

Abstract Selection Report

Young Investigator Travel Awards

13th International Congress of Radiation Research

Abstracts were reviewed by a panel of approximately 25 judges, representing each of the ICRR member Societies, with good balance between the disciplines of biology, physics, chemistry and medicine. The reviewers were assigned by Dr. Dewhirst, after comparing lists of key words describing areas of expertise with titles of abstract topics. Care was taken to avoid conflicts of interest. The abstract assignment process worked fairly well. A few were turned back by reviewers because of lack of expertise. These were re-assigned to other reviewers, as necessary. A few additional reviewers were added when some of the reviewers were not available to complete the reviews by the pre-set deadline.

The reviewing process was done electronically. The reviewers were able to visualize a distribution of their scores and were able to adjust each abstract after initial review.

The abstracts were scored on a 1-10 scale, with 1 being best and 10 being worst. There were four criteria:

- Significance
- Methods
- Results
- Conclusions

There were a minimum of 2 scores given for each and in the majority of cases 3 scores. Although we did not quantify this endpoint, there was generally good agreement on the scoring from the judges. Also, for the most part, the judges really liked the on-line scoring scheme. It was easy to use and transparent. There would be a few things I would fix, but in general, it should work for next year as well.

A total of 247 abstracts were submitted for consideration.

Here are the raw statistics

Median 4.33

25th % tile = 3.50

60th % tile = 4.50

75th % tile = 5.0

Lowest score = 1.7

Highest score = 8.0

The scoring distribution is fairly Gaussian and nearly the whole scoring range was used. Based on available funds from multiple sources, we have offered travel awards to a total of 156 students. Travel funds were obtained mainly from US funding agencies, such as DOE, NASA, NCI and RRS. Additional, but no less significant support came from the European Radiation Research Society, the ICRU, NRH, IARR, Japanese Radiation Research Society, NRH, Amgen and the Polish Radiation Research Society. Of these funds, approximately 80% came from either RRS or US governmental sources. A detailed breakdown of the funding sources can be made available upon request.

The distribution by country is interesting. About half of the applicants were from outside the US and Canada. The awards break down similarly on a financial level. That is, approximately half the funds allocated went for US and Canadian students

and the other half went to foreign students. A preliminary summary of how the scores breakdown by topic and country of origin is appended.

Note that the tables below are not entirely accurate. We had requested that each student respond by a certain deadline date as to whether they were going to accept the award or not. When the deadline date passed, we had eleven students who had not responded, despite two warnings. So, we went ahead and awarded those travel grants to another cohort of eleven students. Of course, then there was a flood of complaints from some of those students, with many excuses for why they had not responded. So far, we have managed to reinstate about five of these – but the information on these five is not included in the tables below. The Australian Society picked up travel for one if its own students as well as paying for faculty travel. This gesture allowed us to cover expenses for this group of students, who otherwise would have lost their awards.

Selection of Marie Curie and Fowler Awards

These awards are for the best two abstracts submitted for this meeting. The Awards Committee of the Radiation Research Society is responsible for adjudicating the award recipients. The RRS makes this decision because both of these awards are RRS sponsored. The top ten scored abstracts were forwarded to the Award Committee, which went through its own evaluation process to determine the two award winners.

Table 1. Breakdown by Topic

General Topic	Total # Submitted	Total # Funded	% Funded
Biodosimetry	10	5	50.0%
Bystander	19	7	36.8%
Cell behavior / stem cells	12	10	83.3%
Clinical	15	8	53.3%
DNA Damage	32	22	68.8%
DNA Repair	33	24	72.7%
Exptl Therapeutics	31	21	67.7%
Physics / Chemistry	13	7	53.8%
Carcinogenesis	14	6	42.9%
Protectors/Mitigators	20	8	40.0%
Signaling	35	28	80.0%
Technical Advances	13	10	76.9%
Total	247	156	

Table 2. Breakdown by Country

Country	Total # Submitted	Total # Funded	% Funded
Australia	1	0	0.0%
Austria	1	0	0.0%
Belarus	1	0	0.0%
Belgium	2	2	100.0%
Canada	14	10	71.4%

China	8	2	25.0%
Columbia	1	1	100.0%
Czech Rep	2	2	100.0%
Egypt	1	1	100.0%
France	6	4	66.7%
Germany	3	2	66.7%
India *	19	0	0.0%
Ireland	2	1	50.0%
Italy	6	1	16.7%
Japan	28	16	57.1%
Poland	5	3	60.0%
S. Korea	10	7	70.0%
Russian Federation	4	2	50.0%
Saudi Arabia	1	1	100.0%
Sweden	5	1	20.0%
Switzerland	1	1	100.0%
Taiwan	5	4	80.0%
The Netherlands	5	5	100.0%
Ukraine	5	1	20.0%
United Kingdom	7	4	57.1%
United States	104	85	81.7%
Total	247	156	

* India – 2 were offered awards but 1 declined. The second student accepted the award late and is not on the table.

Travel Award Funding Schema

A graded award schema was used, based on geographical proximity to San Francisco.

1) Registration fee only (\$420 value) was awarded to students West of the State of Arizona. This would include California, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Utah, Wyoming, Montana and Idaho.

2) Registration + \$300 for students East to the Mississippi

3) Registration + \$500 for students East of the Mississippi and Canada

4) Most foreign students were awarded Registration + \$800.

5) A few students from 3rd world countries, such as Egypt, China and Columbia were offered free registration + \$1500.

Funding Summary

- Funds to US/Canada = \$74,600.00 (\$34,700.00 in award money only)
- Funds outside of US/Canada = \$77,920.00 (\$52,300.00 in award money only)
- 71 of the 112 females that applied received an award = 63.4%
- 12 of the 20 minorities that applied received an award = 60.0%
- 68 SIT members received awards and 88 non members received awards
- 68 SIT members received awards out of 88 SIT members that applied = 77.3%

