
A LETTER TO THE MEMBERSHIP

Some years ago a play posed the question “Will Success Spoil Rock Hunter?” The Society is faced with a similar question vis-a-vis the scientific portion of the national meeting. Last year saw the submission of over 1,500 abstracts for the main program and an additional 150 submissions in answer to the call for “Works-in-Progress.” The Scientific Program Committee has struggled with the problem of providing a forum for the largest number of investigators while trying to maintain a high standard of quality for the material presented. In addressing the challenge of these seemingly conflicting goals, the meeting has changed in many ways over the years. It has, of course, gotten larger. Last year saw over 1,000 entries in the Program Book and Abstract Supplement. The introduction of poster sessions several years ago provided a very successful format for increasing the number of presentations. At the last meeting almost half of the scientific presentations were in the form of posters.

We are now facing a saturation limit. The Convention Center in Cincinnati restricts us to a no-growth situation this year. The Scientific Program Committee hopes to provide the best program ever in Cincinnati but we must work within these restrictions. We are therefore implementing some changes in this year’s review process. We also need the help of you, the members of the Society, and others who will be submitting material for the scientific program. The following guidelines are provided to help you as well as us:

1. Please read and follow all of the instructions on the abstract submission form. They are there for a reason. We have simplified the instructions this year so that this is not an onerous task.
2. Please note the new requirements for a signature certifying that the material has not been submitted for presentation at another national or international meeting or for publication and certifying that all of the listed authors agree to the submission of the material as presented. This point seems as if it should be unnecessary but problems of scientific honesty and courtesy, not to mention potential copyright infringement, have become distressingly frequent. The Committee will make an exception to the previous submission rule if the manuscript has been submitted to *The Journal of Nuclear Medicine* and will not be published before the June meeting.
3. Please combine material of a similar or related nature into a single submission. You will improve the chances of acceptance by sending in abstracts with more “meat” and the Committee may specifically ask submitters of “least presentable units” to combine two or more abstracts into a single presentation.
4. Use good judgement in designating categories for your submissions. For example, preliminary trials of a new radiopharmaceutical that have been conducted only in animals belong in the “Pre-Clinical Testing” category. However, if you have followed guideline #3 above and combined animal and early human trials into a single submission, the paper would belong more appropriately in a clinical session. It is not appropriate to submit essentially similar abstracts to different categories. If you have a question about designating a category call a member of the Scientific Program Committee. We are here to help you.

Works-in-Progress (WIP) has been a simmering problem for many years. No one on the Program Committee has been completely satisfied with this portion of the program although it is acknowledged to meet a real need. We have elected this year to tighten up the WIP review process in order to make this a truly significant portion of the program. Please note the following in regard to WIP:

1. WIP submissions should represent significant work which deserves early dissemination but which wasn't far enough along for submission at the regular January deadline. It is not a vehicle simply for late submission ("I was sick." "I was on vacation." "My cat ate the original abstract on the deadline day.") and it most certainly is not a forum for re-review of papers that were rejected during the main review process. Rejected papers resubmitted for WIP will be automatically rejected again.
2. WIP acceptances will be limited in number in each category.
3. WIP reviews will be *more* stringent than the review process for regular submissions. If you have material ready to go in January, your chances are better than in April.

We on the Scientific Program Committee are looking forward to the best program ever in Cincinnati. This is a great challenge given the high quality of recent meetings. These are exciting, dynamic times for Nuclear Medicine. With your help we can meet this challenge.

John W. Keyes, Jr., MD
Chairman, Scientific Program

Michael J. Welch, PhD
Chairman, General Program

Scientific Program Committee:

Jeffrey A. Leppo, MD, *Vice-Chairman, Cardiovascular*
Joanna S. Fowler, PhD, *Vice-Chairman, NMR/Radiopharmaceuticals*
David A. Weber, PhD, *Vice-Chairman, Physical Science*
Darlene Fink-Bennett, MD, *Vice-Chairman, Clinical I*
Harvey A. Ziessman, MD, *Vice-Chairman, Clinical II*
Robert W. Burt, MD, *Associate Chairman, Categorical Seminars*
Henry D. Royal, MD, *Associate Chairman, Scientific Exhibits*
Robert J. Lull, MD, *Associate Chairman, Continuing Education*

SNM Berson-Yalow Award

The Society of Nuclear Medicine (SNM) Scientific Program Committee has expanded its criteria for the Berson-Yalow Award so that all research making use of the indicator dilution method will be considered.

Originally, the Award was given to investigators who submitted "the most original scientific abstracts in, and the most significant contributions to, basic or clinical radioassay."

Under the current eligibility requirements, the Scientific Program Committee will scan several categories (such as neurology, oncology, and radiopharmaceuticals) in addition to the radioassay sessions for abstracts worthy of the Berson-Yalow Award. To enter, qualified authors must check the designated box on their abstract submission forms for the 1991 SNM Annual Meeting.

Young Investigator Award in Cardiovascular Nuclear Medicine

The Society of Nuclear Medicine, in association with its Cardiovascular Council, sponsors a competition for the best scientific abstract on basic or clinical cardiovascular nuclear medicine. The objectives of the SNM Cardiovascular Young Investigator Award are to identify promising young investigators in the field, help further their careers, and strengthen the theory and practice of the subspecialty of cardiovascular nuclear medicine. The competition is restricted to authors/scientists 36 years old or younger. To enter, qualified authors must check the designated box on their abstract submission forms for the 1991 SNM Annual Meeting. A cash prize will be given to each of the five finalists and they will present their work at a special session of the Annual Meeting.