:27.000

>> DAVID MAGNUS: So I would say for both bioethics publications and for publishing it cannot necessary but helpful to be working with someone that is senior.

00:47:27.000 --> 00:47:35.000

It can be helpful for two different reasons.

00:47:35.000 --> 00:47:42.000

Frankly people that are senior are more experienced and know more and beneficial because they can make your article better.

00:47:42.000 --> 00:47:44.000

Also the reality there is bias.

00:47:44.000 --> 00:47:48.000

The review by the editors is not.

00:47:48.000 --> 00:47:54.000

A medical journals neither of those are true.

00:47:54.000 --> 00:47:59.000

For scientific and medical journals, scientific journals they do not do blind reviews.

00:47:59.000 --> 00:48:11.000

The people will see the author list and the editors do as well.

00:48:11.000 --> 00:48:17.000

There is data showing that for the highest impact factor scientific and medical journals the biggest hurdle is getting sent out for peer review.

00:48:17.000 --> 00:48:20.000

To some extent the article but the letter head that is coming in for the article.

00:48:20.000 --> 00:48:23.000

That's certainly true for us as well.

00:48:23.000 --> 00:48:24.000

It is impossible to ignore that bias.

00:48:24.000 --> 00:48:29.000

It matters.

00:48:29.000 --> 00:48:35.000

If I have a piece from somebody that is prominent.

00:48:35.000 --> 00:48:38.000

We have posted pieces by postdoc and students and scholars.

00:48:38.000 --> 00:48:42.000  
I would say the bar is higher.

00:48:42.000 --> 00:48:45.000  
There is benefits to work with the senior people.

00:48:45.000 --> 00:48:52.000  
How to get is training program.

00:48:52.000 --> 00:48:57.000  
If you do a postdoc and get an opportunity to work with people who are senior at those places I think that can help.

00:48:57.000 --> 00:48:58.000  
ASBA is American humanities.

00:48:58.000 --> 00:49:02.000  
Some don't attend.

00:49:02.000 --> 00:49:19.000  
I strongly urge you to attend ASBH.

00:49:19.000 --> 00:49:33.000  
They have a number of ways to have systematic programs that you can sign up for ways for people to get hooked up with different mentors when you are a junior scholar in the field.

00:49:33.000 --> 00:49:35.000  
ELSI hub is a great way to build a relationship with junior people and senior people to build relationship that's can be fruitful for these collaborative relationships.

00:49:35.000 --> 00:49:39.000  
All of those are ways to hooking up.

00:49:39.000 --> 00:49:48.000  
The same is the way for review process.

00:49:48.000 --> 00:49:51.000  
We have a program that with he were encouraging our peer reviewers to reach out to junior people and trainees to work together on the peer review process.

00:49:51.000 --> 00:50:05.000  
We certainly support people trying to do that.

00:50:05.000 --> 00:50:07.000  
Again, for both of those things I think trying to find ways to get connected to mentors either through a training program or through ELSI

hub are or ASBH are good ways of making those connections.

00:50:07.000 --> 00:50:09.000  
>> MAYA SABATELLO: Thank you.

00:50:09.000 --> 00:50:21.000  
Holly anything to add?

00:50:21.000 --> 00:50:30.000  
>> HOLLY TABOR: I would just say I think if you find someone who is aligned with your training interest, even if they are not your official mentor reach out and try to build a relationship.

00:50:30.000 --> 00:50:31.000  
I have several trainees or people that I mentored that are not directly working with Stanford and done that over the years.

00:50:31.000 --> 00:50:33.000  
I've done that over the years.

00:50:33.000 --> 00:50:36.000  
It doesn't always work.

00:50:36.000 --> 00:50:38.000  
I think it can be really helpful for that.

00:50:38.000 --> 00:50:40.000  
And so that is an opportunity as well.

00:50:40.000 --> 00:50:44.000  
I think also asking other people.

00:50:44.000 --> 00:50:46.000  
If you have someone say I'm trying to learn about reviewing.

00:50:46.000 --> 00:50:50.000  
People can't just show you an article.

00:50:50.000 --> 00:50:54.000  
It is inappropriate for people to show you an article that they reviewed.

00:50:54.000 --> 00:51:00.000  
They can show you a review and response for their own article.

00:51:00.000 --> 00:51:03.000  
Asking people and saying I like your article on this and wonder what the review process is like for you.

00:51:03.000 --> 00:51:04.000

I would show that when you think of mine.

00:51:04.000 --> 00:51:05.000

That is one way to start.

00:51:05.000 --> 00:51:11.000

>> MAYA SABATELLO: Thank you.

00:51:11.000 --> 00:51:16.000

Thinking about folks that are trying to get into the world of research and writing in bioethics.

00:51:16.000 --> 00:51:30.000

Do you think and especially in the medical field there is one question here.

00:51:30.000 --> 00:51:32.000

Do you think that it would be better on focusing on adding some bioethics studies or more philosophy studies, which again that was originally the origin of bioethics.

00:51:32.000 --> 00:51:40.000

Do you think there is a difference?

00:51:40.000 --> 00:51:41.000

Do you have any thoughts about it or should we just go with whatever feels right to them or how should they make that decision?

00:51:41.000 --> 00:51:44.000

>> DAVID MAGNUS: Yeah.

00:51:44.000 --> 00:51:46.000

I would say that the field is interSGLIRN.

00:51:46.000 --> 00:51:53.000

disciplinary.

00:51:53.000 --> 00:52:06.000

It is what is their expertise and be aware of the connection and the style of writing and the place that they're submitting.

00:52:06.000 --> 00:52:24.000

If you write a dense and philosophical piece another philosopher would understand don't submit it to AJOB.

00:52:24.000 --> 00:52:30.000

On the other hand it is a skill that is worth learning how to write and publish in medical and scientific journals and publish in interdisciplinary journals.

00:52:30.000 --> 00:52:38.000

I would not say it doesn't matter but be aware and get mentored by senior people.

00:52:38.000 --> 00:52:40.000

If you are luckily to have an academic job or postdoc get a trainee and get an academic job.

00:52:40.000 --> 00:52:43.000

Think about where you are and where you want to be.

00:52:43.000 --> 00:52:58.000

There are different standards in different places.

00:52:58.000 --> 00:53:04.000

If you are in a place where medical humanities is really the way to go and they want and interested in books and very lengthy things from that are more humanistic and more philosophical then that is what you should do.

00:53:04.000 --> 00:53:19.000

If that is the kind of job you want and wined up, then that is where you should be aiming at.

00:53:19.000 --> 00:53:29.000

On the other hand if you want to be in a medical certainty and you have to go through appointment committee then you have to think differently about the criteria and learn that skill.

00:53:29.000 --> 00:53:30.000

That is part of good mentorship in the training program and junior faculty of wherever you wined up.

00:53:30.000 --> 00:53:37.000

>> MAYA SABATELLO: Thank you.

00:53:37.000 --> 00:53:42.000

We have a few more minutes and target you for the questions and hopefully get through some more.

00:53:42.000 --> 00:53:51.000

One question is about, Holly you mentioned the challenges of finding reviewers.

00:53:51.000 --> 00:53:53.000

How long would it be reasonable for authors to wait before nudging you about what is going on with their manuscript?

00:53:53.000 --> 00:53:56.000

>> HOLLY TABOR: That is a good question.

00:53:56.000 --> 00:54:05.000  
You can nudge whenever you want.

00:54:05.000 --> 00:54:07.000  
It is very rare that we have an answer or know anything in less than four weeks for AJOB empirical.

00:54:07.000 --> 00:54:14.000  
Other journals is longer.

00:54:14.000 --> 00:54:18.000  
Don't think it is with the pandemic and people being burnt out and sick.

00:54:18.000 --> 00:54:21.000  
We have a reviewer that are willing to do it and have a crisis.

00:54:21.000 --> 00:54:25.000  
We try to be supportive of people.

00:54:25.000 --> 00:54:27.000  
Many of you are reviewers that asked for an extension.

00:54:27.000 --> 00:54:33.000  
Six weeks is ideal.

00:54:33.000 --> 00:54:37.000  
I don't get mad if someone asks before then but I don't have a good answer.

00:54:37.000 --> 00:54:42.000  
When you are a reviewer and guilty on being late in my reviews.

00:54:42.000 --> 00:54:44.000  
When you are a reviewer review promptly because someone is usually waiting.

00:54:44.000 --> 00:54:48.000  
They want to move on.

00:54:48.000 --> 00:54:50.000  
If this journal isn't going to work for them they want to more on.

00:54:50.000 --> 00:54:54.000  
>> MAYA SABATELLO: Fair enough.

00:54:54.000 --> 00:54:57.000  
Another question is the aspect of single and multiple authorships.

00:54:57.000 --> 00:55:04.000  
David maybe you can pick it up.

00:55:04.000 --> 00:55:10.000  
We discussed the value of co-authorship especially with more senior authors.

00:55:10.000 --> 00:55:20.000  
There is a question, one, is there still room for single authorship.

00:55:20.000 --> 00:55:25.000  
Two, that might be relevant in the context of PhD thesis where folks are trying to split their thesis into parts and pieces.

00:55:25.000 --> 00:55:31.000  
Is that something that we should think about and does it have a place of bioethics?

00:55:31.000 --> 00:55:35.000  
>> DAVID MAGNUS: I think it still has a place and we do still publish that.

00:55:35.000 --> 00:55:39.000  
What Holly said about the articles that people publish.

00:55:39.000 --> 00:55:40.000  
I do notice that there are fewer that are single authored.

00:55:40.000 --> 00:55:43.000  
We have some.

00:55:43.000 --> 00:55:48.000  
They are getting rare and rare.

00:55:48.000 --> 00:55:52.000  
Even OPC are all single and now they are two, three, four.

00:55:52.000 --> 00:55:53.000  
I can't say that matters much with the OPC's.

00:55:53.000 --> 00:55:54.000  
It is the case.

00:55:54.000 --> 00:56:01.000  
It is getting rare and rare.

00:56:01.000 --> 00:56:06.000  
If you write a PhD dissertation.

00:56:06.000 --> 00:56:11.000

Coming the other direction and rather is having a dissertation be a set of articles.

00:56:11.000 --> 00:56:14.000

That means those article that's are published maybe co-authored by other people.

00:56:14.000 --> 00:56:19.000

Especially for empirical research.

00:56:19.000 --> 00:56:22.000

Even when you are trying to take something that is more conceptual.

00:56:22.000 --> 00:56:26.000

My home philosophy.

00:56:26.000 --> 00:56:33.000

It is not common to look at a common philosophy.

00:56:33.000 --> 00:56:37.000

Thank so and so for this idea and this for this and acknowledgements and thank them for reviewing and making comments.

00:56:37.000 --> 00:56:43.000

They've just described somebody that is a co-author.

00:56:43.000 --> 00:56:52.000

Some of the ideas came from them and helped write the manuscript.

00:56:52.000 --> 00:56:54.000

It is not just the of the field.

00:56:54.000 --> 00:56:58.000

You have to learn new norms.

00:56:58.000 --> 00:56:59.000

That is not a commentary.

00:56:59.000 --> 00:57:01.000

That an nor.

00:57:01.000 --> 00:57:07.000

author.

00:57:07.000 --> 00:57:18.000

As you're turning your work and hitting broader audiences you're going to need help in doing that.

00:57:18.000 --> 00:57:25.000

We have a lot of postdoc that I worked with over the years that are

not trained to write for the kinds of audiences that they need to write for in terms of medical and scientific journals.

00:57:25.000 --> 00:57:26.000

We work with them and teach them how to write those things and coauthors and publish those kinds of articles.

00:57:26.000 --> 00:57:27.000

> MAYA SABATELLO: Thank you so much.

00:57:27.000 --> 00:57:29.000

We are at our time.

00:57:29.000 --> 00:57:34.000

We do have more questions.

00:57:34.000 --> 00:57:37.000

I will say we will take them with us also for the next session on publishing.

00:57:37.000 --> 00:57:45.000

Feel free to reach out separately.

00:57:45.000 --> 00:57:50.000

Otherwise I will pass it along to Mildred to close the event today.

00:57:50.000 --> 00:57:51.000

> MILDRED CH0: Thank you Maya and David and Holly.

00:57:51.000 --> 00:57:55.000

I learned a lot.

00:57:55.000 --> 00:57:58.000

I wanted to make sure that everyone knows that we are going to have more of these sessions.

00:57:58.000 --> 00:58:06.000

Be sure to put these on your calendar.

00:58:06.000 --> 00:58:12.000

The next session of the TraineeHub publication is scientific journals.

00:58:12.000 --> 00:58:17.000

That is September 7th noon Eastern time in the US.

00:58:17.000 --> 00:58:22.000

Kyle brothers that is on the genetics and medicine.

00:58:22.000 --> 00:58:24.000

Claudia from the editorial board of the American genetics.

00:58:24.000 --> 00:58:28.000

I will be joining as well.

00:58:28.000 --> 00:58:31.000

I'm facilitated in the genetics and medicine.

00:58:31.000 --> 00:58:41.000

There is the registration link will be in the chat.

00:58:41.000 --> 00:58:45.000

Before that though we're also going to have a TraineeHub event on July 19th from 4:00 P.M. eastern time.

00:58:45.000 --> 00:58:50.000

This is grantmanship and aims.

00:58:50.000 --> 00:59:02.000

You will definitely want to join this one if you are interested in writing grants.

00:59:02.000 --> 00:59:05.000

This is Rene Sterling and Aimee McGuire.

00:59:05.000 --> 00:59:18.000

That registration link is also in the chat.

00:59:18.000 --> 00:59:22.000

Put July 14th on your calendar for the next LC Friday forum in population descriptors and research in applying recommendations.

00:59:22.000 --> 00:59:33.000

That is the natural academy of medicine.

00:59:33.000 --> 00:59:36.000

There we have panelist Ane and that is moderated by Dorothy Roberts.

00:59:36.000 --> 00:59:51.000

That registration link is also in the chat.

00:59:51.000 --> 00:59:57.000

You'll also get a post event survey and I really encourage you to complete this because all of these events that we are presenting to you now are based on the commentaries and suggestions that we've gotten in the surveys.

00:59:57.000 --> 01:00:01.000

So with that I'll just end there and wish you all a wonderful weekend.

01:00:01.000 --> 01:00:05.000

Thank you again.