

Zoomerang Survey Results

Tri-Society Conference 2009 Survey

1. Are you a current member of one of the societies?

SLB	65	22%
ICS	23	8%
ISICR	84	28%
Not a current member	125	42%
Total	297	100%

2. What category below best describes you and your participation at the conference?

Student/Post-Doc	114	38%
Academia	128	43%
Industry	24	8%
Government	17	6%
Exhibitor/Sponsor	7	2%
Other, please specify	7	2%
Total	297	100%

Responses

Publishing/Editorial
Research Associate
professor
Research assistant
research scientist at University
research worker from the University
Research Institute

3. Please rate the following:

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor
Scientific Content	123 41%	145 49%	29 10%	0 0%
AV/IT	51 19%	144 55%	55 21%	12 5%
Poster Sessions	65 22%	161 54%	62 21%	10 3%
Exhibits	51 18%	157 55%	74 26%	6 2%
Location	130 43%	114 38%	41 14%	14 5%
Speakers	127 43%	138 47%	28 9%	2 1%
Meeting Facilities	104 35%	139 47%	41 14%	12 4%
Meeting Organization	102 34%	136 46%	51 17%	7 2%
Opening Reception	59 23%	133 51%	62 24%	7 3%
Student Mixer	39 25%	78 51%	31 20%	5 3%
Banquet	76 30%	95 38%	58 23%	22 9%
Coffee Breaks	110 37%	120 41%	52 18%	14 5%

4. While in Lisbon, where did you stay?

Dom Pedro Palace	5	2%
Vila Gale Opera	58	20%
Hotel Acores Lisboa	10	3%
Lisboa Marriott Hotel	51	17%
Hotel Real Palacio	24	8%
Hotel Real Parque	36	12%
Olissipo Marques de Sa Hotel	21	7%
Pestana Palace Hotel	7	2%
Other	85	29%

5. How would you rate your accommodations?

Excellent	133	46%
Good	114	39%
Average	37	13%
Poor	6	2%
Total	290	100%

6. How would you rate the shuttle bus service provided?

Excellent	65	28%
Good	102	44%
Average	40	17%
Poor	27	12%
Total	234	100%

7. Did you find the Tri-Society structure of having the three societies join together for this program beneficial?

Yes	235	83%
No	48	17%
Total	283	100%

Responses

- Too diverse; not enough talks in areas of interest
- I would not have included the Leucocyte Society. Topic becomes too broad.
- Too big
- too broad a topic, therefore many topics didn't get covered; also not all award winners got to speak
- The meeting becomes too big and the interesting things are reduced to a very few sessions compared to last year.
- three societies are too many, 2 is enough
- Focus on immunology too strong
- Not really. No significant advantage.
- loss focus
- Too many topics, too much T-cell regulation
- Too many different topics, which means less topics of interest of a certain field (e.g. Interferons).

Way too much interferon. This really limited the scope of the conference on the whole. A greater balance would be more likely to bring me back to the conference in the future. I would be more likely to attend an ICS or SLB meeting than a tri-society meeting. not enough emphasis on IFN-related areas due to dilution effect of tri-meeting

Too big. too crowded. hard to find people.

My interests in leukocyte biology are not that profound to generate a benefit in the program.

too many talks squeezed into too little time

I enjoyed the meeting. However, I felt that the aims of SLB were not fully addressed (ex. one plenary talk related to neutrophils).

but preferably only ISICR and ICS- more cytokines and less leukocytes /immunology. At least the workshops should be not too heavily mixed but more focussed

It is a double-edge sword. Broad spectra of topics but not in depth enough.

Overall it was OK but on the days with 3-4 parallel sessions it was difficult to manage my personal agenda. It was impossible to jump between parallel sessions due to timing inconsistencies and the time required to go to a different room.

Much of the science was not of interest to me.

My primary interest is macrophage cell biology; the Tri-Society organization added a lot of cytokine and signaling biology (as advertised).

To be honest, I'd prefer a more focused meeting. It seems that meetings are becoming less focused, so only 1-2 talks/day are directly relevant. Given the time it takes to travel and the other commitments that all academics have, I wonder if I will attend in the future for a few talks

Beneficial to some extent, but the balance was skewed too far toward T-cells than suits my interest. Therefore, overall not a positive.

too wide variety

I am interested in talks concerning IFN. As it was trisociety, the amount of talks regarding IFN was only 1 third of the entire conference

the conference was too big, which meant too many people at the poster session, too many posters and not enough time to see all.

I think we (SLB) have more common interests with the endotoxin societies that I believe we co-organized the meeting in Boston 2007. In any case, the Boston meeting was far more interesting for me. The Lisbon meeting had bits and pieces of great interest, but they were too scattered. I would have appreciated SLB workshops that were more kept together

No, there are a number of general meetings. Would be good to have an annual meeting focused on cytokines.

There were relatively few talks of interest to me. In general, I found the posters to be of much more interest.

Very little and scattered SLB content.

The whole meeting is so confusing, especially the posters. There is no organization of the categories of posters. If one has to present their posters on both days, when do they get to see other posters?

yes

Too much "distraction"; too much "dilution" of scientific content

Obviously, the organizers from the different societies neither talked to each other nor did they balance the selection of speakers. Indeed, I found excellent talks mixed with presentations that had essentially no content. Many posters showed excellent quality and were much better than many presentations. Finally, the three strings of presentations showed significant overlap leading too many attendees to shuttle permanently. Overall, the organizers did not really perform satisfactorily. Some of the scientific organizers did not even appear or were staying only part-time.

It made the conference bigger than the other SLB meetings I joined, and I prefer smaller conference. I also felt that a few sessions were structured in an unclear manner, maybe also due to the fact that it was a joint conference.

This meeting was too big. Smaller meetings with common meals are better places to meet scientists one did not know from before.

Not focused.

I would prefer to have had one cytokine group represented, as such, there was a heavy focus on interferons from both societies and an under-represented focus on leukocyte biology. My personal preference would have been to have the break out sessions separated by society, but overall I found the program beneficial.

I really enjoyed the quality of the science but it deviated too much from my topic of interest.

But the ISICR and ICS should merge - it doesn't make sense having them separate

The conference was too big - I preferred Montréal 2008 meeting

A tri-society event should occur every 4th year.

too much dilution of content with cytokines and interferons

the interferons had too much emphasis. Why should so much of the meeting be focused on these few cytokines? It's ridiculous.

Too much interesting meetings in the same time, and sometimes choice was difficult.

I did but there were too many IFN talks and not enough "other cytokine" talks.

I thought the ICS and SLB was good. There was a bit too much IFN detail for my taste.

The focus of the topics was skewed to INF and virus

For the ISICR labs who worked on interferon-stimulated genes, it felt like there was not enough emphasis/talk time, probably due to this being a tri-society event and the lack of interest from the other societies.

Yes with a proviso; please see below (#9)

Too many speakers from different fields. A lot of "review" talks about published data. I would appreciate talks by PhD students about their current findings.

As an SLB member, I found it was somewhat too dominated by interferons.

Too much immunology

Too large and distorted emphasis on other societies' interests.

The areas of each Society non always converge

8. Would you attend a future Tri-Society Conference event?

Yes	257	89%
No	33	11%
Total	290	100%

9. We welcome your suggestions for topics and speakers to include at future meetings.

55 Responses

Responses

More structural biology, preferably specific session for cytokine structural biology

Introductory overview lectures and more pharmacological issues would be advisable.

primary immune defects

I would appreciate less time for the speakers (40 min is too much) to save the whole time spent on the conference, because the program took a very long time during the day and therefore it was very tiring. The long time-speakers could have some concluding lessons, not only presentations of their own research.

glycobiology L. Baum, G. Rabinovich, J.D. Marth

More clinical emphasis, cytokine/interferon- and anti-cytokine therapies for example.

A keynote on how research can improve global health - so that we get a society perspective the occasion

more focalization on specific problems

less immunological, more mechanical

Klaus Ley - granulocyte homeostasis

novel methods and protocols should be introduced and discussed

Macrophages

Eosinophils

It will be important to continue to have representation from diverse subjects within the SLB areas of interest. Meeting alone as well as with other societies with overlapping or complementary interests (not just the cytokine societies) is important. Meeting regularly with only one other society would be a very poor decision (and the end of SLB).

more on phagocytes/neutrophils

Some of the plenary talks were not plenary!
I missed new topics or hot topics talks that are not directly linked to the meeting.

Interferon type III

role of inflammasome in viral infections

genetics of disease susceptibility (J-L CASANOVA)

translational research from bench to bedside

Any excellent scientists.

Would have appreciated more focus on cytokine basic research and focused sessions on some of the novel T cell subsets (Th9, Tfh, Th22, etc.). They were covered sometimes in context of other topics but it was difficult to predict off of the agenda.

The opening session should be the top-guns, not student/jr faculty presenters. This will start out the meeting with greater attendance.

Invited speakers should be required to spend a certain amount of time at the meeting. Some were in town maybe 24 hr and did not contribute much. If the society pays for them they should interact with students/postdocs/faculty etc.

More topics including clinical relevance.

Transplantation and inflammation

Doug Golenbock, Immune signalling.

More information on new and emerging pattern recognition receptors (C-type lectin R's, for ex.). Less on interferons. There was not enough on Th17 cells and related subsets (e.g. Th9, Th22), which is still a fast-moving area.

i would appreciate having more talks regarding innate immunity. And the speakers should be encouraged to talk about unpublished data.

HMGB1

A better venue with all participants staying at the same hotel would afford better informal interactions. The hotels being off site was a disaster for this meeting. It was one of the worst locations for a meeting I've ever attended.

More clinical topics need to be included. There are mainly two reason one studies cytokines. 1. to find a clinical use for the cytokines and 2. understand why they work or not work in clinical settings. One has to understand this is the basis for cytokine research and not treat another cell line or transgenic mice with cytokine for another abstract.

more clinical studies

It would be greatfull to include some review lectures so that students could acquire general knowledge.

more younger speakers and not only the officers of the societies

Specific focus at pathogen-host interactions

no special suggestions

Lipid mediators in leukocyte functions

it was very interested with the various topics and speeches but, if available..give more change to student for speech even really short time.. 3-5 min.

phagocytosis

Topics on clinical success to cytokine inhibitors and lessons learnt from them would be useful.

Speakers representing pharma industry as well as clinicians would be welcome

I would personally like to present a case study of a compound which is a specific cytokine inhibitor myself in the next meeting every sessions - 1. speaker - overview (theoretical)lecture on the topic field

Better diversity of speakers from different laboratories would be good.

good meeting, not too big and great interactions

Topics: 1. Dendritic cells; 2.Tuberculosis

Speakers: 1. Caetano Reis E Souza; 2. Alan Sher

Please consider a more diverse selection of cytokines to be presented or contextual understanding of how cytokines together effect a given organ or disease. Again, way too much on interferons.

Too many sessions/talks on interferon; not enough variety

SLB talks should not all be scheduled for 8am

We were speakers on novel cytokines.

Inflammatory cytokines
gammacommon cytokines
Signaling

I think it would be helpful to hear more about cytokines - not just the newly discovered but new data on older cytokines like IL-1, TNF, IL-23. It seems there is a lot more IFN than cytokine presentations.

Neutrophils in innate and acquired immunity

Should have a session for students presenting their work and then have some feedback on their project.

My group works with IFN signal transduction pathways. Although the immunology of cytokines is an extremely important subject, it dominated ~95% of the meeting. We would much prefer a higher representation of subjects outside of the immunological sphere. This should not be impossible to do especially with multiple co-occurrent sessions organized to suit all members of the three societies.

Consider adding sessions to some less popular/ newer topics, possibly including new methodologies, mathematical modeling, large scale / systems studies, epigenetics, related discoveries in cell biology

More cell biology

Suggest a session on DAMP`s/Alarmins

Make more space available for clinical applications. For instance there are several novel interferons undergoing early or advanced clinical trials that have not been even mentioned

More stress on Applied science & less on Basic science

Innate immunity and neutrophils

10. Other comments regarding the 2009 Tri-Society Conference:

102 Responses

Responses

Select more talks from abstract. There was some terrific posters which should have been presented.

There should have been coffee before the 8am sessions.

Having the main hotel far from the conference center was a huge mistake-- inhibiting interactions between conferees.

Poster panels would be better in the same order as in the poster book. They were not and therefore it was not easy to find and see a single poster chosen from the book.

The poster number are very confusing. It is very difficult to find the posters we are interested in.

It would be good to cordinate the parallell sessions so that talks are equally long and start at the same time, this year it was almost impossible to go between sessions. It is also important that the speaker and chair really keep the time scedule.

as an ISICR member, I realized that cytokinologists barely know viruses and antiviral or pro-viral activities of the cytokines and interferons they may be dealing with.

conference hotel charged more when booked via the conference web page compared to independent bookings via internet (e.g. opodo or expedia)

Need to fix how presenters use computers. The problems on switch over from one speaker to the next was very distracting. At the banquet, there was very little opportunity to mix with other people. I felt like I was stuck at the table. It would be better to design more mix time before and after the meal.

Very pleasant city. Excellent congress center (small and compact, easy to switch between sessions).

Very difficult to ship into Lisbon from US and the booths were too small. I would suggest more local assistance with sponsor shipments to shows in Lisbon or other international sites. Additionally, the bus service to the site from hotels was very sparse.

Very poor location. Many hotels far from the meeting with very poor bus service. The overall meeting was worse than usual.

The dense schedule made it difficult to attend all interesting sessions. This was compounded by the poor adherence to scheduled times by speakers and session chairs. Absolute time limits must be enforced when there are concurrent sessions to allow people to maximize their learning.

Also, the coffee breaks in the poster rooms could have been poster sessions... it would have been better to have presenters present at one or two 'coffee break' sessions and one wine and cheese session- the posters were too closely spaced and it was often impossible to navigate through the crowds to see particular posters. Having alternate posters presented would have helped alleviate this problem.

Excellent meeting - nice combination of talks / topics. Would definitely attend again ...

Surprisingly, food was insufficient at the reception event, and average at the banquet. Luckily, food in Lisboa was excellent and plentiful pretty much everywhere else. Other than that, excellent meeting. Much better than many other SLB's in the past.

Improve "quality of some of the plenary speakers!

The choice of hotel Marriot for the speakers was absolutely unacceptable! Too isolated, reachable only by taxi or the shuttle, too expensive (other attendees that booked themselves paid less than registrants through the website). Despite that, Tri-Society conference participants were directed to a 'special' breakfast room where the quality was considerably lower than the regular breakfast (e.g coffee only available from automatic machines, no possibility to order eggs etc. Did the organising company choose this hotel to ensure the best stay of the invited speakers or to make money? I would ask the organising committee to look into this.

Coordinated time schedule in parallel workshops would be advantageous. Was hard to switch workshops to join another talk. Maybe chairmen should also try harder to keep the speakers in the scheduled time frame.

Posters were crammed too close together. It was difficult, if not impossible, to get to posters because there was not enough space. A wide poster format would be better, but the accordion/saw tooth layout of the poster boards was a far worse offense. It would be much better to have fewer posters in the space, or to expand the space to allow for more posters.

It would be much better to have more than one bus departure to/from the conference.

The poster session panels were too close. The poster presentations should have been on alternate days for adjoining panels. As it was, it was almost impossible for two adjoining presenters to talk at the same time.

Would have preferred a venue closer to hotels or down-town - too much traveling back and forth and not very flexible.

The conference facility was sub par. The internet was not very functional and there was no water or paper provided for attendees.

1. The survey didnt let you check being a member of more than one society.

2. poster rooms were bad. crowded. posters should be up 1/2 the time and be numbered consecutively. VERY hard to find specific posters... so I gave up and assume others did the same.

3. for breaks and food/drink: there is no reason why the wait staff cant pre-pore 3 dozen drinks to speed up the line.

4. there should have been coffee (free or for purchase) at the conf center in the morning.

5. banquet was too crowded.

Sorry you asked...

The location and ability to get to the conference was horrible and hotels very expensive

Thank you!

I would have preferred a combined hotel/conference venue

If the meeting had been a day longer the programme could have been spaced out a bit more to allow for more social time

The sessions running over made the day a little hectic. The banquet didn't allow for any mixing, and neither did the poster sessions, with everybody being broken up into the different rooms.

Would be great to have access to a list with the name of everybody that have attended to the meeting. Sometimes we talk to people and do not have contact with them anymore. Just one complete list with names of people who have attended would help to contact them for collaborations or exchanging ideas or informations. Thanks

not enough time for breakfast at hotel

When you said that there was shuttle service we thought that it will be more frequent. When we arrived at the hotel on sunday afternoon, they didn't know which bus we had to take to the congress center.

The poster sessions were poorly organized. It was hard to match posters with program and abstracts. As a result, it took too much time searching, taking away from reviewing posters.

nice atmosphere

Food of the banquet dinner can be improved.

not enough breaks and timekeeping wasn't done very well. We typically had 10 minutes for a break that was supposed to be 30 minutes.

shuttles were a disaster, late..full.. Had to pay for many taxis.

Conference center was too far away from hotels.

The distance between the hotels and the meeting locations was a real pain

Facilities: Wireless at more than one spot would have been very helpful. The internet area was understandably too crowded. An extra area for researchers to work with their laptops would have helped. Food: Although not asking for luncheons each day, the registration fees were so high that one would assume light food was provided during the breaks. Buses: I didn't stay at one of the major hotels, and buses refused to make stops along the way, I was forced to take taxis and buses throughout the stay. These busses were expensive, I paid for them with my registration and yet could not enjoy them. Conference 'gift' bag: A note pad would help, and conference material in a CD would also help.

The inability to walk or take public transportation or a bus to travel between hotel and conference at other than the one designated time was a disadvantage. The catering at the conference was exceptional. I heard many excellent talks --- a good selection to choose from. In general, I prefer meetings of 100-200 people.

Conference centre was good. Found that the distance between the venue and hotel was far from ideal. It would have been better to have the entire venue/accommodation on site

Dpendence on busses for transport to nearly all hotels a negative. Ability to walk/determine own schedule is a huge advantage for senior persons with other work to do while at the conference.

It was unfortunate that the internet connection was not provided at the entire venue. And at the "Hot spots" there was no plug in to charge the computer, which made us rely only on the labtop battery which generally lasts 1 hour for an average computer.

The Tri-Society was too big, not allowing enough chance for networking. Two-Socities is just enough, and allow more focused talks, less posters and are less overwhelming. The best meetings are a single-society events, which are small, intimate, allow networking and discussions at the poster sessions.

need better poster session planning

The remote location of the hotels was inconvenient.

The big problems with using of shuttle bus for people out selected hotels. No any cooperation with people traveling out these hotels, no request for helps to people stay out of selected hotels. Very bad contact on any request for participants for transportation to and from gala party. no any helps from organizers of transportations

Keep the talks on time

Scheduling talks at 8:00 am in the morning when the hotels were so far away from the Congress centre was not good. The hotel breakfast did not even open until 7:00 am so there was little time for breakfast.

Hotels were too far apart and far from the conference centre, preferable to have everyone close together...otherwise excellent conference.

it will be much better with less registration fees

Please do not give awards to the people who work for the organizers. It does not look good.

Computer and Pointer troubles happened very often.

Small thing: please have meat containing foods labeled. Also the wireless hotspot was barely warm.

I think it would be better not to have the posters up the whole conference. there was too little interaction on the day of the poster. Specific 1 h times to stand by posters would be better. Snacks should have been provided for day 2 poster sessions.

The hotels were too far from the conference center, making it difficult to take short breaks from the meeting.

I rather prefer when hotels and the conference site are in the same location or at least in foot-walking distance

Too much animal models, we need more from human medicine.

Too many of the lectures should have been more like a review of the topic instead of presenting only own data.

The chairmen should look at their watches, there were too many sessions that lasted much longer than they should. 45 minutes extra for a 2 hours session is not good at all, although this was the worst example. I was left with an impression that speakers were allowed to use the time they wanted and all old friends were allowed to have time for their questions. Start on time, make questions and answers short and focused, interrupting chairmen and end on time should be possible also at this conference. There were exceptions, but they were few.

it could be more helpful if the venue and hotels are located more closely, or if convenient transportation is available.

Unfortunately, the same speakers are invited year after year which makes it boring in parts. As such, I will not attend the meeting annually in the future.

It would be greatfull to include some review lectures so that students could acquire general knowledge.

The three societies should always make a conference together, not just once in three years. This broadens the scope of the conference.

I found the conference to be excellent overall and I thoroughly enjoyed it both scientifically and personally. I congratulate the organisers for such an event that was extremely well run.

It was a very nice conference, wonderfully organized in the nice place with high scientific level.

Organization of Poster sessions was horrible since the order of the posters did not follow the numbers of the posters. Consequently, it was impossible to find a poster of interest.

I found it somewhat strange that the hotel (Vila Gale Opera) was less than half price if NOT booked through the trisociety website. In other words: There was no conference discount, but rather a conference-related price INCREASE. ???

The posters were very disorganized, the numbers or the codes were very confusing. They should have had consecutive numbers just for convenience. Also I found the place (the conference centre) very far from the city or any other place, especially for lunches.

I would have preferred larger sessions centering more around a particular topic. I felt the sessions sometimes covered a wide variety of topics and sometimes even caused schedule clashes in that we had to choose between similar topics discussed at the same time. Moreover, the slightly odd scheduling forced us to move between the different lecture rooms.

Poster organization was poorly planned. Instead of having PP1 and PP2 groups in addition to A and B groups, why not have even-number posters being presented on one day and odd-number posters on the other day? This would also, most importantly, avoid having two adjacent posters being presented the same day with absolutely no space for visitors because of the narrow format of the poster boards.

Hotels should be closer to conference centre in order to waste less time in transportation.

AV/IT: too many troubles with the AV. When parallel sessions are running, it becomes more imperative to ensure talks are on time. This could be improved. In general timing should be improved to allow people the opportunity to travel between parallel sessions and not miss talks.

POSTERS: the second poster session was not as well attended as the first, likely lack of free food/drink was an issue. I would consider this next time around.

FACILITIES: I liked the large auditorium with desks and did not love the rooms without them.

SHUTTLE: It would have been nice (although i am sure expensive, so i understand why this was not done) to have more than 1 shuttle to and from the conference center each day. Maybe i should have picked a closer hotel!

PARALLEL SESSIONS: hard to see talks when they are not all the same length when bouncing between rooms.

I did not appreciate the several instances of talk titles/content being different than advertised.

STUDENT MIXER: not well organized. there were no tables around which people could sit and chat, only chairs on the perimeter of the room. Interaction between students/postdocs very slim.

FOOD: always nice to ensure vegetarian options(or signage indicating which food is vegetarian)

MEETING BANQUET: was very nice! I had a great time. It wasn't the Alamo with amadillo races but it was fun in its own way.

Banquet food was not excellent compare with last year in Montreal.

I noticed that many people were taking pictures during both the talks and poster presentations. During the posters session the poster presenter was not even present when people were taking pictures of their poster. I strongly feel that this should be prohibited, especially since many of us are presenting unpublished data.

The way the posters were organized was very confusing. The order of the posters in the abstract book had no correlation to the order in which they were hanging in the actual poster session. This made it unnecessarily difficult to find a specific poster of interest after having read the abstract in the book.

More coffee breaks would be useful. Easier transport to the conference site would be useful.

The poster session needed to be better organized since I did not find too many interested scientists at the poster since these sessions were in the evening and most took the opportunity to leave early

There should be more time for the poster sessions and a schedule/map for the the different topics have been placed

Exhibitors were not happy with information provided before the meeting as shipment of booth materials was compromised. this needs to be improved as it could impact their participation in future events

very good

The extreme geographic separation between hotels and the meeting site (convention center) was onerous, tiring and distracting. It should have been a deal breaker and the meeting should have been held in another city with better logistics. In the future a repeat of this should be avoided at all costs.

The meeting was overwhelmingly "immunology driven". Although this is understandable in part, it is not clear why, for instance, oral sessions such as those related to "Signaling" were so biased towards cellular immunology and did not include more studies actually focused on cytokine/growth factor signal transduction mechanisms.

Shuttle buses should run more frequently

Huge turn out, great organization. Quality science, amazing interaction.

Personally I find that 3 parallel sessions are 1 or 2 too many. In several cases it was not possible to 'jump' from one session to another, as the timing of the talks (as is common) was not kept, as some sessions would be too far ahead, and others too far behind.

The hotel rates were more expensive when booking through the meeting website. Booking the hotels directly was significantly cheaper ($p > 0.05$).

You need to do a better job of communicating with poster presenters. Little info was given to those of us who submitted abstracts and asked for a talk, but were given posters. In my case, the only thing I received was a graphic showing the poster dimensions with no explanation as to when I would present, how the posters would be put up, etc. IT made poster presenters seem like a decided afterthought. Also, if you ever have the accordion shape again, DO NOT have adjacent posters presented on the same day. This was a golden chance to have arranged sessions B and A so as to avoid having two presenters crammed in together in a V-shape.

I think it was ridiculous that most of the hotels were so far away from the meeting place.

more coffee please

Hotels should be within a 30 min (max) walking distance.

work with the exhibitors more to achieve your goals

Few of the speakers were having same old same presentations, its better if new speakers are encouraged.

Having hotels so far away was really a pain. I chose the Marriot because it was cheaper than hotels closer to the conference center but it was a real deterrent for interaction with people at the meeting. The poster session #1 was good but the 2nd poster session was poorly attended- it should have been earlier during the meeting. Posters were up for most of the meeting but there was very little time to actually talk with the authors.

Having the hotels so far from conference center made for long days, inconvenient. Coffee breaks did not have coffee, that is not coffee break.

It would be nice to have a more centralized location for the meeting. To avoid dependency on bus transportation, or at least to have an option of public transportation. Also, the hotels recommended were not in proximity of common Lisbon monument or sites interesting for visitors. Improving on this would be of a huge importance.

Interesting social program.

This is a really good conference

Poster sessions: having them Monday and Tuesday rather than Tuesday and Wednesday feels a little more balanced

Venue: nice for the most part, but definitely cramped on the seating

Thanks for a wonderful job.

In places a good meeting, but I found elements unsatisfactory. The location of hotels compared to the conference centre was not great. Either close to the conference centre, but far from the city centre and most other participants, or too far from the the conference centre and generally wherever you stayed the other participants too spread out. This made it a less social event than I would have liked. Having the posters so late in the meeting was not ideal - they are such a good way to make contacts early on. The access to precise information on talks/titles was not available online early enough, and there was not enough info on exactly where all the hotels were on the website. Lastly the banquet was not long enough nor arranged in a layout or at a venue that really facilitated mixing.

Sorry to give so many negatives, as much was good and it is always easier to complain than praise, but I hope the comments are useful none the less.

Need more breaks between sessions ,and better synchronisation if parallel sessions

An excellent fusion of programmatically interesting and relevant topics. This avoids conflicts and competition between these meetings.

Thanks for all the hard work arranging the meeting.

poster numbering was a bit confusing. It was not easy to find the posters and abstracts from the abstract book.

I haven't received yet the receipt of the registration payment.

The recommended hotel was a long way from the conference centre. It would have been nice to be either close to the conference or the city centre. Also a break in one of the afternoons or mornings to explore would have been good, especially given the excellence of the talks would have also helped maintain concentration and attendance.