Teaming Up for Our Program

Carlos Zarate, M.D., Program Committee Chair

Dear ACNP Family,

The Annual Program is one of the most important aspects of our Society. It distills the best that our field has to offer in neuropsychopharmacology, ranging from basic to clinical science. Each year I look forward to attending this meeting, to seeing the latest and hottest science out there, and to catching up with my colleagues and friends. The Annual Program is an opportunity to learn, to exchange ideas, to come up with collaborations, to get our families together, and to have fun. But most importantly, the electric and convivial atmosphere of the Annual Program lends itself to a constant exchange of science and ideas that, ultimately, results in a hopefully better understanding of the causes of the disorders we study and to improved treatments for our many patients who suffer from them. The meeting this year is a particularly important one for me as I was entrusted by our Society’s President, Alan Frazer, with chairing the 2016 Program Committee. This piece summarizes the steps that our “team”—the members of the selection committee—took to develop what I believe will be viewed as a high-quality, balanced scientific program.

The expertise and scientific areas of interest of the selection committee members lies at the heart of every Annual Program. This year, 50 outstanding team members from diverse backgrounds were selected based on their interest, enthusiasm, credentials, and expertise to put together our 2016 Annual Program. The membership was balanced to ensure we had sufficient expert representation across a broad range of primary disorders, clinical sciences, and basic sciences. We also sought to address areas perceived to have a particular gap that might require additional expertise in the review process.

This year, we received 921 submissions (Panel = 83, Mini-Panel = 24, Study Group = 6, Posters = 808). The acceptance rate for non-Poster submissions was 54% and, of these, 40% resulted from Request for Proposals (RFPs). With regard to research areas, 77 were integrative (Clinical and Basic), 19 were Basic and 15 were Clinical. Disease State areas covered included: schizophrenia (N=27), mood disorders (N=23), substance-related disorders (N=14), childhood or adolescence (N=13), anxiety disorders (N=6), childhood or adolescence (N=13), dementia (N=1), disorders of infancy (N=1), mental disorders due to a general medical condition (N=1), and other (N=25). Interestingly, the number of submissions in the “other” category increased compared to previous years, which may reflect submissions that are more integrative and cross disorders rather than focus on a single disorder.

We abided by a tight timeline to ensure that the RFPs were received early, that submissions could be submitted in a timely manner, and that allowed enough time to conduct a thorough review of all submissions prior to and during our face-to-face meeting. RFPs were chosen by asking members of our community and others to assess what topics they might consider to be...
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particularly important or relevant for our annual meeting. Ten areas were highly favored and were thus submitted as RFPs.
1. Biohackers get ready: Genome editing in neuropsychiatric diseases.
2. How electromagnetic fields influence neural function, from cells to circuits to connectivity - the fundamental neuroscience underlying device-based interventions.
3. Immune markers in psychiatry: Inflammation or synaptic remodeling/pruning?
4. Interactions of cannabis and the endocannabinoid system in the brain: relevance to psychiatric disorders and their therapeutics.
5. New tools and translational models for drug discovery (zebrafish, disease-in-a dish models, organs on chips).
6. Refining the concept of “target” for intervention development.
7. Suicide (Filling in the gap: from basic to clinic to treatment).
8. Tackling data robustness in drug discovery.
10. Using human genetics GWAS and expression data to drive discovery.

Each reviewer was assigned submissions to evaluate and rate well in advance of our face-to-face meeting. Before giving out the assignments, we double-checked for potential conflicts of interest. In addition, after assignments were handed out, reviewers had 48 hours to let us know if they identified other areas of potential conflict of interest that would require them to recuse themselves. Thanks to a new search engine introduced by the ACNP, we could easily sort submissions by any desired criteria.

Member Nominations and Promotions

Nomination materials for new Member and Associate Member applicants and Fellow promotion candidates are available under the Membership tab on the ACNP website, http://www.acnp.org/membership/applications.aspx.

As the September 12th nomination deadline approaches, please remember the 2014 change allowing an additional nomination in support of applicants for full membership or associate membership as long as one of the nominations is for a woman or under-represented minority. As the College strives to continue to increase the number of membership applications from these two demographics, we hope each of you will take advantage of this opportunity.

Nominator Instructions: Please note nomination letters are no longer needed this year. The nomination process will be completely online. Once the nominee inputs your name in the online system, you will receive an email with a link to complete the nomination form online. Please complete the specific sections to give a clear indication of how this nominee, if granted membership, would contribute to and promote the mission of the ACNP. Please do not list information that would be contained in their CV. Instead, please comment specifically on:

• Important findings and their impact on the field
• Innovative conceptualizations or methodological contributions
• Clinical approach or experience, including clinical protocols the nominee has developed
• Personal qualities that would be an asset for the College such as collegiality, collaboration with others, and productive leadership
• Nomination forms for Industry applicants should also describe major contributions that have helped to advance the field. It is important for the nominator to convey those qualities and accomplishments to identify the applicant as outstanding.

*Please note that this was submitted in letter form in year’s past. This year you will submit the information online on behalf of the nominee. The nominee will waive their right to read the information you submit.

New Members, Associate Members and Fellows will be announced at the ACNP Business Meeting on Wednesday, December 7th. Please contact the Executive Office with any questions at acnp@acnp.org.
Director’s Notes
Ronnie Wilkins, Ed.D., CAE, ACNP Executive Director

Renovations at The Diplomat: Ten years ago, in 2006 we held the ACNP Annual Meeting at the Diplomat Resort and Spa in Hollywood, FL. That was the first time in decades that we had held the Annual Meeting in the Continental United States, and it was the beginning of a major break in the tradition of the College to meet for three years in Puerto Rico and the fourth year in Hawaii. Although the meeting had simply outgrown the meeting space at the Caribe Hilton, it was hard to leave there. Many members had such fond memories from years of meeting at the Caribe that they were understandably concerned about the idea of leaving such a wonderful place. In turn, I was concerned that if the meeting at the Diplomat did not go well that my career with ACNP might be cut short! Fortunately, the 2006 meeting was a big success, and the evaluations of the hotel were the highest we had ever received up to that point.

However, we all noticed last year that the Diplomat was showing some signs of wear and tear. You will be pleased to know that the hotel is undergoing major renovations even as I write. In December you will see a completely renovated and new look in the lobby. All guest rooms are being renovated. And, there will be a total of nine restaurants on the property, with several of them being new or newly renovated. We are anxious to see the finished product, but what we have seen so far looks great.

Although the renovations will be mostly complete before the meeting, some of you may be disappointed that you have a room with a balcony, but find the balcony door locked. We have been warned that repairs to the outside of the building will not be complete before our meeting dates. Not all rooms will be affected, but some will. If you are among those who get a room with no access to the balcony, please be patient with the hotel and know that they are doing their best to keep the disruptions to our attendees as minimal as possible.

More on Going Green: In the May ACNP Bulletin I announced that we will be going green at the meeting this year. We will be heavily promoting the use of electronic tools such as the online itinerary planner and the mobile app. But with so many meeting attendees using these tools in recent years, along with the convenient pocket guide, we have decided that the program book is no longer necessary. Eliminating the book saves trees and money, and helps to keep the cost of the meeting registration as low as possible.

Recently we also surveyed members regarding this Bulletin: should it continue to be printed and mailed, or should it too become an electronic publication? Our response rate to the survey was only about 30% (perhaps not unexpected), but the preference of those who did respond was overwhelming (86%) in favor of sending the Bulletin as an electronic newsletter rather than in print. So, we are working on an electronic newsletter design that will hopefully be pleasing and efficient. Our goal is to deliver the first electronic copy of the Bulletin to you in November.

Given the flexibility that is inherent in an electronic publication we will be able to accommodate more material, be more flexible with the length of articles, and perhaps publish more frequent but shorter Bulletins than we have in the past. As always, we will welcome your feedback.

No More Past Presidents’ Luncheon: As the Annual Meeting continues to grow, I am sure you have noticed that it has also become more and more packed with scientific sessions, new types of sessions, special luncheons, receptions, and various meetings of committees, task forces, and other small groups. We have come to the point where the consideration of any new addition to the meeting essentially means that we have to consider in tandem what old event will be deleted in order to make room in the schedule for the new one. In 2016, for the first time we will not hold a past presidents’ luncheon. This gathering of former presidents has been a tradition for many years, but the current leadership of the College can seek their advice in other ways and freeing this time will allow Executive Committee members another opportunity to schedule one of the many meetings they must attend.

As I am writing this article, the meeting registration numbers are looking comparable to last year, which had record high attendance. I hope you have registered and reserved your room, and I look forward to seeing you in December.
Negotiation for Early-Career Scientists: A View from Both Sides

Erika Forbes, Ph.D., ACNP Membership Advisory Task Force member

Negotiation is repeatedly identified as a skill that early career scientists—and, in particular, past ACNP travel award recipients and associate members—value and hope to improve. Effective negotiation is critical throughout the early career period (e.g., not only when starting a new position) and is relevant across settings, including both academia and industry. This year's Career Development Session will focus on negotiation and, furthermore, will build on the ACNP Women's Task Force Luncheon, which will focus on negotiation for women. Accordingly, Dr. Andrea Kupfer Schneider, the invited speaker for the Women's Luncheon, will serve as a member of the panel. A Professor of Law and Director of the Alternative Dispute Resolution program at Marquette University, as well as longstanding faculty of the Career Development Institute for Psychiatry, Dr. Schneider will provide an expert perspective and place the discussion into the context of early career issues. The other panelists represent a range of career stages, scientific specialties (e.g., basic vs. clinical), and experiences on both sides of the early-career negotiation table. These will be Drs. Vaishali Bakshi (who has had recent experience negotiating for hiring/promotion and family leave issues in multiple types of institutions), David Lewis (who as Chair of Psychiatry at University of Pittsburgh has experience negotiating with clinicians and basic scientists and the issues that are unique to each in a clinical department), Lorna Role (who as Chair of Neurobiology and Behavior at Stony Brook University, has extensive experience with negotiations in a basic science department), and George Koob (who has experience leading teams in both intramural (Director, NIAAA) and private research foundation (Chair at Scripps Institute) settings). Dr. Shelly Flagel, from the Membership Advisory Task Force, will serve as moderator. Topics will include what exactly is negotiable (there are many things that can be negotiated besides money and lab space), how early-career scientists should approach negotiation (how far to ‘lean in’?), how to negotiate the terms of postdoc/fellowship training and transition into one’s first independent research position in a variety of career paths (small college versus large medical school, for example), how to adapt one’s negotiation style to specific circumstances, and how might ‘what’s on the table’ differ across different types of settings (for example, clinical versus basic science department, academia versus intramural program, industry versus private foundation). In all, the panel will provide a valuable combination of broad principles, practical tips, and personally derived wisdom.

Associate Member and Past Travel Awardee Survey Results

Mercedes Perez-Rodriguez, M.D., Ph.D., ACNP Membership Advisory Task Force member

*Summary is based on 2016 Results

SAMPLE DEMOGRAPHICS

The survey was sent to 145 Associate Members and 543 Past Travel Awardees; response rates were 46% and 44% respectively.

Associate Member respondents: 51% are female, the majority (82%) are between the ages 36 and 45, and 6% consider themselves to be a part of an underrepresented minority. 45% have children, and 78% have a partner/spouse who works in a full-time position. Of those with children, 62% reported that they do not usually bring their children to the annual meeting, and 40% reported that having subsidized childcare would impact this decision.

Past Travel Awardee respondents: 52% are female, 48% are between the ages of 36 and 45, and 18% consider themselves members of an underrepresented minority. 75% have a partner/spouse that works in a position of full-time employment. The majority (66%) have children, most (57%) do not usually bring their children to the annual meeting, and 32% reported that having subsidized childcare would impact their decision to bring the children.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 5
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ANNUAL MEETING LOGISTICS/ATTENDANCE

The location of the Meeting impacts the attendance of most Associate Member and Past Travel Awardee respondents (63% and 55%, respectively). The most popular locations were Florida, Arizona, Puerto Rico and Hawaii. Most Associate Members (71%) agree that meeting registration fees are reasonable. This opinion has consequences for attendance, as 55% of Associate Members and 48% of Past Travel Awardees reported that the price of registration influences their decision to attend the annual meeting. Despite concern about meeting costs, only a minority of respondents (19% of Associate Members, 34% of Past Travel Awardees) said they would participate in a room-sharing program.

Associate Members’ Feedback

Out of the 67 respondents, 66% are PhDs, 17% are MDs, and 17% are MD/PhDs. The majority of respondents (86%) had applied once before being accepted as an Associate Member (12% applied twice; 2% applied 3 or more times). 69% of respondents know about the Membership Advisory Task force.

Culture. With respect to perceptions of the College, 63% rated ACNP’s welcoming atmosphere as “Very High” or “High” for early, mid-career, and potential members. This reflects a decrease from the 2015 rating of 82%. For specific concerns, however, Associate Members rated ACNP’s culture quite positively: 72% felt very highly or highly comfortable asking more senior members about promotion and participation, and 71% felt very highly or highly confident that they knew who to contact with questions. The three most-valued aspects of the College are the opportunities for networking for scientific collaboration and exchange of ideas (75% of respondents), the access to the latest research methods (64%), and the sophisticated audience for feedback about one’s own research (61%).

Membership. To date, 7% have applied for full membership, but 93% intend to apply in the future. While only a minority of respondents (39%) are optimistic about being accepted as full members after the first application, the majority (62%) believe they will eventually achieve full membership. For those who have yet to apply, 81% of respondents list “not confident that I will be accepted” as the main reason. 54% of respondents believed that academic institutions value ACNP membership for promotion decisions. Approximately half (51%) view ACNP associate membership dues ($400) as reasonable, and a similar proportion (52%) see ACNP membership as more appealing if dues and meeting registration cost were lower. When asked to identify unappealing aspects of membership, respondent focused on mentorship quality; fees; the role of women, members in industry, young scientists, minorities and international attendees; mandatory attendance; and the growing size of the annual meeting. One respondent suggested having a voluntary pre-review system for membership applications, to allow applicants to work on weak areas based on the pre-review feedback before submitting the application.

Comments. Respondents suggested increasing meeting attendance by providing more opportunities to participate in ACNP activities, having better meeting locations, being more inclusive, and increasing the focus on development and animal models.

Past Travel Awardees’ Feedback

Of the 240 respondents, the majority (64%) were PhDs, 14% were MDs, and 22% were MD/PhDs. About half (52%) of Past Travel Awardees knew about the Membership Advisory Task force.

Culture. The majority (66%) rated ACNP as “very high” or “high” in terms of its welcoming atmosphere, 68% said they know who to contact with questions, and 66% were very highly or highly comfortable about asking more senior members about membership and participation (very high – 34%, high – 32%). The most valued aspects of ACNP were networking for scientific collaboration or exchange of ideas (68%), access to the latest research methods (56%), and the sophisticated audience for peer-review and feedback about the respondents’ own research (53%).
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Membership. The majority of Past Travel Awardees (75%) had never applied for membership. Of those who have become Associate Members, 46% were successful after applying once, 8% had applied twice, and 5% had applied 3 times. 63% intended to apply for full membership, and 35% believed they would eventually acquire full member status. 44% of respondents believed that ACNP membership would be valued for promotion decisions by their academic institutions, reflecting a decrease of 7% since 2015. 44% of respondents replied that the price of annual ACNP membership dues ($400) influenced their desire to maintain or acquire full membership. The most common reasons for not having applied to be a Full Member were low priority (49%), difficulty attend the meeting consistently (40%), and uncertainty of acceptance (34%). In the comments section, reasons for not applying included junior status, cost, time involved in applying, meeting location, “exclusivity”, lack of “unique scientific information” and “politics”. Of ways to make membership more appealing, the most highly endorsed were lower membership fees and registration costs (53%), increasing the transparency of the application process (44%) and not requiring meeting attendance (40%).

Comments. While acknowledging the “significant” changes over the past “5-6 years” to increase diversity, respondents expressed concerns about male predominance, with some comparing the ACNP to an “old boys’ club”. The exclusivity of ACNP was valued by some respondents and criticized by others; one respondent compared the membership process to “rushing a college fraternity”.

SUMMARY

Generally, Associate Members and Past Travel Awardees view the ACNP as welcoming and its annual meeting as a setting for high-quality scientific exchange. They consider ACNP membership challenging to obtain but ultimately valuable for their scientific and career development. The majority of the responses were positive, especially from the Associate Members, who have chosen to increase their participation in ACNP. They were quite happy with the networking opportunities, the provided childcare services and the decreased fees. The Past Travel Awardees are pleased with their experience overall, are not as consistently committed to ACNP membership, and gave constructive criticism about the membership process. Respondents reported that location and cost influence their likelihood of participating in the annual meeting. Additionally, some misconceptions about ACNP and perceptions of its elitism were expressed, and these could be addressed at a number of levels to benefit the junior scientists who will increasingly contribute to the College.
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Staff Spotlight - Meet the Member Services Manager

After graduating from Michigan State University, Erin Colladay worked in the advertising and television industry. A couple of years later she met a young professional who was creating an agency to support meetings and event companies with travel staff. He asked if she wanted to travel the world and get paid for it. She could not refuse. After traveling for a few years, she decided to settle down. Erin worked for a couple of boutique hotels in the Detroit area and then made her way to General Motors Corporation as a Meetings and Events Manager. During her thirteen years at General Motors, she planned and executed corporate events, board meetings, announcement shows, created marketing displays and worked on major auto shows.

Due to her husband’s job transfer, her family relocated to the Nashville area. In her current position, she supports the ACNP Travel Awards program, works with various committees as well as provide general support to the ACNP team. When she is not working, she spends time with her husband and two sons, traveling the US to soccer and lacrosse tournaments, skiing, and hiking.
ACNP 55th Annual Meeting, December 4-8, 2016

Once again members and guests will be welcomed to Hollywood, Florida by ACNP staff along with the familiar faces at the Diplomat Resort. As in the past, the hotel’s commitment to excellence and enthusiasm for the ACNP has not changed, but you will see great changes in the hotel and amenities. These changes will be very obvious when you enter the lobby this year at the Diplomat Resort. You will be greeted with an entire new look to the lobby, including views of the ocean and new networking areas. ACNP attendees will be able to enjoy brand new restaurants, new pool features that are kid-friendly, and importantly, the hotel has been in the room renovation process and expects to be very close to completion for our arrival! As we look forward to December to experience the exciting changes at the Diplomat Resort, please prepare for your visit by reading below for important reminders.

Registration and Hotel Reservations:
Registration for the 55th Annual Meeting opened in June. Please register by October 28th; the early discounted registration rates increase by $50 on October 29th.

Member Registrations are completed on the ACNP website. To access the registration site, members must login to the ACNP website, www.acnp.org, select “Annual Meeting” and click “Registration.”

Invited Guests will receive a link to the registration site in their invitation letter.

Hotel Reservations:
All hotel reservations will be completed on the hotel site. To reserve your hotel room, click on the link contained in your registration confirmation email. The link will take you directly to the hotel website where you can access the ACNP rooming block and make your reservation directly with the hotel.

The final day for hotel reservation acceptance at ACNP’s discounted rates will be November 7th; however, rooms at these rates are limited and may sell out before the deadline. Please be sure to secure your hotel room early to ensure availability.

Air Travel for the Annual Meeting:
ACNP has partnered with Direct Travel, Inc. for airline travel. Please contact Betty Stanfill, bstanfill@dt.com, or call toll-free 800-229-3344.

Please contact the ACNP Executive Office at 615-324-2360 or acnp@acnp.org with any questions you may have regarding the meeting.

Childcare During the Annual Meeting

During the ACNP 55th Annual Meeting, KiddieCorp will again provide a children’s program. KiddieCorp is in its 30th year of providing high-quality children’s programs and youth services for meetings and special events. They take watching your children very seriously. KiddieCorp has enjoyed long-time partnerships with the American Academy of Pediatrics, which has helped establish KiddieCorp as a premier provider of event children’s program services.

Their goal is to provide your children with a program they want to attend while providing you with that critical "peace of mind" feeling so you can attend your meeting activities.

The children’s program is for children ages 6 months through 12 years old and will be located at the Diplomat Resort in Hollywood, Florida. For more information and to register, please visit https://jotform.com/KiddieCorp/acnpkids.
Member to Fellow Promotions

Article III, Paragraph 3 of the ACNP Constitution states, “Fellows shall be chosen from Members who have not less than five years standing as Members and who have made substantial contributions to the College and to the field of neuropsychopharmacology.”

Over the past 5 years, the promotion process has been streamlined with the goal and expectation of significantly increasing the number of Members promoted to Fellow status. The Membership Committee and ACNP leadership encourage you to consider applying for promotion.

Certain important ACNP committees such as the Nominating Committee and Ethics Committee are restricted to participation by Fellows only and, of course, only Fellows are eligible to be elected to Council. Becoming a Fellow provides both the recognition you deserve for your service to the College as well as the opportunity to participate in these leadership positions.

Contributions to the College are primarily, but not exclusively, defined by the following:

1. Has attended at least 75% of the Annual Meetings since becoming a member. (mandatory minimum for automatic promotion)
2. Has presented at 2 meetings within their term as a member. (Poster presentations included)
3. Is a reviewer in good standing with Neuropsychopharmacology.
4. Has served on a committee or has volunteered to serve.
5. Has served as a mentor or has volunteered to serve.

*Members who meet the minimum 75% attendance plus 3 of the 4 additional contribution criteria, will be automatically promoted to Fellow.*

If you are interested in applying for a promotion, you can pull your Activity Sheets from the “My Activities” tab after logging-in on the conference website (https://acnp.societyconference.com), or by logging-in on the ACNP website (www.acnp.org) and selecting “My Activities” from the Members Only column on the right hand side of the page. Please confirm all information is correct, and then save as a PDF to upload during submission.

---

2016 Travel Awardees Named

*Kathleen Merikangas, Ph.D., Education & Training Committee Chair*

*Steve Siegel, M.D., Ph.D., Education & Training Committee Co-Chair*

The Education & Training Committee is pleased to announce the selection of 58 outstanding scientists for the 2016 ACNP Travel Award program. We received nearly 350 applications for the 58 awards, making this yet another year for difficult decisions by the committee. In addition, the ACNP continues to partner with the ADAA (Anxiety Disorders Association of America) to offer invitations to their selected young researchers to attend the meeting.

As a vitally important portion of the Travel Award program, we strive to assign each awardee a mentor during the week of the meeting. Year after year the committee receives positive feedback from these young scientists who value the experience; many consider the mentorship aspect of the travel awardee program as one of the most meaningful parts of the Annual Meeting. The Travel Award program remains a key pipeline for the College, as it brings the best and brightest up and coming scientists in the field to participate in the Annual Meeting, some of whom will eventually go on to become members. If you would like to serve as a mentor during this year’s meeting, please contact the ACNP Executive Office, acnp@acnp.org.

This year’s schedule of events for the awardees will include a Travel Awardee reception on Saturday evening, December 3rd, and a Travel Awardee luncheon on Wednesday, December 7th.

For a complete listing of the awardees, please visit: www.acnp.org/annualmeeting/travelawards.aspx.
Congressional Briefings

On June 29th, the ACNP Liaison Committee, led by Chair Natalie Rasgon, M.D., Ph.D., (Stanford University) and Charles B. Nemeroff, M.D., Ph.D., (University of Miami) together with the American Brain Coalition in presented at the Congressional Neuroscience Caucus a briefing titled, “A Precision Medicine Approach to Mental Illness,” focused on the area of depression and suicide. The briefing was targeted to congressional staffers to offer more information on the latest research in this area.

ACNP member, Helen Mayberg, M.D. (Emory University) presented to a room of approximately 50 staffers. Accompanying Dr. Mayberg was a long standing patient of Dr. Nemeroff’s, Beverly Brewster an attorney who has suffered with severe depression. Ms. Brewster recounted her journey with depression over the years and how much she had suffered with the cardinal symptoms of depression including persistent suicidal thoughts when finally her persistence led to treatment success. She explained that many patients, like herself, often spend years on a medical journey trying numerous treatment options before finding one or a combination of treatments that ultimately result in treatment success. In her individual case, she emphasized the importance of both appropriate pharmacotherapy and psychotherapy. Dr. Mayberg began her presentation highlighting the fact that despite the effectiveness of many antidepressant treatments, both medication and certain forms of psychotherapy, there is no reliable method to match an individual depressed patient to the treatment with the greatest likelihood of success. In all of medicine, including psychiatry, personalized or precision medicine is being actively investigated with two goals in mind. First identifying individuals who are at risk for psychiatric disorders and second, to identify clinically meaningful brain biosignatures that can be used to predict the best treatment for the patient, including the most effective with the least side effects. Dr. Mayberg documented her remarkable studies that have revealed patterns of brain activity using functional magnetic resonance imaging that predict response to antidepressant treatment and other patterns that predict response to certain psychotherapies. These strategies coupled with ongoing genomic research will likely together achieve our goal of more personalized medicine in psychiatry.

Feedback from those in attendance was encouraging. They found Dr. Mayberg’s progress encouraging and hopeful for future therapeutics.

http://www.brainfacts.org/policymakers/articles/2016/brief-finding-the-right-treatment-for-depression-071416/

To a standing room only, bipartisan crowd, the ACNP Liaison Committee, led by Committee Chair Natalie Rasgon, M.D., Ph.D., (Stanford University) and Co-Chair Charles B. Nemeroff, M.D., Ph.D., (University of Miami) presented “The Nation’s Opioid Addiction and Overdose Crisis,” on June 30th. Working with the office of Senator Lamar Alexander (R-TN), Chair of the U.S. Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions, the briefing was presented as opioid legislation recently passed in the House of Representatives and now heads to the Senate. The goal of this program, and all ACNP briefings, is to educate policy makers on important scientific issues and stress the importance of continued research funding.

Dr. Nora Volkow, Director of the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) and an ACNP member, presented to the group on how science informs us about the intertwined problems of chronic pain, nonmedical use of prescription pain medicines, heroin use, and opioid overdose deaths in the U.S. The misuse of, and addiction to, opioids such as heroin and
prescription pain medicines is a serious national problem that affects public health as well as social and economic welfare. Neuroscience research has provided some solutions to aspects of the problem, but we also know that existing evidence-based prevention and treatment strategies are both highly underutilized and not efficacious for many patients. Accompanying Dr. Volkow was Mr. Justin Riley, President and CEO of Young People in Recovery who offered a patient’s perspective.

Significant efforts have been undertaken across the United States to reduce diversion and misuse of prescription opioids and to reduce opioid overdoses and related deaths. NIDA supports research to understand the impact of these policy changes on rates of opioid misuse, opioid use disorders, and related public health outcomes. This research has demonstrated the efficacy of multiple types of interventions including:

- Educational initiatives delivered in school and community settings (primary prevention)
- Supporting consistent use of prescription drug monitoring programs (PDMPs)
- Implementation of overdose education and naloxone distribution programs to issue naloxone directly to opioid users and potential bystanders
- Aggressive law enforcement efforts to address doctor shopping and pill mills
- Diverting justice-involved individuals with substance use disorders to Drug Courts with mandated engagement in treatment
- Expansion of access to Medication Assisted Treatments
- Abuse-deterrent formulations for opioid analgesics
- Unfortunately the increasing regulation of prescription opiates has had an unintended consequence, namely a marked increase in heroin use which has further contributed to the alarming overdose death rate due to opiates in the United States

The attendance and response to the briefing has been overwhelmingly positive. Many of the staffers were appreciative of the education and the efforts of our members’ research in an area of such dire need. It is clear that understanding the pathogenesis of opiate addiction, like all other medical disorders, is the requisite cornerstone for developing novel prevention and treatment strategies.

**Dates to Remember**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 12, 2016</td>
<td>Deadline for Membership Nominations/Promotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 28, 2016</td>
<td>Annual Meeting Early Registration Deadline; fees increase by $50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 7, 2016</td>
<td>2016 Annual Meeting Hotel Reservation Deadline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Congratulations to ACNP Member, Dr. Joshua Gordon, new Director of NIMH**
number of variables including type of submission, scores, key words, etc. This permitted us to identify potential areas of conflict, to assess the composition of the panels (including gender or under-represented minority status), and to identify a possible overlap in topics. In the case of the latter, we created subcommittees that allowed reviewers to read over abstracts with potentially similar themes before our face-to-face meeting to help determine which submissions were similar, and to help select the best proposals.

Our face-to-face meeting was held in July in Chicago. The meeting began with opening remarks and words of encouragement from our President, Alan Frazer. The need for strict confidentiality during the review process and resulting discussions was repeatedly emphasized throughout the review process and again during the meeting. A master summary list of submissions was handed out to the committee members that included submission, type of submission, and rank scores; reviewers’ scores were anonymized.

What was clear from the abstracts submitted and resulting scores was the very high quality of all the submissions, which made the task of selecting the best ones for the Annual Program that much harder. Rank order was based on scores regardless of type of submission (i.e., Panel, Mini-Panel, Study Group). If scores were tied (mean and SD), submissions were next ranked based on the composition of the author group, taking into account the number of women and under-represented minorities. This was done to address the ACNP Executive Committee’s charge to increase diversity and has been highlighted in our Society’s Journal (Bolaños-Guzmán and Zarate, 2016; Moghaddam et al., 2016).

Thus, the selection committee’s task was to choose the best of the best. The summary scores resulted in three subgroups. The subgroup with the top scores was automatically accepted for the program and not further discussed unless a member wished to do so. The subgroup with the bottom scores was not discussed unless a member nominated a submission for reconsideration; from this subgroup only two submissions were nominated for discussion again. For the subgroup with the middle scores (the “Discuss” subgroup), three reviewers (a primary, secondary, and tertiary reviewer) were assigned to each submission; these reviewers had been asked to be prepared to present and discuss the submission and defend their assigned rating during the meeting. Subsequently, through the use of push-button vote electronic technology introduced by the ACNP, committee members were asked to vote for the submission under consideration as “Accept” or “Not Accept.” The latter group could then be re-accessed by rank if the number of submissions required to fill the program schedule had not been achieved. This iterative process continued until all the available slots were filled and programmatic balance was achieved. Notably, the push-button technology permitted members to vote in a blind fashion as opposed to a vote by raising hands as had been done in previous years.

Throughout the process, committee members performed as a cohesive team. They executed their duties admirably, worked hard to provide thorough and thoughtful reviews, and were well prepared to defend their evaluations and ratings. In my opinion, the process was fair, efficient, open, and in-depth which truly resulted in the selection of the best proposals among those submitted. I was tremendously impressed with this group, and am particularly proud of what we have achieved.

I am fortunate to have done several tours on the program committee at the ACNP and other associations and, over the years, I have had ample opportunity to learn the necessary processes for setting up a high quality review of the science for a scientific program. Thus, I can clearly see that the success of this strong Annual Program is directly due to our dedicated team, the committee members, the Executive Committee, and the ACNP staff. In particular, I wish to thank Bita Moghaddam for whom I served as Co-chair last year for her insights and wisdom; the committee members who made this process so smooth and efficient for their time and for the great discussions we had (in a timely manner); Alan Frazer, ACNP President, who selected me for this task; and my Co-chair Patricio O’Donnell who will become Chair of the 2017 Program Committee. Finally, special kudos to the ACNP staff—John White, Sarah Timm, Erin Shaw, Heather McCroskey, and Ronnie Wilkins. Their tireless efforts made this process seamless.

We are not out of the woods yet. Scheduling of the submissions is underway and this will be done to maximize balance throughout the weeks of our meeting and minimize overlap in topics. Scheduling is also done with an eye towards supporting, as much as possible, the ability of members to attend multiple sessions in the same half day. Other tasks also remain. For instance, our committee members are currently reviewing 808 posters submissions, and the Hot Topics Subcommittee will be selecting the best submissions for oral presentations.
Important Policy Reminders

As you are making plans to attend the 55th Annual Meeting, we ask you remember these important College policies. Council recognizes that many people who attend our meeting find it a convenient place to network and to connect with colleagues from other academic, government, or industrial organizations. This informal networking has historically been an important aspect of the meeting that many of our members believe has helped further scientific progress. However, organizing competing activities (e.g. satellite sessions, scientific board meetings, or social functions) that take attendees away from the meeting site detracts from other important goals of the meeting, such as fostering an atmosphere that encourages both formal and informal scientific discourse throughout the week and providing opportunities for travel awardees, trainees, and other young scientists to interact with leaders in the field. Therefore, Council asks that you refrain from organizing activities that take our members and meeting attendees away from the meeting.

Many of our supporting corporations and academic institutions are large organizations with many people involved in planning meetings, and we realize that sometimes people organize meetings in conflict with this policy simply because they are not aware of it. If you are invited to attend any such functions, please help us by reminding the person issuing the invitation that this would be a violation of ACNP policy.

Additionally, the ACNP name, logo, or the name of the Annual Meeting should not be used in association with any CME activity without the approval of the College. To obtain permission to use the College name for such purposes, please contact ACNP (acnp@acnp.org) who will have your request reviewed by the appropriate committee and/or Council.

Teaming Up for Our Program

(continued from page 11)

While the unforeseen might arise between now and the upcoming Annual Program, I am confident that our team will be able to tackle any issues and am looking forward to an enriching and exciting meeting. Finally, this has been a very rewarding and productive experience—thanks for letting me serve.

See you soon,
Carlos.
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