



# INSIGHTS GAINED FROM NATURE EDITOR PEP PAMIES

Jelmer Raaijmakers<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Master Student Biomedical Sciences, Radboud university medical center, Nijmegen, the Netherlands.

## Interview

In November 2019, RAMS attended the ENABLE congress in Nijmegen with the aim to gain knowledge on open access. One of the participants of the plenary debate was Pep Pàmies, PhD, who is the chief editor of the scientific journal Nature Biomedical Engineering. Since editors can be seen as the guardians of good science and publications, we interviewed Pàmies after the plenary debate to find out how we, as students, can also become good editors and ensure good science.

The plenary debate discussed whether articles should be published in open access. We asked his opinion regarding the matter. He told us that the publishing model of open access has already been proven to be successful and that people want this model. He enlightened us: 'The problem is making it work since there are different fields of science'. This is an obstacle to overcome since scientific fields other than the (bio)medical field have different habits and a different workflow. Furthermore, due to practical problems such as finances, the speed on which we move towards open access is really slow.

Students only have limited experience with publishing models, but can already prepare themselves to become a good editor or reviewer. This is something we should all aspire to become, since we will all have to critically assess scientific articles. What makes an editor a good editor? Pàmies' answer to the question was short but sweet: 'You are a good editor if you recognise good work and scientific relevance'. However, a good reviewer has to provide more. A good reviewer has to study whether the work is valid and if the evidence is proper. Furthermore, a reviewer must assist the editor in whether the science is properly exposed or depicted and whether the article is nicely constructed. Lastly, he added: 'A good reviewer is constructive'. This is something we should all keep in mind when critically appraising articles.

To finalise the insights gained from Pep Pàmies, we asked him what he learned during his time as an editor. His answer was quite surprising. From his point-of-view it is crucial to recognise the constraints of people that do research over the world: differences in people, environments, luck, religion and different findings are things to keep in mind, and therefore you cannot treat all the people the same.

We hope you have gained insights from our interview with Pep Pàmies, chief editor Nature Biomedical Engineering, and remember:

“

*The more you know, the more you realise there is to know.*

”

- Pep Pàmies, PhD

## CORRECT ANSWERS TO THE EXAM QUESTIONS

### Answer question 1:

*C. Have an obstruction in the intestines*

As a result of body folding, the tube-within-a-tube body plan is established. This plan consists of an embryo body design composed of two main tubes: an outer ectodermal tube forming the skin and an inner endodermal tube forming the gut.

For further reading:

Schoenwolf, G.C., et al. *Fourth week: Forming the embryo* in Larsen's Human Embryology, Vol. 5e. (Churchill Livingstone, Philadelphia, 2009)

*During the exam, 63% of the participants answered this question correctly.*

**The exam questions can be found back on page 6 in this journal.**

### Answer question 2:

*B. Feet*

Diabetic foot problems are responsible for nearly 50% of all diabetes-related hospital admissions. The blood flow to the feet is assessed clinically and with Doppler ultrasound. Femoral angiography is used to localise areas of occlusion amenable to bypass surgery or angioplasty. Relatively few patients fall into this category.

For further reading:

Gale, E.A.M. and Anderson, J.V. *Diabetes mellitus and other disorders of metabolism* in Kumar and Clark's Clinical Medicine, Vol. 9 (Elsevier Ltd, the Netherlands, 2017)

*During the exam, 92% of the participants answered this question correctly.*