INTRODUCTION

It is commonly believed that videos represent a great way to enrich scientific articles; however, we know very little about how authors and publication professionals working to support them value these in their publication activities.

There are strong reasons to believe that academic authors and publication professionals’ perspectives on video abstracts may differ.

An exploratory analysis aimed at understanding the role of video abstracts in disseminating research findings by comparing video abstract views with other publication metrics is presented in an accompanying poster.

METHODS

A brief, nine-question survey was conducted by Dove Medical Press using iSurveyPro and circulated among Dove Medical Press-opt-in users and by PAREXEL, using SurveyMonkey and circulated in relevant LinkedIn groups.

A case study on a recent video abstract submission to the International Journal of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease was also conducted by PAREXEL to supplement the survey’s results. The case study illustrates a possible process and provides views of the author and journal editor (scan the QR code above to download a recent video abstract case study).

ABSTRACT

Objective: Video abstracts offer a new way to increase article readership. In these two short surveys, we sought to understand the perception and issues around developing video abstracts from the perspective of publication professionals and academic authors.

Research Design and Methods: Dove Medical Press surveyed its opt-in users with ten questions (iSurveyPro) whilst PAREXEL circulated a nine-question survey (SurveyMonkey) for relevant LinkedIn groups.

Results: In total, 370 responses were received from authors and 68 from professionals. Although 85% of authors and 54% of professionals would consider submitting a video only a few actually (11% of authors versus 12.5% of professionals). The main benefit perceived to be increased reach of the results (73% of authors versus 48% of professionals) and the main barrier was logistics for 45% of authors and cost for 40% of professionals. In open responses, authors said that videos are a good way to show/explain data and that they would be encouraged to submit video abstracts if they had access to a video creation toolkits. Open responses from professionals typically emphasized the importance of demonstrating return on investment.

Conclusions: Few author or professionals submit video abstracts despite being interested in their potential to increase readership. While authors are prescripted with logistics, professionals are focused on the lack of clarity over benefits and costs. Publishers need to provide authors with as much guidance/support as possible and additional examples of video development are needed to build confidence within the industry.

OBJECTIVE

In this study, we surveyed academic authors and publication professionals independently in order to understand the differences and similarities in the perception and issues around developing video abstracts.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

• Video abstracts are perceived as adding value to an article but many barriers prevent authors from initiating them.
• The publication professionals’ and academic authors’ perspectives differ when it comes to the factors that would influence them to create a video abstract.
• Publication professionals are more focused on cost and return on investment.
• Academic authors are more preoccupied with logistics and ease of creating the videos.
• This is not surprising considering that publication professionals create the work for commercial enterprises, whereas academic authors generally do not.
• Attitudes towards developing video abstracts may change if publishers can provide authors with as much guidance and support as possible, and when data showing the actual impact of video abstracts on the dissemination of the research results are readily available, to increase confidence and uptake.
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