

Zoomerang Survey Results

2010 SLB/IEIIS Survey

Response Status: Completes

Filter: No filter applied

Nov 15, 2010 8:06 AM PST

1. Are you a current member of the societies? (Check all that apply)

SLB	103	66%
IEIIS	34	22%
Not a member	29	19%

SLB Membership Survey

2. When in your career did you originally join SLB?

Student	21	21%
Post-Doc	24	24%
Professional	57	56%
Total	102	100%

3. What is your current job title?

101 Responses

4. How many years have you been a member of SLB?

Less than 1	21	20%
5-Feb	31	30%
10-May	20	19%
More than 10	31	30%
Total	103	100%

5. What was your PRIMARY reason for joining SLB?

Interest in Leukocyte Biology	79	77%
Networking	6	6%
Career Advancement	2	2%
Less Expensive Registration Fees at Annual Meeting	9	9%
Education	3	3%
Other, please specify	4	4%
Total	103	100%

6. How well has your membership met your expectations?

Very well	34	33%
Well	55	53%
Somewhat	11	11%
Very little	2	2%
Not at all	1	1%
Total	103	100%

7. How important are these benefits to you?

	Very important	Somewhat important	Not at all important
Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.			
Journal of Leukocyte Biology	65 63%	35 34%	3 3%
Annual Meeting	49 49%	43 43%	8 8%
Networking	40 40%	54 53%	7 7%
Newsletter	10 10%	56 55%	35 35%
Scientific Content of Society Meetings	68 69%	29 29%	2 2%
Opportunities for Student Presentations	34 34%	54 53%	13 13%
Web Site	16 16%	60 60%	24 24%

8. How well is SLB meeting your expectations for these same benefits?

	Very well	Somewhat	Poorly
Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.			
Journal of Leukocyte Biology	69 71%	27 28%	1 1%
Annual Meeting	56 60%	31 33%	6 6%
Networking	26 28%	61 66%	6 6%
Newsletter	27 29%	60 65%	6 6%

Scientific Content of Society Meetings	54 58%	35 38%	4 4%
Opportunities for Student Presentations	41 45%	45 49%	6 7%
Web Site	25 27%	65 69%	4 4%

9. What are the most effective ways for SLB to communicate to you? (Check all that apply)

Newsletter	29	28%
Quarterly electronic newsletter	43	42%
Weekly Emails	5	5%
Monthly Emails	61	60%
Other, please specify	2	2%

10. Are you willing to serve on an SLB Committee or Task Force?

Yes	39	42%
No	53	58%
Total	92	100%

iSLB - SLB's quarterly electronic newsletter

11. When you receive the iSLB newsletter, do you read it?

Yes	85	85%
No	15	15%
Total	100	100%

12. Is the quarterly frequency of iSLB sufficient?

Yes	90	90%
Too much	6	6%
Too little	4	4%
Total	100	100%

13. Do you find the content provided in the iSLB newsletter informative and useful?

Yes	86	91%
No	9	9%
Total	95	100%

14. What additional information would you like to see in the iSLB newsletter? Please provide at least one.

21 Responses

e-JLB - In January 2010, we introduced a new, digital format of the Journal of Leukocyte Biology called e-JLB.

15. Do you consider e-JLB an important format for the journal and society to maintain and build?

Yes	83	81%
No	19	19%
Total	102	100%

16. Would you like to see added features to the e-JLB format such as more hotlinks to supplemental data, references?

Yes	51	54%
No	44	46%
Total	95	100%

17. Does receiving the emailed Table of Contents (eTOC alert) increase or decrease your interest to interact with the e-JLB?

Increase	87	93%
Decrease	7	7%
Total	94	100%

2010 SLB/IEIIES Meeting

18. Did you attend the 2010 SLB/IEIIES Meeting in Vancouver?

Yes	67	65%
-----	----	-----

No	36	35%
Total	103	100%

19. If you did NOT attend the 2010 SLB/IEIS Meeting, what was the main reason?

Scheduling conflict	19	53%
Scientific content did not interest me	3	8%
Location was difficult to get to	2	6%
Registration fee was too high	0	0%
Destination was cost-prohibitive	5	14%
Other, please specify	7	19%
Total	36	100%

20. For SLB Awards, in your opinion is it more important the society provides more awards of a lesser amount or fewer amount of a larger dollar amount?

More awards, smaller amount	65	69%
Larger amount, fewer awards	29	31%
Total	94	100%

SLB/IEIS Annual Meeting

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

Student/Post-Doc	42	36%
Academia	62	53%
Industry	6	5%
Government	4	3%
Exhibitor/Sponsor	4	3%
Other, please specify	0	0%
Total	118	100%

22. 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	63 53%	48 40%	6 5%	2 2%
AV/IT	30 26%	56 49%	24 21%	4 4%
Poster Sessions	38	67	13	1

Poster Sessions	32%	56%	11%	1%
Exhibits	7	53	52	4
	6%	46%	45%	3%
Location	81	32	6	0
	68%	27%	5%	0%
Speakers	64	47	7	0
	54%	40%	6%	0%
Meeting Facilities	56	43	19	1
	47%	36%	16%	1%
Meeting Organization	57	43	15	2
	49%	37%	13%	2%
Opening Reception	56	41	11	0
	52%	38%	10%	0%
Student Mixer	21	29	11	1
	34%	47%	18%	2%
Banquet Cruise	30	34	20	2
	35%	40%	23%	2%
Coffee Breaks	29	58	27	3
	25%	50%	23%	3%

23. Did you find the joint structure of having SLB and IEIIS together for this program beneficial?		
Yes	104	91%
No	10	9%
Total	114	100%

Abstracts

24. Do you prefer to view meeting abstracts online or in a printed program?		
Online abstracts	41	35%
Printed program	75	65%
Total	116	100%

25. If there was complimentary internet access at the 2011 meeting, would you be in favor of abstracts being published online only and NOT printed in the program book?		
Yes	63	54%
No	54	46%
Total	117	100%

26. If abstracts were viewable online for free, would you be likely to purchase an optional printed abstract book?		
Yes	33	28%

No	83	72%
Total	116	100%

Accommodations

27. While in Vancouver, where did you stay?

Fairmont Hotel Vancouver (meeting venue)	75	63%
Days Inn Downtown Vancouver	1	1%
Four Seasons Hotel Vancouver	0	0%
Hyatt Regency Hotel Vancouver	3	3%
Le Soleil Hotel Vancouver	1	1%
Metropolitan Hotel Vancouver	1	1%
Local, commute	10	8%
Other, please specify	28	24%

28. How would you rate your accommodations?

Excellent	63	55%
Good	41	36%
Average	11	10%
Poor	0	0%
Total	115	100%

Future Events

29. Would you attend a future SLB/IEIS conference event?

Yes	115	97%
No	4	3%
Total	119	100%

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

25 Responses

31. Other comments regarding the 2010 SLB/IEIS Conference:

35 Responses

3. What is your current job title?

Respondent #	Response
	1 Section Chief
	2 Professor
	3 Microbiologist III
	4 Professor
	5 professor
	6 Assistant Professor
	7 Chair and Professor
	8 Professor
	9 Instructor in Medicine
	10 VP, Research
	11 Research Microbiologist
	12 Associate Professor
	13 Associate Professor and Vice Chair for Education
	14 Professor
	15 professor
	16 Professor of Pathology
	17 PI
	18 Post-Doc
	19 PhD student
	20 Professor and Chief, Infectious Diseases
	21 Associate Dean & Professor
	22 Senior Lecturer
	23 research scientist
	24 Distinguished professor
	25 Professor
	26 PhD candidate
	27 Assistant Professor
	28 Assistant Professor
	29 research associate
	30 Professor
	31 Assistant Professor
	32 Professor of Medicine
	33 Staff Scientist
	34 Research Investigator
	35 Graduate Student
	36 Graduate student
	37 Post Doctoral fellow
	38 Professor
	39 senior scientist
	40 Assistant Professor
	41 Research Assistant Professor
	42 Assistant Prof
	43 Professor
	44 Professor

45 post-doctoral fellow
46 MD/PhD Student
47 Professor, Head of Department
48 Professor
49 Sr. Director
50 Assistant Professor
51 Head of Department
52 Professor
53 Professor
54 post doc
55 MD/PhD Student
56 Staff Scientist
57 Associate Professor
58 Vice Chair Surgery for Research, Prof
Micro/Immunol & Surgery
59 post-doc
60 professor, division director
61 Assoc. Prof.
62 PhD Graduate Student
63 Chief of Lab, NCI
64 Professor and Vice Chair of a clinical dept
65 Research associate Professor
66 Graduate Research Assistant
67 Senior Scientist
68 Professor
69 Student
70 Professor
71 President
72 Independent Scientist (Professor)
73 professor
74 Graduate student
75 Professor
76 postdoc
77 Senior investigator
78 Professor
79 senior scientist
80 associate professor
81 Post-Doc
82 Research Fellow
83 Assistant Professor
84 Associate Professor
85 Professor
86 professor
87 Professor
88 professor
89 Professor
90 Assistant Professor
91 Senior Lecturer
92 Lecturer in Cell Biology
93 Graduate Student
94 postDoc
95 assistant professor
96 Associate Professor
97 Senior Clinical lecturer
98 student
99 Senior Research Scientist

- 100 Full Professor
- 101 Reserch assistant professor

9. What are the most effective ways for SLB to communicate to you? (Check all that apply)

Respondent #	Response
	1 emails when there is a reason for communicating
	2 Web Site

10. Are you willing to serve on an SLB Committee or Task Force?

Respondent #	Response
	1 Souvenir Tachado Beth Israel Deaconess Medical/Harvard Med School stachado@bidmc.harvard.edu
	2 Kenneth Genovese kenneth.genovese@ars.usda.gov
	3 Richard Tapping University of Illinois tapping@illinois.edu 217 244-7940
	4 Andrei Medvedev amedvedev@som.umaryland.edu
	5 Diane Bimczok dbimczok@ub.edu
	6 Already serving
	7 anne-pereira@ouhsc.edu
	8 I am already part of a committee
	9 Anju Singh Post Doctoral Fellow Center for Immunology & Microbial diseases, Albany Medical College, Albany, NY-12208
	10 Possibly. I am currently one of the editors for JLB. Gail Bishop, gail-bishop@uiowa.edu
	11 Liza Makowski 919-843-4348 liza.makowski@unc.edu
	12 margot zoeller department of tumor cell biology university hospital of surgery im neuenheimer feld 365 d69120 heidelberg phone 49 6221 565146 fax 49 6221 565199 e-mail: margot.zoeller@uni-heidelberg.de
	13 David T. Harris davidh@email.arizona.edu
	14 Alexander Persson apersson@cfri.ubc.ca
	15 Aleah Brubaker MD/PhD Student Loyola University Medical Center abruck@lumc.edu 708.310.2232
	16 O M Zack Howard, Ph.D NCI-Frederick Bld 560 Rm 31-19 PO Box B Frederick MD 21702
	17 Guoshun Wang, DVM,PhD Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center Departments of Microbiology, Medicine and Genetics CSRB 642, 533 Bolivar Street New Orleans, LA 70112 Ofc# 504-568-7908 FAX 504-568-8500 E-mail: gwang@lsuhsc.edu
	18 Carol Miller-Graziano Dept Surg. Univ. Rochester Med. Center carol_miller-graziano@urmc.rochester.edu

19 Judith Maxwell Silverman jmaxsilverman@gmail.com

20 Brent Berwin

21 Gernot Zissel University Medical Centre Freiburg Medical Centre Dept. of Pneumology Hugstetter.Str.
55 79106 Freiburg Germany gernot.zissel@uniklinik-freiburg.de Tel. ++49-761-270 7436 FAX. ++49-761-
270 3712

22 Linda McManus

23 Carlos D. Figueroa, Ph.D. Universidad Austral de Chile cdfigueroa@gmail.com

24 already on W&D Task Force

25 Louis B. Justement

26 Andrew Devitt PhD School of Life & Health Sciences Aston University BIRMINGHAM, UK B4 7ET Tel:
+44 (0) 121 204 4165 Fax: +44 (0) 121 204 4175 <http://www1.aston.ac.uk/lhs/staff/az-index/devitta/>

27 Sophie Paczesny

28 Andrew W. Taylor, PhD Associate Professor Department of Ophthalmology Boston University School
of Medicine 72 East Concord Street, Rm L915B Boston, MA 02118 Voice: 617-638-4525 Fax: 617-638-
5337 awtaylor@bu.edu

13. Do you find the content provided in the iSLB newsletter informative and useful?

Respondent #

Response

- 1 It's OK.
- 2 an inbetween answer would be more correct
- 3 aperss
- 4 When I read it, I enjoy it.
- 5 More networking mechanisms the better. Can these in part be divided into research areas or areas of expertise.
- 6 sometimes

14. What additional information would you like to see in the iSLB newsletter? Please provide at least one.

Respondent #

Response

- 1 none
- 2 how is the website updated, what is the program of the next meeting- at least 6 month in advance
- 3 Future meetings of potential interest Past conference summaries Commentaries or blogs about current theories Technical reviews or lab protocols
- 4 Brief review of new advancement in patern recognition receptors
- 5 Information on activities/meetings of organizations with similar interests
- 6 More advertising of other scientific meetings related to the field of leukocyte biology.
- 7 More information regarding the upcoming conferences and seminars involving leukocyte cells.
- 8 Relevant grant opportunities

- 9 Contain more about what is going on in committees
- 10 a listing of other conferences that might be of interest to leukocyte researchers
- 11 highlight members research
- 12 results of council decisions-- joint meetings or meetings with an SLB presence
- 13 more exosome work
- 14 member highlights and dates of SLB's and other relevant scientific meetings.
- 15 at the moment I do not miss something
- 16 Grant opportunities
- 17 Job postings
- 18 Updates on web resources for services and databases, including tissue sources, cell signaling databases, shRNA knockdown efficiencies in different cells...
- 19 Notices of other relevant scientific meetings.
- 20 More about the meeting organizers' plans for the scientific content of up coming meetings. This would help in writing abstract submissions to add in matching the abstract to topic. Also, besides listing student and fellow awards for abstracts, including some follow up such as where the student's abstract has made it to publication, and where their careers have progressed would be beneficial. This acts as an incentive to other students and fellows to compete.
- 21 hot topics in leukocyte biology

16. Would you like to see added features to the e-JLB format such as more hotlinks to supplemental data, references?

Respondent #	Response
	1 supplemental data
	2 links to references, related info
	3 Detailed methods
	4 hot links to the supplemental data would be really good.
	5 Currently I find the e-JLB harder to browse than just looking for articles on the Web site. Maybe that's just me.
	6 both supplemental data and reference links would be good
	7 particularity more links to supplemental data
	8 supplemental data
	9 hotlinks are very nice and easy to use
	10 Supplemental data, references
	11 I never read the e-journal.
	12 as long as essential data are included in the manuscript supplemental data are not necessary.
	13 links to source information

14 Links to supplemental data would be very useful.

15 hotlinks on both would be good

16 more hotlinks is a good idea

17 Relevant funding sources

18 hotlinks to supplemental data

19 supplemental data, references

19. If you did NOT attend the 2010 SLB/IEIS Meeting, what was the main reason?

Respondent #

Response

1 I'm just really busy!

2 All of the above and too many meetings with similar content

3 budget this year

4 health

5 Would like to see more content relevant to lymphocytes, not just myeloid cells

6 other mtgs had higher priority

7 health problems

23. Did you find the joint structure of having SLB and IEIS together for this program beneficial?

Respondent #

Response

1 The topics were too focussed on TLRs and LPS.

2 would recommend having joint meetings on regular bases, include other related societies

3 I think the chemical/biochemical aspects of IEIS were swamped out by the overwhelming excess of innate immunity related material. I'm not sure how to rectify this. I learned a lot about innate immunity, but as a biochemist, I felt marginalized.

4 Yes for some of the innate immunity related topics No for purely endotoxin related

5 I felt that the joint meeting diluted out the area of greatest interest to me, the structural, molecular and cellular biology of innate immune signaling in response to microbial pathogens

6 too much LPS- TLRs not enough basic leukocyte biology

7 Focuses are different in spite of some overlaps

8 I found it overwhelming content-wise.

9 Required to large of a format and most people didn't attend what they weren't interested in anyway.

10 For us as exhibitor was it an unique opportunity to meet many scientists within the focus of our company. For us it is also important that the participants attending the conference is more than 500, to compensate the costs made.

11 This should occur when IEIS has their meetings in No America (about every 4 years).

12 IEIS is too concentrated on one aspect of leukocyte biology

13 IEIS not as close to my interests as SLB.

26. If abstracts were viewable online for free, would you be likely to purchase an optional printed abstract book?

Respondent #	Response
	1 abstracts are (should be) based on new, non-published yet data. It is not fare to publish them on-line for free, even if it is restricted to meeting participants or society members
	2 THE ABSTRACT BOOK DID NOT HAVE an Alphabetically order AUTHOR index! Other meetings have participants listed with their affiliations and e-mails (Very Helpful)
	3 The book is needed for convenience at the meeting. Eg. Browsing during sessions, finding poster abstracts of interest.
	4 I really don't have the time to review abstracts and print prior to the meeting. I also like the serendipitous aspect of coming across an interesting poster (not obvious from the abstract) and being able to scribble notes in a printed book. I will not be carrying my laptop around as I view posters.
	5 I wouldn't feel comfortable lugging around a laptop at the conference over multiple days. Nor would be willing to except international data charges on my smartphone.
	6 It depends on how much the purchased book would cost.
	7 The abstract book is very useful for use while at the meeting - especially for figuring out the concurrent sessions.
	8 I would have no way to access the abstracts at the conference if they were online (I don't have a laptop or a fancy phone). In order to see the abstracts I would require a printed version.
	9 Depends on the cost
	10 Abstract book should be lighter to change paper quality.
	11 costs for an abstract book should be included in the registration fees

27. While in Vancouver, where did you stay?

Respondent #	Response
	1 Hampton Inn
	2 Cascadia Suites
	3 Friends in town
	4 Coast Harbor Hotel
	5 The Sutton Place
	6 Cascadia Suites and Hotel
	7 holiday inn
	8 Days inn
	9 Century Plaza
	10 Hotel Moda
	11 Kingston Bed and Breakfast
	12 Marriott Renaissance
	13 I live here
	14 Cascadia Hotel

- 15 Ramada Inn and Suites
- 16 The Coast Coal Harbour Hotel
- 17 Vintage Hotel, Vancouver
- 18 empire landmark
- 19 Moda hotel
- 20 Kingston hotel B&B
- 21 Best Western Chateau Granville
- 22 Ramada
- 23 Howard Johnson, Vancouver
- 24 Holiday Inn
- 25 Comfort Inn Downtown
- 26 best western chateau granville
- 27 Best Western Granville Palace
- 28 Hampton Inn & Suites

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

Respondent #	Response
	1 Keep inviting physician scientists like Steve Holland. I suggest inviting Casanova next time.
	2 DAMPs in immune responses
	3 I belong to the minority of IEIS members who work in the chemistry/biochemistry field and have no real interest in immunology. If the IEIS continues to move further in the direction of innate immunity to the exclusion of chemistry/biochemistry, I will discontinue my membership. At this past meeting I counted only half a dozen talks that were focussed on structure-function relationships in molecules. Everything else was cellular immunobiology. I cannot justify the time and expense to attend the meeting when I only encounter half a dozen or so colleagues who work in my area.
	4 Need more clinical content/clinical correlations (eg animal models of disease)
	5 Speakers should present new data instead of published data.
	6 TLR signaling
	7 Inflammation
	8 need more endotoxin presentation
	9 Some more basic leukocyte biology, eg motility
	10 Exosomes biology in immunology and infectious diseases
	11 More topics on host-pathogen interactions
	12 more disease oriented symposia/topics
	13 I miss Joost Oppenheim's many earlier presentations
	14 I would like to see a bit more on the variable structure and biology of endotoxin.
	15 More epigenetics would have been helpful.
	16 Signaling pathways that follow receptors activation
	17 For plenary, Prof. Dr. Klaus BRANDENBURG (Res Cent Borstel)

- 18 more on viral recognition/DNA recognition and subsequent signaling. More innate immunity signaling in plenary sessions.
- 19 obesity and inflammation iron metabolism, infection and inflammation acute phase response
- 20 too much overlap in some of the sessions, posters, etc. probably trying to fit in too much in the time available
- 21 apoptosis, in vivo imaging, neutrophil effector mechanisms
- 22 Have a session on receptors in the TREM locus
- 23 Serve something with coffee; particularly on days where you did not provide lunch.
- 24 More international speakers More cutting edge studies rather than overviews of the field
- 25 Tissue specific regulation of immunity such as context specific immune responses within specific tissues like the eye, brain, lung, tumor mass etc. And what is the homeostatic condition of immunity.

31. Other comments regarding the 2010 SLB/IEIS Conference:

Respondent #	Response
1	Nice meeting. Well done.
2	The Fairmont cost too much. Next time, choose a lower cost venue. Grant money is too difficult to obtain to be wasted on high cost hotels.
3	I would have benefitted from free internet access in my room - this should have been negotiated with the hotel for the benefit of all conferees.
4	Probably the best food I have encountered at a society meeting
5	On saturday, many people wanted to hear talks that OCCURED SIMULTANEOUSLY in different sessions. While initial sessions during the first day did not gard much attention. Program planning should consider this. There wasn't really a place to seat and eat during the lunch
6	Overall, a very good conference
7	The meeting was too short for traveling from Europe. Could have extended another day, instead of having concurrent sessions.
8	The meeting contained too much of infectious biology
9	It was great not to have an obligatory conference banquet. Making the cruise optional was perfect & future meetings should keep the social event & scientific meeting separate (the former being elective).
10	In general, I felt that the featured speakers presented mostly already published material. I would favor fewer speakers with more novel information. Importantly, there should be a break in the middle of the day. This was a very dense conference and more down time would have helped. Limit to a maximum of two concurrent sessions.
11	I found the breakfast mentoring event very informative. I think there should have been more events like this, involving 3-4 speakers and a bunch of students and Post-docs where they can interact.

- 12 Seemed a bit unorganized this year - program was not put together well considering topics that similar topics were going on in parallel sessions which made it hard to see what you wanted to see. Also MANY speakers did not speak about what was in the program - this became annoying especially if you specifically went to a session to hear a specific talk that was then COMPLETELY different and about a COMPLETELY different topic!
- 13 Three concurrent sessions is a bit much. It would be nice to be able to attend more than 1/3 of the meeting. More PhD student talks would be nice too.
- 14 Outstanding. Content of joint SLB/IEIS is my favorite. In contrast, joint meetings with cytokine societies are my least favorite of all.
- 15 The exhibits and sessions were designed poorly with no flow for the exhibitors.
- 16 For future conferences, I would suggest adding a break between the different sessions (particularly the talks and poster sessions) so one is not running from one to the other.
- 17 As a US researcher, I am happier from a financial viewpoint with meetings held in North America.
- 18 An excellent meeting I thoroughly enjoyed it. Size was intimate enough to really connect with people and speakers were top notch. The meeting was extraordinarily well-organized.
- 19 (1) Excellent meeting - great job by the organizers! (2) In general, I am not a fan of concurrent sessions at small meetings such as this, since there are inevitably time conflicts between sessions of interest. (2) It would be helpful to have a list of meeting participants, perhaps available online during the meeting.
- 20 This was my first SLB/IEIS Conference. My work has only recently brought me into innate immunity from an ongoing career in biochemistry. I found the meeting terrific for bringing me up to date in the field and helping to shape my thinking about new directions for experimentation.
- 21 As an exhibitor I did not find this meeting very beneficial as the attendees really did not interact with the exhibitors during the breaks.
- 22 It was my first SLB Conference and I thought it was terrific: great location, well coordinated, and I got to meet a fair number of people I had not met before (and wanted to meet).
- 23 Would like to see contact information for all attendees printed in the back of the abstract book, this is helpful for contacting people after the conference.
- 24 Expensive hotel for no free wifi!! It's 2010 after all... Otherwise fairly good.
- 25 The opening session could have been stronger. The clinical talks were generally weak and the malaria talk didn't fit in the session. Would have preferred to hear smart people like Nathan and Tracey talk about recent progress.
- 26 Abstract is available by internet, however, detailed program is not, please include.
- 27 The conference should be held in 4 days instead of 3. Should not hold a conference in one day of the weekend.
- 28 Nice place to have a conference. In general, good speakers, but some speakers were a little below cutting edge science. Much of the innate immune signaling was clustered at the end of the conference (unfortunately in parallel sessions), this is less than optimal and many complained about this. Too much of conference time was taken up by a variety of prizes for both societies. This can be done differently. Need some snacks at coffee breaks!

- 29 It's odd that none of invited speakers had abstracts published in the abstract book. Also, a lot of speakers seemed to have changed their topic, which was a bit annoying. Otherwise a very enjoyable conference
- 30 Overall - very well done.
- 31 I wanted to have abstract book before the meeting was held.
- 32 I enjoyed the size of the conference. This made it easier to network with people and much easier to attend the sessions (since many did not overlap in times). I really liked the student mixer. The fact that it was held in a very casual place that was away from the meeting venue, made it very enjoyable.
- 33 it should not be allowed to take photographs of posters or talk, so researches can present original data
- 34 Lack of free internet access for participants was disappointing, given how widespread this is generally. The programme was not ideal - the first day had no convenient break for lunch, several interesting sessions conflicted, and posters were not well attended, as most people were eating lunch for the first hour.
- 35 This was the first SLB meeting I had been able to attend in many years and was impressed with the quality of the speakers/presentations. I really liked having lunch during the poster sessions and the fact that all of the posters were up during the meeting so that you could browse them at any time.