

**Council Call**  
**Tuesday, July 13, 2021**  
**2:00pm - 3:00pm Eastern**

**Participants:**

**Linda Brady**  
**Carlos Zarate**  
**Kerry Ressler**  
**David Rubinow**  
**Rita Valentino**  
**Maria Oquendo**  
**Marina Wolf**  
**Trevor Robbins**  
**Helen Mayberg**  
**Carrie Bearden**  
**Ellen Leibenluft**

**Mary Phillips**  
**Diego Pizzagalli**  
**Marina Picciotto**  
**Bill Carlezon**  
**David Kupfer**  
**Guillermo Horga, Program Committee Chair**  
**Rajita Sinha, Program Committee Co-Chair**  
**Sarah Timm, staff**  
**Erin Shaw, staff**  
**Tori Swinehart, staff**

**Minutes:**

- 1. Program Committee Report** – Guillermo Horga and Rajita Sinha presented the Program Committee report and list of accepted sessions from the Program Committee meeting on July 10<sup>th</sup>. Council was reminded that these reports are confidential and should not be shared outside of the call. L. Brady thanked the chairs for a great Program Committee Meeting. The chairs agreed the meeting went well and were happy with the sessions that were accepted. G. Horga reminded Council that the President's Plenary session is titled *Brain Initiative Technologies to Understand Brain Function at Cellular, Circuit, and Systems Levels* presented by Hongkui Zeng, Anthony Zador, Damien Fair, and David Boas. The Distinguished Lecture, *Mapping Emotions: Discovering Structure in Mesoscale Electrical Brain Recordings*, will be presented by Kafui Dzirasa. The NPPR Panel, *The Prefrontal Cortex*, is chaired by Suzanne Haber and Trevor Robbins and presented by Angela Roberts, Matthew Rushworth, John O'Doherty, and Holly Lisanby. The Women's Luncheon, *Conspiring for Better*, will be presented by Raychelle Burks. The Career Development Session is titled, *Climbing out of the Career Chasm Caused by COVID*. The Meet the Expert Session, *New Developments in CRISPR-Based Brain Technologies*, will be presented by Alexandros Pouloupoulos. G. Horga reported that the Program Committee reviewed and accepted 37 of the 102 (36%) panel submissions, 8 of the 22 (36%) mini-panel submissions, and 14 of the 18 (78%) study group submissions. He stated the criteria was clear and that the Program Committee has worked to be transparent in the review process and modified as needed. He advised that the committee voted to accept three more sessions than are available in the program, so the chairs chose to reject the three proposals with the lowest accept percentages by the committee to be systematic and fair. Out of the 323 unique participants (male and female) and 59 sessions accepted, 31 (53%) have female chairs and 6 (10%) have a URM (female) chair. He advised that 173 (54%) are women presenters and 59 (18%) are URM presenters. The Program Committee chairs provided charts to Council on the number of submissions and acceptances by women, men, URM, LGBTQ+ and scientists with a disability. G. Horga reminded Council that the Program Committee decided against having a specific RFP for this year's meeting; however, emphasized representation of clinically relevant work and clinical work. The committee did see an increase in clinical submissions this year. G. Horga stated that the labels (basic,

clinical, integrative) are becoming less useful as more people are listing integrative for their abstracts. G. Horga advised that the numbers of male and female presenters are similar to 2020; however, we did see an increase in the number of URM proposed presenters. S. Timm reminded Council that people can now multi-select their ethnicity in their profile which could have led to the apparent increase of URM submissions. On the chart of the 2021 primary categories, it was questioned what sessions categorized as “other”. The Executive Office will provide this data with the minutes. G. Horga stated that the Program Committee continues to see low representation for computational research, genetics/genomics, and non-pharmacological submission. H. Mayberg advised that the International Conference on Neuroscience, Brain Mapping and Therapeutics overlaps with the ACNP meeting this year and that many researchers in this field could have submitted their proposals to this meeting instead of ACNP. G. Horga advised that the Program Committee discussed this during their meeting as well with the brain stimulation focused panels. S. Timm advised that this meeting does not usually overlap with our meeting; however, this is an outlier year as they had to reschedule their meeting due to COVID. S. Timm volunteered to contact their Executive Director to find plans for their future meetings. G. Horga questioned if it would help to get more underrepresented areas in submissions with going back to an RFP. G. Horga advised that the disease state did not change much from 2020. The chairs stated the Program Committee had a robust discussion about seniority and the level of enthusiasm to encourage mid-level and early career researchers to be listed as presenters on panel submissions and for the committee to review the composition of panels closely. The chairs advised that there were some great single abstracts that were rejected due to the overall panel; however, the individual abstracts could be submitted as a hot topic or data blitz this year. The chairs stated they planned to soften the language in the “reject” letters based on the recent URM retreats to encourage them to consider applying again in the future. The chairs questioned if they should encourage those URM presentations that were rejected due to the overall panel to submit a poster abstract for a hot topics or data blitz session. L. Brady suggested to let all rejected sessions know with the first hybrid meeting, the Program Committee received a robust number of proposals and many meritorious proposals were not accepted, and to encourage all presenters to submit their science as a poster abstract. There was concern from Council with encouraging presenters to submit their science for hot topics and data blitz in case they were not accepted for these sessions either. Council agreed to encourage all rejected sessions to submit for a poster abstract including non-members who were invited to the meeting by an ACNP member. It was questioned if the Program Committee chairs should send a follow-up email to the non-member URM presenters that were not accepted with an invitation to the meeting if they did not already have one to bring in more URMs. This could be done by reminding the URMs of the Diversity Invitation Bank. There was concern raised by Council that people do talk and did not want to seem biased to URMs; however, it was stated that the Diversity Invitation Bank is unlimited to URMs and the extra notification would be in regard to the bank. G. Horga stated that the criteria for submissions were included in the panel, mini-panel and study group guidelines and that the current rejection letter includes the following most common reasons for proposals to not be accepted.

## **9 Common Reasons for Why a Session and/or Abstract is Not Accepted.**

1. Insufficient data and/or statistical analyses.
  - a. To address scientific rigor, each data presentation should report N, and ideally an effect size and power calculation. Preliminary or hypothesis-generating studies are of

interest and would be expected to have a smaller 'N', but should be explicitly labeled as such.

2. The session is not sufficiently cohesive.
3. The session is not sufficiently innovative.
4. The session does not include sufficient novel/new data.
5. The theme of the session is over-represented in current submissions for this year.
6. Similar sessions have been presented in recent ACNP meetings.
7. The abstract(s) is not informative enough.
8. The panel participant composition does not have women, minority and/or early career scientist/clinician representation.
9. Speakers are not from diverse institutions.

Council agreed the program looks great and thanked the Program Committee for a great job. There was a motion and second and all approved the 2021 selected program.

2. ***Publications Committee Charge*** – One of the Publications Committee charges is “*Explore strategies for tracking submissions from thought leaders who are non-ACNP members*”. L. Brady advised that the committee discussed and agreed they need a clear definition of a thought leader and is asking Council for clarification. L. Brady suggested a thought leader is someone who has deep expertise, significant impact of seniority in the field, h-index, and relative to other researchers in their field. It was stated that a thought leader could also be a junior researcher that has a relative amount of quality publications in their field and visibility in journals. B. Carlezon advised that the journal looked at the Executive Committee members in the past as leaders for ACNP and where they were submitting their papers if not to NPP. It was questioned what the overarching goal was for this charge. Council was reminded that this charge originated from the Strategic Plan and was given to the Publications Committee and journal as a charge. It was stated that someone could be considered as a “thought leader” in the field, but still submit a lousy paper. It was also stated that this could discourage early career researchers in the field. It was questioned if Council should remove this charge from the Publications Committee and journal. It was stated that at this point, Council is not even clear if our own members are submitting their best work to NPP and the College should focus on their members instead of non-members in the field. There was a motion and second to remove the charge and all of Council were in favor.