

**Minutes**

**PBC Meeting**

**Wednesday, 22 October 2014**

**Time: 13:45 – 14:30**

**Sheraton Centre Toronto Hotel, Toronto, Canada**

**SIOP Board Room (ELGIN)**

**Attendees:** Giorgio Perilongo (SIOP President), Paul Rogers (SIOP Secretary General), Gregory Reaman (SIOP Treasurer), Francois Doz (Chair of the Scientific Committee), Dr. Robert Arceci (Editor-in-Chief PBC), Dr. Peter Newburger (Editor-in-Chief Elect PBC), Linda Friedman (Kenes Int.), Susanne Wollaert (KAW)

**Apologies:** Perry Gil Ran (Kenes Int.)

**Agenda:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **By** | **Est. time** |
| 1. **Welcome and Communication**
 | **Giorgio Perilongo** | 5 |
| 1. **Update from the Editor-in-Chief**
 | **Robert Arceci** | 15 |
| 1. **SIOP Papers**
 | **All** | **5** |
| 1. **Handling of SIOP abstracts/abstract book**
 | **All** | 15 |
| 1. **Any other business**
 | **All** | 5 |

**1. Welcome and Communication**

Giorgio Perilongo welcomed all.

**2. Update from the Editor-in-Chief**

Dr. Robert Arceci (RA) commenced the meeting with a brief update as Editor-in-Chief of the official society journal of SIOP namely Pediatric Blood Cancer (PBC).

Additionally, RA introduced Dr. Peter Newburger (PN) as his successor to the board and how the transition and handover between the two will be handled.

Dr. Gregory Reaman (GR) inquired with RA who exactly from the SIOP Board is on the board of editors and if not, there should be since the society needs a strong link and representation in their journal.

RA supported the comment that active involvement from SIOP is really needed but sometimes difficult due to different time zones and busy schedules.

Dr. Giorgio Perilongo (GP) introduced the SIOP Executive Board to Dr. Peter Newburger and inquired with RA and PN if they have seen the goals and objective plan for the next three years of SIOP which they denied. Susanne Wollaert (SW) was asked to email them the plan after the congress.

RA continued with the updates on the journal and pointed out that the main focus will be on the abstracts but there are a couple of activities and items he would like to point out nevertheless.

RA reported that due to the change to a sole online version the budget of the journal has been effected positively and for the first time more research articles have been received which is a complete inverse as to when the journal started.

Moving on to acceptance rates, RA stated that the overall rate is 36% which is slanted towards North America but there are quite a few submission from Asia which is terrific news and mainly due to Dr. Lee’s involvement.

RA was confident to report that the review turnaround is in very good shape and highly efficient. The average decision time is twenty-one days which is quite stable in his opinion.

The impact factor of the journal has shown a positive trend line and is at 2.562 at the moment and most cited papers are articles now.

Wiley Anywhere Article is a very nice application and enables readers to view the PBC from anywhere, anytime and is very user friendly. Additionally, an App that supports Android operated mobile devices has just been launched as well.

In regards to the handover between RA and PN, RA assured the board that there will be a gradual shift in terms of reviewing responsibility and percentages. PN has been handling 25% of the submissions as of June 2014.

**3. SIOP Papers**

Dr. Francois Doz (FD) pointed out that there needs to be a discussion about the rules for certain publications in regards to ethics and scientific competition, e.g. to not encourage non prospective trials.

RA replied that the new guidelines state that such papers need to be IRB approved but not that they are completely forbidden.

GP pointed out to RA that SIOP would like promote more educational activities and would like to inquire if the journal is willing to can support this initiative and also get more Young Investigators (YI) interested in the society.

Additionally, GP asked if the PBC would be able to give YI a more privileged way to submit their paper and informed the editors that SIOP has just recently implemented a YI award.

RA replied that this is a wonderful idea but that privileged submissions for YI would affect the impact factor negatively. However, he added that there might be room for an educational series, but they might not be cited. GR added to the conversation that there might be other and better channels to communicate educational content, however it is possible to get a good review on educational topics as well.

RA added continued in reporting that PBC published “Best of IPSO” just recently but that some of them were rejected. Stephen Shochat (IPSO President Elect) took the lead on this matter and formed a small task force to review these.

**4. Handling of SIOP abstracts/abstract book**

The second half of the meeting focused on the abstract guidelines and online submission portal (refer to Appendix 1 for “Guidelines for Submission to PBC: SIOP Abstracts).

Main issues included that large figures and tables have been submitted despite the fact that only an abstract should be submitted. FD added that some of the abstract had blank tables and P values where displayed as questions marks. The attendees agreed that this is a purely technical issue and needs to be looked into by Kenes Int. There should be a possibility to already pre-filter these abstracts out before they make to the review stage. This would take off a huge burden of the SC and SPECS and other meetings such as ASH (American Society of Hematology) have very advanced systems to support this.

**5. Any other business**

n/a

Decision(s):

Abstracts with tables and figures should not be accepted anymore and Kenes needs to block them off during the submission stage already.

Action(s):

* SW to send SIOP goals and objectives to Editor in Chief
* Kenes Int. to check if the abstract submission portal and be adjusted to the technical needs of the SC
* Wiley Anywhere Article to be made available to members of SIOP in the members zone online