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A record number of poster presentations

27 posters

6 oral presentations*
A wealth of topics & research methods
Some key themes

- Getting research to the readers
- Involving patients
- Professional medical writers
- Advancing the profession
Getting the research to the readers: the good news

Step 1 – Clear, comprehensive & transparent reporting

Data transparency¹

• 75% of industry-sponsored data disclosed (2006–2015)¹

¹ Baronikova et al. Disclosure of results of clinical trials sponsored by pharmaceutical companies.
Methodological rigour

• >50% of systematic reviews did not fully meet PRISMA criteria\textsuperscript{1}
• Consensus (Delphi) guidelines in rare diseases often omitted a systematic literature review\textsuperscript{2*}

Reporting rigour

• Consensus (Delphi) guidelines in rare diseases often omitted key methodological details\textsuperscript{2*}

---

1. Booth et al. A day in the life of systematic reviews: adherence to PRISMA guidelines in a cross-section of systematic reviews from a single day in 2017.
2. Resemann et al. Reporting of Delphi methods to achieve consensus on guidelines in rare diseases.*
Getting the research to the readers: the good news

Step 2 – Open access

Open access extends reach

• Altmetric scores were higher for open access articles$^{1,2*}$

---

1. Bell et al. Does ‘open access’ affect the amount of attention an article receives online.*
2. Wiehn et al. Can the social-media footprint of published articles predict long-term impact?*
Getting the research to the readers: more to do

Step 2 – Open access

Barriers remain to ‘true’ open access

- 1/6 of guidelines not free to access\(^1\)
  - For those that were free, this was not always clear on PubMed
- 62\% high-tier journals offer CC-BY; most charge $5000\(^2\)
  - Very few for industry-funded research

---

1. Moss et al. Ease of online accessibility to expert disease management guidelines.
2. Ellison et al. Do journals restrict access to commercially funded research?
Getting the research to the readers: the good news

Step 3 – Extending reach through digital and social media

Cross-stakeholder engagement can be effective

• Publisher tweets can increase overall number of tweets\(^1\)*

Congress activity

• Simultaneous congress activity generated extra media and social media coverage\(^2\)

1. Wiehn et al. Can the social-media footprint of published articles predict long-term impact?*
Opportunities missed

• Given the opportunity, 40% of authors did not provide an e-poster, <3% share an audio file¹*

1. Venn et al. Do authors fully utilize opportunities to share supplementary information at conferences?*
Involving patients: the good news

**Journal articles are read by patients & caregivers**
- 45% access journal articles

**Journal articles are useful to patients & caregivers**
- 51% think they help their clinical decision-making
- 45% think they aid discussions with HCPs

**Publications professionals keen to collaborate**
- Generally less experienced collaborating with patients, but are enthusiastic to do so

---

1. Georgieva et al. Should we consider patients in communication plans?
2. Lommele & deSchoolmeester. Involving patients in research from an industry-sponsored registry.
Involving patients: more to do

Barriers to access exist

- Jargon\textsuperscript{1*}
- How conclusions relate to patients\textsuperscript{1*}
- Only 5% of journals publishing rare diseases required lay summary\textsuperscript{2}

Lack of involvement or acknowledgement\textsuperscript{3*}

- 25% of clinical trial publications did not involve, or even thank, patients
- <20% involved patients in study design and conduct

Patients as authors\textsuperscript{3*}

- 1 article included a patient as an author

\textsuperscript{1} Georgieva et al. Should we consider patients in communication plans?\textsuperscript{*}

\textsuperscript{2} Thurtle et al. Rare disease publications: How accessible are they?

\textsuperscript{3} Wadsworth et al. Patient involvement…or not? Analysis of “Patient Involvement” statements in clinical trial publications in The BMJ\textsuperscript{*}.
The role of professional medical writers

“Ethical, accurate and timely”¹
- AMWA–EMWA–ISMPP Joint Position Statement on the role of professional medical writers

Transparency and quality²
- Increased compliance with CONSORT guidelines and transparent reporting of financial disclosures

Valued by authors
- 78% of corresponding authors found support useful³
- Non-English-speaking authors value support; some barriers to access exist⁴

² Evuarherhe et al. Association between professional medical writing support and the quality, ethics and timeliness of clinical trials reporting: a systematic review.
³ Claudi et al. Do corresponding authors value the support of professional medical writers?
⁴ Pons et al. Why don’t Spanish-speaking physicians publish more in English?
Advancing the profession

Publish our findings

• ISMPP members don’t always practice what we preach: only 5% abstracts became full publications\(^1\)

Reaching out to other organisations

• Awareness survey at the Eighth International Congress on Peer Review and Scientific Publication\(^2\)

Within-industry communication

• The community could do more to engage online\(^3\)

---

1. Neuner-Jehle. Do we publish enough? Publication rates of ISMPP meeting abstracts.
2. Woolley et al. Survey evidence to advance advocacy: Awareness of publication professional initiatives at the Peer Review Congress.
3. Mace et al. How do medical publication professionals engage with online news resources?
Find out more

• Abstracts: published in April’s CMRO

• Posters: available to members at ismpp.org

• Medical publications news and ISMPP EU 2018 meeting reports: www.thepublicationplan.com
Speed research: Part 2

• Reporting Delphi Methods to achieve consensus on guidelines in rare diseases
• Should we consider patients in communication plans?
• Patient involvement… or not? Analysis of ‘patient involvement’ statements in clinical trial publications in the BMJ
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