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00:00:00.000 --> 00:00:26.000

We like to admit the waiting room and start, okay.

00:00:26.000 --> 00:00:56.000

Okay, we'll get started in a minute or so.

00:01:21.000 --> 00:01:29.000

All right. I think we could get started. Welcome, everyone. This is as I hope you all know, is a informational session on the special issue.

00:01:29.000 --> 00:01:41.000

Call for papers for envisioning a more just genomics, and we are recording.

00:01:41.000 --> 00:01:47.000

So it's you you're colleagues are interested in hearing what we have to say today.

00:01:47.000 --> 00:01:56.000

There will be a recording on Lc. Hub for folks who couldn't make it, so I let me just begin.

00:01:56.000 --> 00:02:17.000

I'm Sandra Sijin Lee. I'm a co-director with Mildred Chill of the Sierra, and we have this wonderful opportunity to collaborate with the Hastings Center on this special report by the Hastings Center report and this

00:02:17.000 --> 00:02:37.000

special report is going to really focus on the future of genomics asking questions about how science and its medical and non-medical applications can address social determinants of health and health inequities as well as structural and other injustices and so I hope you all have had a chance

00:02:37.000 --> 00:02:41.000

to, review the call for papers. We're gonna spend the bulk of today answering any questions that you all have about the special report.

00:02:41.000 --> 00:02:50.000

But I do want to underscore just a couple of key points.

00:02:50.000 --> 00:02:55.000

The first is that we're really interested in commentaries and essays.

00:02:55.000 --> 00:03:17.000

And while that can draw on imperical, conceptual, normative research, that you may have been funded to conduct, we're really interested in commentaries and essays that are going to present arguments and proposals for how to move questions of justice forward with respect to genomics research and so many of us are going to

00:03:17.000 --> 00:03:21.000

be talking a bit more about that. But we're gonna just in terms of the roadmap for today's session.

00:03:21.000 --> 00:03:32.000

We're gonna begin with some quick introductions by the guest editors then we'll move into a description of the Hastings Center.

00:03:32.000 --> 00:03:53.000

Report the processes there. Our timeline and in terms of the special report, and we will address some of the pre-submitted questions, but really open it up for our group today in terms of so just to start us off for these quick introductions as I

00:03:53.000 --> 00:04:03.000

mentioned. I'm Sandra Lee. I'm a professor of Medical humanities and Ethics, and Chief of the Division of Ethics at Columbia University.

00:04:03.000 --> 00:04:05.000

I my hopes for this special issue is that we will be able to highlight and engage scholarship.

00:04:05.000 --> 00:04:18.000

That is innovative, and ask questions and and and presents issues that should be centered in Lc.

00:04:18.000 --> 00:04:24.000

But perhaps have not been. That includes methodological approaches and disciplinary perspectives that have not yet been included in Lc.

00:04:24.000 --> 00:04:31.000

Work. And in Lc work proper I will say, and to raise up the work of scholars who are underrepresented in Lc.

00:04:31.000 --> 00:04:41.000

And bioethics, whose research centers the experience of historically marginalized populations and communities.

00:04:41.000 --> 00:04:56.000

That's my hope for this special report, and we'll have a lot to talk about in terms of what this would, what this issue will be doing.

00:04:56.000 --> 00:05:01.000

I'm gonna hand off to Millieren.

00:05:01.000 --> 00:05:02.000

Thanks, Sandra. I'm Mildred show at the Stanford Center for Biomedical Ethics.

00:05:02.000 --> 00:05:12.000

I'm a professor there, and I am really excited about this love working with Josie at the Hastings Center, and for the Hastings Center report.

00:05:12.000 --> 00:05:38.000

So I think my my hopes for this report are a couple of them are that I really hope that this is a forward-looking piece, as opposed to kind of retrospective, although there's certainly much that could be written about sort of looking backwards.

00:05:38.000 --> 00:05:45.000

I sort of want to see about what people think about how we can move forward, and we being sort of ethics.

00:05:45.000 --> 00:05:59.000

Lc, and also another one of my hopes is to encourage people to sort of join this conversation, who may not think of themselves as Lc.

00:05:59.000 --> 00:06:17.000

Researchers. And so just want to be clear that this call is really for for anyone, and not necessarily only certain disciplines that are traditionally associated with Lc. Research.

00:06:17.000 --> 00:06:24.000

Oh, hand it over to! Who's next that Deanne or Josie?

00:06:24.000 --> 00:06:25.000

Okay.

00:06:25.000 --> 00:06:26.000

Josie, please go ahead. So.

00:06:26.000 --> 00:06:32.000

Hi what? Kyoto? Everyone! I'm Josephine Johnston. I'm a researcher at the Hastings Center, and also I work at the University of a tiger in New Zealand.

00:06:32.000 --> 00:06:45.000

Side 2 affiliations. But I'm here with my hastens in a hat well and truly on, and I am yeah, just excited for this, for this topic.

00:06:45.000 --> 00:06:50.000

I wanna make this is a sort of straightforward for everyone involved.

00:06:50.000 --> 00:06:52.000

And and I think it's gonna be a fun process.

00:06:52.000 --> 00:06:58.000

We don't always do this with speak reports, or but in this case we're gonna have this cool.

00:06:58.000 --> 00:07:04.000

I think we'll be really fine. The workshopping part way through the process of people's papers, so that we can get some of across different people can pick up on each other's work and ideas.

00:07:04.000 --> 00:07:09.000

So I feel like that's gonna be really exciting. Part of this process.

00:07:09.000 --> 00:07:15.000

I'm gonna introduce my colleague, Danny, is she on here, Danny Pasha?

00:07:15.000 --> 00:07:19.000

She is right now in France, on holiday, on vacation.

00:07:19.000 --> 00:07:22.000

So I she's just got like a little bit. She didn't.

00:07:22.000 --> 00:07:24.000

Some kind of hopefully, really glamorous holiday breakout spot.

00:07:24.000 --> 00:07:25.000

And she's a research associate at Hastings.

00:07:25.000 --> 00:07:41.000

She's working with me and with us as a team here on this project. And so she's also gonna be heavily involved. She just might not be able to be fully present on this webinar at the second she is, I see online.

00:07:41.000 --> 00:07:45.000

Yeah. Awesome. And then the end. Allen, our research scholar at Stanford University School of Medicine and the Center for Lc.

00:07:45.000 --> 00:08:02.000

Resources Analysis, analysis, which we call Sarah. My primary discipline is anthropology, and I'm most excited about the essay format of this issue, because to my mind it encourages creativity and easily fostering new work.

00:08:02.000 --> 00:08:06.000

You don't have to collect them pure data. In fact, we've specifically asked applicants not to report primary research.

00:08:06.000 --> 00:08:16.000

So think Big propose a new research agenda, offer a new strategy, or dissect a known problem, and propose a solution that would make a big difference.

00:08:16.000 --> 00:08:28.000

Creativity is my excitement about the issue and I hope to talk to the rest of you further in the session.

00:08:28.000 --> 00:08:34.000

Back to Josie now for some discussion about the process, and the Hastings Center report.

00:08:34.000 --> 00:08:40.000

So hopefully, people are interested. We have a chance to look at the Hastings Center report as as a journal.

00:08:40.000 --> 00:08:53.000

This is a peer reviewed journal. It's been around for about well, not quite 50 years, but it's been around for a long time, and it's named after the Hastings, Center, but it's a peer review journal.

00:08:53.000 --> 00:08:59.000

It doesn't end it. This special report is, it's like a special issue, but it's called a special report.

00:08:59.000 --> 00:09:11.000

It's we are the guest of it, but all of the prime papers will go through Peer Review once they're written, but because we're the guess it is we're going to shepherd this as much as possible in that process.

00:09:11.000 --> 00:09:12.000

And so everything will kind of go through us spending.

00:09:12.000 --> 00:09:15.000

We put it all together, and then we submitted to the report for Independent Peer Review.

00:09:15.000 --> 00:09:25.000

So that's good. If you need peer review publications.

00:09:25.000 --> 00:09:28.000

This is this is what this process will involve.

00:09:28.000 --> 00:09:34.000

The timeline that we have laid out is that we are asking inially for abstracts, not whole papers.

00:09:34.000 --> 00:09:50.000

So that's because we are keen for you to receive feedback from us and from the workshopping webinar which will happen for and those papers are abstract that are accepted will have a workshop in May and we're

00:09:50.000 --> 00:09:54.000

scheduling that around the availability of the people who will be authors so we haven't changed on it.

00:09:54.000 --> 00:10:07.000

And so, and then over the summer, the North American summer people will finish their papers, and they will be due to ask in the end of September.

00:10:07.000 --> 00:10:21.000

So the guest editors, and so then we will go through a little bit of back and forth, feedback from us on the full papers, and then submit to the report for peer review and publication.

00:10:21.000 --> 00:10:23.000

For everything that goes through peer review will comes out, will be able to be published in 2024.

00:10:23.000 --> 00:10:32.000

So that's sort of the rough timeline. I can provide more detail about the timeline.

00:10:32.000 --> 00:10:39.000

But is there anything else anyone thinks I should mention just about the process.

00:10:39.000 --> 00:10:47.000

No, I think that's good, and I think we could move to the questions. Stan, do you wanna take the lead on that?

00:10:47.000 --> 00:10:58.000

Yeah, sure. Absolutely. So I'm gonna start us off with some questions that were submitted during registration prioritizing some that will be useful to the maximum number of people in the session.

00:10:58.000 --> 00:11:04.000

And then at the end of the session, we'll leave some time for those who want to pitch specific as a ideas to the guest.

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

Editors are, talk about their specific paper, so be great.

00:11:07.000 --> 00:11:11.000

If you could hold those types of queryies until the end of the session, just to make sure it's maximum useful to everyone.

00:11:11.000 --> 00:11:28.000

So we're pretty small group you can feel free to unmute yourself or turn your camera on to ask your questions, or you can use the raise hand feature Mildred, if you wouldn't mind helping me keep an eye on the chat and surface, any questions that show up there that would be

00:11:28.000 --> 00:11:33.000

helpful so I'm gonna go quickly through some questions that came up during registration that I can answer pretty quickly.

00:11:33.000 --> 00:11:54.000

There was a question about how many articles will be selected, and we decided on between 7 to 10 abstracts, and that depends upon the proposed length of the papers, because, as I understand it, we're at working within a maximum length for the issue.

00:11:54.000 --> 00:12:05.000

We can answer further questions about that. There's some questions about journal scope we'll get to as well that will enable us to talk about how we're going to make those selections.

00:12:05.000 --> 00:12:12.000

There was a question about timeline specifically, how long will authors have to revise papers?

00:12:12.000 --> 00:12:21.000

So you have about 4 months to write paper. So it's June through September to revise papers following the guest editor, Feedback. You have 2 months.

00:12:21.000 --> 00:12:40.000

That's October and November, and then one month following Peer Review, which is in March of 2024 someone asked if there was a preferred number of authors or a limit to the number of authors the answer to that question is no it could be one or

00:12:40.000 --> 00:12:52.000

a team, and then Sandra, Peer Review, which is in March of 2024. Someone asked if there was a preferred number of authors or a limit to the number of authors. The answer to that question is, No. It could be one or a team and then Sandra, you

00:12:52.000 --> 00:12:56.000

emph, it's still. How would that work?

00:12:56.000 --> 00:12:58.000

What types of scholars!

00:12:58.000 --> 00:13:05.000

Yeah. So this you know, a major focus of this special report is to be inclusive.

00:13:05.000 --> 00:13:27.000

So we're really we really would love folks who are at any stage in their career to submit a proposal, and to the extent that there are more junior folks working with senior folks that's something that we would love to encourage and so just highlighting those dimensions

00:13:27.000 --> 00:13:32.000

may, perhaps in your proposal, would be helpful to us.

00:13:32.000 --> 00:13:33.000

There was a question about how the special issue will be disseminated to its audiences.

00:13:33.000 --> 00:13:47.000

I know that I can speak for the Sarah. We're gonna promote the issue via the Sarah communication channels, including hosting on the Sarah Web Portal, Lc.

00:13:47.000 --> 00:13:52.000

Hub for motion via our newsletter, Twitter and Linkedin properties.

00:13:52.000 --> 00:14:06.000

Our audience includes Lc. Scholars, life and data scientists, genetic counselors, educators, journalists, and members of the public. Josie, do you want to say something about how the Hastings Center report disseminates work to their audience?

00:14:06.000 --> 00:14:09.000

Yeah, so everything obviously goes in the peer review, literature.

00:14:09.000 --> 00:14:13.000

It's indexed and pubmed, and all of those places.

00:14:13.000 --> 00:14:14.000

So it appears in that way, but the Hastings scene also does pretty robust outreach.

00:14:14.000 --> 00:14:24.000

We have, in New Zealand. That's 20 or 30,000 recipients.

00:14:24.000 --> 00:14:30.000

We have a database of healthcare and science doing less than other journalists, but it's predominantly healthcare and science journalists.

00:14:30.000 --> 00:14:51.000

Thousands of those who have contacted the Hastingsina over time, and who we are, we reach out to some of the outreach may be very specific, and targeted, so they might be specific journalists that we think are interesting in particular, actually, we target.

00:14:51.000 --> 00:14:52.000

Okay. Nice.

00:14:52.000 --> 00:14:53.000

The I mean it sounds horrible. We reach out to them specifically, I was going to Ech Point to a report that I helped kind of ship it along.

00:14:53.000 --> 00:15:14.000

That was published last year so I'll just find it and drop it in the chat for people to see an example of a special report that we had really successful outreach honestly, one of the successes of promotion of a special report can be that some of the

00:15:14.000 --> 00:15:23.000

of the writers are authors, and that get asked to write something else by someone else like a blog post, for I think someone wrote something for Undak related to one of the topics.

00:15:23.000 --> 00:15:25.000

So there's quite a bit of follow on, so be heavily.

00:15:25.000 --> 00:15:38.000

And then all the social media public product sort of dissemination that.

00:15:38.000 --> 00:15:56.000

It might make sense to do something at Sph, or another meeting at conference relating to this visual, so sort of depends on on what we you know what, what the content is, and what people are paying for in terms of disseminating to other audiences, and we would also really welcome

00:15:56.000 --> 00:15:59.000

suggestions. So if you're one of the authors and you are, I would like to disseminate this to, you know in this way we would.

00:15:59.000 --> 00:16:00.000

That would be something that we'd be really excited to hear about.

00:16:00.000 --> 00:16:12.000

So I I think that there's a lot of possibilities beyond sort of the usual means which are already pretty robust. I think.

00:16:12.000 --> 00:16:22.000

Oh, awesome! Thanks, Josie. We had a question about the format of the workshop, and I know it's virtual, and it's a workshopping of abstract, not full papers.

00:16:22.000 --> 00:16:34.000

I wanna clarify that anyone else on the guest side of the group have some details about the way that that process.

00:16:34.000 --> 00:16:37.000

So my experience with workshops like this is, that it's great when people go in with an abstract, and maybe you know, obviously, some more ideas about what they're gonna do.

00:16:37.000 --> 00:16:49.000

But to get the most out of getting feedback from other authors and from the gift editors.

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

If you don't have kind of like if you haven't already sort of nailed down your paper, and your own mind, you're more open to feedback.

00:16:55.000 --> 00:16:59.000

So the idea was to do it early enough that people have, you know, got their ebs.

00:16:59.000 --> 00:17:03.000

They've done their abstract, and they start thinking about what the papers gonna look like in detail.

00:17:03.000 --> 00:17:09.000

But they haven't sort of submitted that yet, so that there's still time for us for the group to really give input.

00:17:09.000 --> 00:17:10.000

And for people's work to get connected with each other.

00:17:10.000 --> 00:17:20.000

We thought that that was a good timeframe and sort of a live workshopping of the type of the ideas and the work.

00:17:20.000 --> 00:17:29.000

And then, you know, there was. We will give direct comments on people's papers when I've actually drafted them, but that will be.

00:17:29.000 --> 00:17:34.000

But a little bit at least, I mean of a kind of workshopping situation.

00:17:34.000 --> 00:17:35.000

Good.

00:17:35.000 --> 00:17:37.000

By the end. So that's the idea behind having that workshop.

00:17:37.000 --> 00:17:50.000

That's great. Alright at this time I'll take questions from the audience, and the other guest editors will will join in about, especially logistics and process, and we'll move on in another section to talk about scope of the issue types of questions.

00:17:50.000 --> 00:18:03.000

So if you have questions now about logistics or process, please either raise your hand or turn your camera on and go ahead and send.

00:18:03.000 --> 00:18:05.000

It's really hard, and I don't even know.

00:18:05.000 --> 00:18:11.000

You couldn't have answered all of your questions. There must be a question out there.

00:18:11.000 --> 00:18:12.000

Okay, so I'll break. Would you mind?

00:18:12.000 --> 00:18:15.000

I!

00:18:15.000 --> 00:18:29.000

Please, just reiterate the timeline I was trying to take notes, and and especially with Josephine, mentioning how you're really encouraging us to not have something set in mind before we you know, with our abstract.

00:18:29.000 --> 00:18:32.000

Just go over that timeline a little bit more. We submit the abstract.

00:18:32.000 --> 00:18:39.000

We wait to find out if the abstract is accepted, then we workshop the abstract, then submit the paper.

00:18:39.000 --> 00:18:42.000

It gets reviewed, and then we find out if it's accepted.

00:18:42.000 --> 00:18:46.000

But maybe just line those up with months again.

00:18:46.000 --> 00:18:48.000

I can do that to see if you want. Yeah. So so the workshops and may, and that's a workshop of selected abstract.

00:18:48.000 --> 00:19:08.000

And then you'll have 4 months June. Through September to write the paper, and then you have feedback from the guest editors in September, I think we said end of September, and then you have 2 months to respond to that February.

00:19:08.000 --> 00:19:25.000

So that's October, November of 2,023, and then we'll send it for Peer Review, and then you have one month following Peer Review, and that's March of 2024 to revise and restrict the Peer Reviewers.

00:19:25.000 --> 00:19:31.000

And I just wanna clarify Rachel cause I think I heard you say that you know you.

00:19:31.000 --> 00:19:38.000

The proposals would not be accepted until after the workshop, and actually proposals are accepted prior to the workshop.

00:19:38.000 --> 00:19:44.000

So there wouldn't be any surprises after the workshop. Yeah.

00:19:44.000 --> 00:19:46.000

Yeah, it's the abstracts get accepted.

00:19:46.000 --> 00:19:51.000

And then those abstracts, those are authors are invited to the workshop, and we will ask you to like.

00:19:51.000 --> 00:19:56.000

Say probably will ask you to say a little more about your your idea than just what's in the abstract.

00:19:56.000 --> 00:19:57.000

But the ideas to the invisible kind of like say more about it.

00:19:57.000 --> 00:20:00.000

Get some feedback and kind of yeah, see what other people are doing.

00:20:00.000 --> 00:20:09.000

So you have the connections. I try that kind of just so. You're not sort of doing it all by yourself.

00:20:09.000 --> 00:20:13.000

Before we go to Malia. I see your hand up.

00:20:13.000 --> 00:20:19.000

Could I just address the question from location? David in in the chat?

00:20:19.000 --> 00:20:22.000

I just wanna clarify that there is no requirement.

00:20:22.000 --> 00:20:23.000

That junior scholars work with senior scholars.

00:20:23.000 --> 00:20:37.000

We're we are just saying that if there is an opportunity or that scholars would like to work with each other that are across these professionals stages, we are welcome welcome that.

00:20:37.000 --> 00:20:40.000

But there is no requirement at all. I hope that answers your question.

00:20:40.000 --> 00:20:44.000

Lakisha.

00:20:44.000 --> 00:20:45.000

Hey, molia!

00:20:45.000 --> 00:20:46.000

Did you? Thank you very much. I think there might have been one other question in the chat.

00:20:46.000 --> 00:20:54.000

I'm happy to hold on until we address that one too.

00:20:54.000 --> 00:20:55.000

I think.

00:20:55.000 --> 00:21:02.000

Oh! Oh! I see! Do you anticipate inviting more abstracts for the workshop and will be invited to the contribute to the special issue.

00:21:02.000 --> 00:21:11.000

I think the answer to that was, no, because we're going to be selecting abstracts and making the invites to the workshop afterward. Is that correct?

00:21:11.000 --> 00:21:12.000

We're going to get the abstracts, and we're gonna select them abstract.

00:21:12.000 --> 00:21:19.000

Those people will be invited to the workshop, and I and just our like.

00:21:19.000 --> 00:21:24.000

Oh, I mean I no one. No one's gonna be held to this.

00:21:24.000 --> 00:21:36.000

But if you're with your workshop, if you're astracted and you come to the workshop and workshop your paper, then that we we think that paper is gonna be submitted to his report as part of the end.

00:21:36.000 --> 00:21:41.000

Okay. I'm gonna ask probably an impossible question.

00:21:41.000 --> 00:21:51.000

But I will ask a anyway, I'm wondering if the editors might be able to give us a little bit of insight into how you're hoping to kind of.

00:21:51.000 --> 00:21:56.000

I mean, I know that it's gonna depend on which kinds of abstracts are submitted.

00:21:56.000 --> 00:22:01.000

But some insights about sort of balancing papers, you know.

00:22:01.000 --> 00:22:05.000

Are you going to be? You know, aiming to enhance, inclusion and diversity, and diversity of ideas? Perhaps.

00:22:05.000 --> 00:22:13.000

Or are you specifically looking for synergies between papers?

00:22:13.000 --> 00:22:28.000

I don't think this isn't gonna change what I might submit as an abstract but I'm just kind of curious about how you all are envisioning the process of making a very hard because presumably there's going to be well more than than 10 abstract submitted and so how

00:22:28.000 --> 00:22:36.000

you're thinking about kind of making those hard calls about which abstracts to choose.

00:22:36.000 --> 00:22:41.000

I would just say that when you're putting something together you're like, please let me be at least 10 abstracts.

00:22:41.000 --> 00:22:50.000

I believe in our project but I I believe in our project, but I also know how busy it is.

00:22:50.000 --> 00:22:58.000

I personally feel like, we, yeah, we think people should write about what they're passionate about what they most think needs to be said.

00:22:58.000 --> 00:23:03.000

And then, and that we will probably go for synergies and distinctions in the way that you put it money, and that was a helpful question.

00:23:03.000 --> 00:23:30.000

And honestly, my own personal expectation is that there will be some people who are, who are, who are saying things that are somewhat critical of the idea that genomics and justice can be very sinusoidalist in this together, and then some people like I say this great opportunity for

00:23:30.000 --> 00:23:40.000

genomics, and to help. And you know, with just advanced justice.

00:23:40.000 --> 00:23:41.000

Oh, yeah.

00:23:41.000 --> 00:23:42.000

So I'm imagining it might be a little bit of kind of disagreement, maybe even.

00:23:42.000 --> 00:23:43.000

So, being contrary, would be helpful.

00:23:43.000 --> 00:23:45.000

Yeah. And I'll just being contrary.

00:23:45.000 --> 00:23:46.000

Yeah, the standard notes. I'm happy. I'm happy to be contract.

00:23:46.000 --> 00:23:49.000

Yeah.

00:23:49.000 --> 00:23:53.000

Yeah, no, that would be excellent. I just wanna add that you know the hope.

00:23:53.000 --> 00:23:54.000

I think the hope for this special issue is that it's gonna catalyze change. Moving forward.

00:23:54.000 --> 00:24:08.000

So this I just really wanna underscore this, this focus on forward thinking commentaries and essays.

00:24:08.000 --> 00:24:24.000

And our hope is that this is gonna be a highly cited special report for end users, like funders and other researchers and folks that may not feel that they are part of the Lc world.

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

I mean, really, we' to catalyze change. And so to the extent that you can speak to that that would be fantastic.

00:24:35.000 --> 00:24:39.000

I just wanted to add that this is our third special issue to get together.

00:24:39.000 --> 00:24:43.000

So we tend to prioritize inclusion over having a streamlined focus in the issue.

00:24:43.000 --> 00:24:50.000

I think that's partly because of the nature of Lc.

00:24:50.000 --> 00:25:07.000

Itself, and the area of inquiry. There's just a lot of people who can bring something to the table, and we tend to prefer all of those voices rather than narrowing down to preserve the integrity of an issue and focus in on a single topic and I think here the way that we've

00:25:07.000 --> 00:25:09.000

listed a number of possible approaches you could take, as well as others that are not named.

00:25:09.000 --> 00:25:19.000

There we really are, throwing the door wide open in terms of topics.

00:25:19.000 --> 00:25:25.000

Terrific. Thank you all so much. I may follow up with one other quick question.

00:25:25.000 --> 00:25:26.000

It's very fast. I am delighted.

00:25:26.000 --> 00:25:43.000

I see multiple of my trainees here in the room, and I am assuming that you do not want a senior co-author on multiple of these submissions, though would that be correct?

00:25:43.000 --> 00:25:45.000

Well, we haven't discussed it, haven't we?

00:25:45.000 --> 00:25:52.000

It could influence me from picking both of those. I think that that happened previously.

00:25:52.000 --> 00:25:59.000

When we were looking at special issues, submissions. I don't know.

00:25:59.000 --> 00:26:04.000

Other thoughts from the group. Is it just gonna disappear or?

00:26:04.000 --> 00:26:08.000

I'm not in principle opposed to someone appearing more than on more than one paper.

00:26:08.000 --> 00:26:11.000

I haven't really thought about it too much.

00:26:11.000 --> 00:26:17.000

I feel like, Yeah, I'm not in principle. But yeah.

00:26:17.000 --> 00:26:31.000

I think if there was less conceptual overlap between the submissions that would be helpful, so that they could be considered as isolates and separate contributions that.

00:26:31.000 --> 00:26:40.000

And I just wanna emphasize that a paper will not be penalized or for not having a senior author on it either.

00:26:40.000 --> 00:26:51.000

Okay? In fact, we do wanna highlight new perspectives in this issue.

00:26:51.000 --> 00:26:57.000

Okay, other questions about logistics and process before we move on last call.

00:26:57.000 --> 00:27:09.000

Okay, so questions about the scope of the issue came in through the registration, and one asked us to define nonmedical applications of genomics in it appears in the top of the call for papers.

00:27:09.000 --> 00:27:20.000

I think this is essentially a scope question, like, what range of non medical applications would we consider? So it's really something that we haven't talked about previously, a scope question like, what range of better non medical applications would we consider so it's really something that we haven't talked about?

00:27:20.000 --> 00:27:35.000

Previously, as I guessed, at a group. But I think it's an interesting question. When I think of non-medical applications, I'm thinking of ancestry testing maybe polygenic scores for predicting educational attainment or other social behavioral outcomes.

00:27:35.000 --> 00:27:48.000

But when we consider things as far field as bioscurity, or genetically modified organisms, so thoughts from other.

00:27:48.000 --> 00:27:53.000

Some guest, editor.

00:27:53.000 --> 00:27:57.000

Well, one thing that I think.

00:27:57.000 --> 00:28:05.000

Could be included in this non medical area. That would also be very, you know.

00:28:05.000 --> 00:28:18.000

Closely tied to this issue of justice is forensic and legal uses of genetics.

00:28:18.000 --> 00:28:20.000

That's great!

00:28:20.000 --> 00:28:21.000

Yeah.

00:28:21.000 --> 00:28:25.000

Sounds good. I think we people wanna know that when you write one of these calls, you try to put down a bunch of ideas.

00:28:25.000 --> 00:28:38.000

But then you also really want to remain open, and so I I really don't want anyone to look at this and say what's not in the bulleted list. So it's not part of what I'm gonna submit like, if you think it's related to genomics and justice we'd

00:28:38.000 --> 00:28:41.000

love to hear about it.

00:28:41.000 --> 00:28:42.000

Absolutely.

00:28:42.000 --> 00:28:46.000

Help you understand those things.

00:28:46.000 --> 00:28:47.000

Sandra, did you have something to add, or you?

00:28:47.000 --> 00:28:55.000

No, I just some agreeing with what Josie has has just said, that we have a very capacious definition of what would be included in that.

00:28:55.000 --> 00:29:03.000

You know, we in that special issue and focus. I do think this medical versus nonmedical gets a little blurry.

00:29:03.000 --> 00:29:10.000

And so I don't want to discourage folks from putting in a proposal that might.

00:29:10.000 --> 00:29:31.000

You know, might seem a bit far afield, and I guess one thing that we haven't discussed is whether or not after this, webinar, if we would entertain questions from folks who have, you know, who are trying to understand whether their idea is within scope.

00:29:31.000 --> 00:29:41.000

And my guess is that we would answer questions.

00:29:41.000 --> 00:29:42.000

Yes, yes.

00:29:42.000 --> 00:29:45.000

We would, but so the take home is probably yes, most cases.

00:29:45.000 --> 00:29:53.000

Yeah, this is not an Nih granting process, like, we're not sort of like, we have to do things only that are about public, you know, gonna advance the public health.

00:29:53.000 --> 00:29:54.000

That's right.

00:29:54.000 --> 00:30:00.000

What? That's not the limit of this. We just like very much kind of like these are these are, this is the broad rush area that we're in.

00:30:00.000 --> 00:30:05.000

We feel like it's huge, and we like to hear all kinds of perspectives on it.

00:30:05.000 --> 00:30:17.000

And but there was also a question similar would it be of interest to approach this topic or these questions, using genomics in a particular subspecialty?

00:30:17.000 --> 00:30:18.000

Similarly, no, we don't have a particular, some specialty.

00:30:18.000 --> 00:30:32.000

In mind of genomics. I think some of the questions tend to lean towards the medical realm, but that is not required in any way.

00:30:32.000 --> 00:30:43.000

So it's wide open, all right. Does anyone have any general questions about the scope of the issue?

00:30:43.000 --> 00:30:57.000

Okay. And so would anyone like to ask questions about their specific topic that they're planning?

00:30:57.000 --> 00:31:07.000

Okay, any questions of any kind at all.

00:31:07.000 --> 00:31:12.000

Oh, we did a great job.

00:31:12.000 --> 00:31:16.000

Hi! I have kind of a very individual type of question.

00:31:16.000 --> 00:31:24.000

So I kind of wanted to wait until the very end. But I'm just putting a plug in. So you guys don't hang up before I get a chance to chat with you.

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

Oh, no! This is your time. Show me to go ahead.

00:31:26.000 --> 00:31:27.000

Okay, sure. So Mildred knows I'm working on a book around genetics.

00:31:27.000 --> 00:31:40.000

And justice. It's really focusing on understanding the biological underpinnings of traits, and where people misunderstand that and all the different harms that can result.

00:31:40.000 --> 00:31:52.000

So this is, of course, a much longer form piece of writing that I'm working on, but there's gonna be a lot of different elements that could be, you know, quite a good fit for the scope of your issue.

00:31:52.000 --> 00:32:13.000

So I'm you know, I could pick from any number of topics, and I'm kind of wondering how best to go about choosing or aligning with your efforts to the support each other.

00:32:13.000 --> 00:32:14.000

I mean, yeah, it really runs the full gamut.

00:32:14.000 --> 00:32:16.000

Did you wanna say a topic here? I think it's about.

00:32:16.000 --> 00:32:25.000

Everything from sort of the biological differences about ancestry versus how people confirm that with race.

00:32:25.000 --> 00:32:35.000

Similarly sex and gender thinking about Lgbtq plus community members, pregnancy and post-s world.

00:32:35.000 --> 00:32:43.000

All sorts of different topics, and then getting into some of the more current topics around Prs around.

00:32:43.000 --> 00:32:48.000

Forensics. And Houston, the justice system. All kinds of different topics.

00:32:48.000 --> 00:32:53.000

So I'm just. I'm having a triple prioritizing.

00:32:53.000 --> 00:33:00.000

What would be sort of the best thing to do with you guys.

00:33:00.000 --> 00:33:12.000

I would personally say one that gets at these justice and equity questions the most and in the most creative way is what I would recommend you.

00:33:12.000 --> 00:33:24.000

Take up. I think we have a question specifically about how can populations be fairly described?

00:33:24.000 --> 00:33:31.000

Categorized and measured. We know sort of the debate we want to see a solution or proposed solution right?

00:33:31.000 --> 00:33:44.000

So creativity, I think I would emphasize, but others can chime right now.

00:33:44.000 --> 00:33:50.000

Maybe another way of thinking about it is.

00:33:50.000 --> 00:33:56.000

Whether it's thinking about whether there's sort of a.

00:33:56.000 --> 00:34:11.000

Common theme among all your different topics, in terms of being forward-looking, and whether there's something synthetic there that you could sort of encapsulate that would bring together a number of different ideas that might be in you know your specific book chat chapters.

00:34:11.000 --> 00:34:41.000

But whether there's any overarching themes there in terms of how either the field of genomics, or you know, sort of the public, or, you know a particular group might move forward with some of the things that you're addressing in your in your book.

00:34:41.000 --> 00:34:45.000

Yeah, thank you. That's a great suggestion.

00:34:45.000 --> 00:34:50.000

I think a question from Martin get involved with this.

00:34:50.000 --> 00:34:51.000

Hey!

00:34:51.000 --> 00:35:03.000

Hi! Hi! Just see many familiar faces. It's been a while I saw this call, and actually my postdoc and master students brought it to my attention.

00:35:03.000 --> 00:35:04.000

They said, this is like exactly what we're working on.

00:35:04.000 --> 00:35:14.000

And it's really exciting to hear the sort of creative broadness of the scope.

00:35:14.000 --> 00:35:17.000

And I wanted to ask a little bit more. Since we have this opportunity about our specific work, and how it might fit.

00:35:17.000 --> 00:35:31.000

We do research on the social justice, implications and social and ethical implications of behavioral epigenetics.

00:35:31.000 --> 00:35:35.000

Primarily. And that's obviously related to genetics.

00:35:35.000 --> 00:35:54.000

But it also dovetails with a lot of concerns around racial injustice and health andequities and and gender and care responsibilities around reproduction, and that tends to be the focus of our work.

00:35:54.000 --> 00:35:59.000

We also are very empirical, because that's the kind of work we've been funded to do.

00:35:59.000 --> 00:36:02.000

I'm a sociologist of science, Health and Medicine.

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

And so this opportunity to think out of the empirical work and pitch something more creative as a little bit of a different direction.

00:36:09.000 --> 00:36:21.000

So I was just curious. Obviously, we have these really lovely examples from the previous special reports which we've all read, our team really loves and has inspired by those.

00:36:21.000 --> 00:36:42.000

And I'm just curious if you can say a little bit more about the kind of ideas that you have in mind like what's inspiring your team when you're thinking about this creative option, particularly for those of us who have had to make these pitches very closely aligned with our empirical

00:36:42.000 --> 00:36:46.000

research. And we maybe want this opportunity to move out of that zone.

00:36:46.000 --> 00:36:54.000

But how would you describe what that might look like, for instance?

00:36:54.000 --> 00:36:55.000

Oh, I'd like to hear what Josie thinks, because obviously you have all the experience with putting together these issues.

00:36:55.000 --> 00:37:14.000

But I mean, I just want to say as somebody who also does a lot of empirical work, I feel like this is a good opportunity for a lot of things that I wish I could say, and you can't publish in.

00:37:14.000 --> 00:37:32.000

You know an academic journal that publishes your research, you know, as a as a piece of empirical work, and you know, I think there's a lot you could do with sort of again trying to be synthetic with all the work that you're doing and thinking about how can that be applied to

00:37:32.000 --> 00:37:38.000

policy with all the work that you're doing and thinking about. How can that be applied to policy, or how should it be applied to policy, or how should it be applied to policy?

00:37:38.000 --> 00:37:41.000

Or how should you know? How should empirical work of the sort that you're be considered?

00:37:41.000 --> 00:38:01.000

How should be taken up? You know there's a lot of it there that are more sort of meta, and not so much just reporting like, what's the implication of those findings in terms of broader societal or other you know, other fields of technological

00:38:01.000 --> 00:38:07.000

fes, and so forth.

00:38:07.000 --> 00:38:17.000

Yeah, and I just wanna emphasize that absolutely draw on your research on your empirical research for your, you know, qualitative quantitative stuff absolutely, but maybe have a thesis about what you think should be different as a result.

00:38:17.000 --> 00:38:26.000

And why, or what you know, what you're looking for.

00:38:26.000 --> 00:38:27.000

That's all. We mean what we just don't.

00:38:27.000 --> 00:38:34.000

Wanna, yeah, we we're just looking for people to make it some kind of argument about concepts or things or policy.

00:38:34.000 --> 00:38:41.000

Or if that's yeah, tell us what you think should be different.

00:38:41.000 --> 00:38:45.000

Going forwards.

00:38:45.000 --> 00:38:49.000

Are you gonna say something, Sandra? I.

00:38:49.000 --> 00:38:57.000

No, I you know. So I love the question, Martin, and I mean first of all, the work that you're doing in epigenetics.

00:38:57.000 --> 00:39:00.000

That would be definitely within scope. So that's the prior question.

00:39:00.000 --> 00:39:24.000

But the opportunity to situate your work, I mean certainly you're welcome to draw on your empirical work, but also being able to speak and bring in other work that's in the field that you feel is relevant and important in making your argument about how we move forward I think this is what this

00:39:24.000 --> 00:39:25.000

format you know, gives you a bit more freedom to not just focus on what you've done.

00:39:25.000 --> 00:39:41.000

But actually be synergistic with other work that's out there that you think is going to really inform your argument about what needs to what needs to happen, to move forward.

00:39:41.000 --> 00:39:45.000

Yeah, I would just say it feels like the literature has raised.

00:39:45.000 --> 00:39:46.000

Our awareness has put a couple of problems on our plate that need to be resolved.

00:39:46.000 --> 00:40:01.000

I think what we wanna do is perhaps even just hypothesize a feature direction for empirical research that will take those problems and move them forward away.

00:40:01.000 --> 00:40:02.000

How can we? Go? Where do we go from here? Now that we know these problems exist?

00:40:02.000 --> 00:40:09.000

What's the next step?

00:40:09.000 --> 00:40:15.000

Great. Thank you all so much.

00:40:15.000 --> 00:40:23.000

Any other questions or a specific ideas to discuss.

00:40:23.000 --> 00:40:29.000

Yeah, and we just hired a new staff person to see. See?

00:40:29.000 --> 00:40:35.000

The guest editors want to say anything else. Yeah.

00:40:35.000 --> 00:40:40.000

I just hope people feel unrestricted. Like if you've got an idea.

00:40:40.000 --> 00:40:49.000

But something that you think about in response to this, just like free yourself to to.

00:40:49.000 --> 00:40:50.000

Yeah, bye.

00:40:50.000 --> 00:40:53.000

Yeah. Put it down on paper proposal to us.

00:40:53.000 --> 00:40:56.000

So we're really curious and hopeful.

00:40:56.000 --> 00:40:59.000

Hoping that this person will now actually.

00:40:59.000 --> 00:41:00.000

Yeah, we're super excited about this this project, and seeing all of you today is really energizing.

00:41:00.000 --> 00:41:08.000

So, looking forward to this very much.

00:41:08.000 --> 00:41:15.000

Okay, if there's any way that you're okay to wrap up early.

00:41:15.000 --> 00:41:24.000

But if someone thinks of a question after today, you can email info@elchub.org, and we will get back to you with an answer.

00:41:24.000 --> 00:41:26.000

The submission form is in the chat, and the basic parameters.

00:41:26.000 --> 00:41:35.000

There's also a link to a web page where you can find the most uploaded.

00:41:35.000 --> 00:41:42.000

Call for papers, text. Okay? We look forward to seeing your abstracts submitted by.

00:41:42.000 --> 00:41:49.000

See? Where's the date? I believe it's April.

00:41:49.000 --> 00:41:50.000

April third.

00:41:50.000 --> 00:41:54.000

Help me out anyone. Third April third, we'll see April third.

00:41:54.000 --> 00:41:59.000

We look forward to reading those. So thanks everyone for coming, and please feel free to follow up.

00:41:59.000 --> 00:42:05.000

If you have more questions.

00:42:05.000 --> 00:42:06.000

Thanks. Everyone.

00:42:06.000 --> 00:42:09.000

Thank you. Everyone got to keep that.