

## Lost in translation: Corrections and the Lay Media

*What experiences have you had with incorrect reporting of research in the media?*

### NOTHING

- Nil
- Nil
- None
- Nil
- Nothing in regard to my editor role

### POSITIVE

- Journal X does encourage Wiley Blackwell to consider press releases on its published articles, but those considered are carefully selected by the Editor in Chief. Furthermore, the press release will only go out if approved by the Editor in Chief and authors of the original study. The aim is to prevent as much as possible that any misleading interpretation in lay terms (as good as it may be if something constitutes a desirable 'soundbite' for the media) will be conveyed to the wider public. **We have not had experience with incorrect research reporting in the media yet**

### DISTORTION OF FACTS

- Sometimes the media emphasis distorts the overall results, but I have seldom encountered incorrect reporting

- Thankfully, I have not had my own research mis-reported, but I see it happen often regarding the work of others. Usually, the error is to overly state either the originality or the impact of the work
- Expanding **regional into Asia-Pacific** market

### PREPARATION IS KEY

- Too much! I used to work in a research lab **where we were 'groomed' whenever we had to do an interview with the media, be that radio or TV**. The kinds of questions we should expect were gone over, and we were given multiple tips and hints on what to say, what not to say, how to say it, and so forth. As an academic working in a University, the media just calls and we are expected to talk 'off the cuff'

### PUBLIC MISCONCEPTION

- ...fundamental genetic research in plant breeding takes place in our highly controlled containment laboratories and glasshouses. As an organisation, **we've had a few issues/experiences, mostly with public misconceptions about the work** we do, and have needed to move swiftly and decisively to clarify, and to protect our reputation