

Minutes 3rd WG8 meeting. 29/10/20, 1pm UK, 2pm CET, 9am EST.

Agenda

- Welcome new participants (5 min)
- Agreement about recording the meeting (1 min)
- Figure suggestion by Sebastian Munck (10 min)
- Figure suggestion by Roland Nitschke and Laurent Gelman (10 min)
- Step-by-Step commenting on the White Paper (60 min)
- Next steps / Scheduling of the next meeting (4 min)

Attendees

Ulrike Boehm, Glyn Nelson, Julia Fernandez, Laurent Gelman, Aurelien Dauphin, Christian Kukat, Lucas Schultz, Sebastian Munck, Caterina Strambio, Josh Moore, Alex Laude, Orestis Falkaris, Roland Nitschke, Claire Brown, Alison North, Miso Mitkovski, Ian Dobbie, Ute Resch-Genger.

Minutes

Julia F introduced herself as running a facility in Gotheburg, LM and EM.

Lucas S. introduced himself from EMBL Heidelberg, maintaining confocals using Argolight and lase power sensors.

Christian K. introduced himself as a Facility leader from Koln.

RN pointed out we (GN and UB) hadn't used an up to date mailing list. Action- GN and UB to update lists and GN to share googledoc with new members too.

Sebastian M. introduced a Figure concept for describing various components of QC and which parts each addresses.

AN- add detailed text next to / in each balloon point. Or add in Figure legend.

UB- each should ebadded to a Glossary of Terms at the end of the WP.

CS- agreed, could still have terms in a glossary n the appendix.

RN- QC should be an encompassing bubble/ basket with other terms inside since they belong to it.

Action Point: Sebastian M. to expand this Figure. **[Any other volunteers to help?]**

LG introduced two bar charts from the ELMI 2019 survey for the second fig. One of tools used/ known about by microscopists and a second showing frequency of QC protocols performed.

UB and AL: simplify as too distracting with so much information. UB also asked if the data were published already. LG and RN said no.

JF- don't simplify as it highlights the complexity of the problem we face. Or at least keep the full Figs in Supplementary.

GN- simplify with batches in first fig (eg pattern based tools, beads/ point sources, and sensors) and an overall mean frequency of QC in second chart. Could display with the original, or put that in Supplementary).

AN- these charts display the best case scenario as they were mostly populated by Facility staff. We should highlight this in WP. Asked RN if happy to use this data in the WP?

UB- if we wait until RN and LG publish the ELMI survey it will set back our WP by at least a couple of months. Survey results could be published on ArXiv. This WG could be used to do so.

LG- no problem to publish these 2 Figs in WP. RN agreed.

Action Point- LG and RN to modify Figures for requested changes.

JW- we have to be clear about our audience. ELMI survey covered experimental scientists too.

LG- we need companies to read it (in chat)

LS- experimental scientists often not aware of degradation/ changes in a system.

MM- need grant agencies and institute governance to read so they appreciate the problem (in Chat)

CS- can separate out imaging scientists and experimental scientists (in Chat). Led to discussion about naming these two group.

Action Point- CS, AN, JW and LS will discuss names for imaging scientists (generally agreed upon that one) and experimental scientists.

Re. JW comment on audience, UB pointed out we had already discussed the choice of audience for the WP in the first meeting and we had decided to roll out a general WP that could then be tailored to specific audiences if desired (see meeting Minutes).

UB. We received comments back from 12 WG members for the second draft. Still have references to integrate, but all other changes incorporated or added as comments.

Googledoc has been shared with all. Several comments that the link doesn't work for them.

UB- use Suggestions for editing (in menu View- Mode-Suggesting)

GN shared a ubiquitous link that anyone can use in Chat:

^[P]_[SEP]https://docs.google.com/document/d/1TVx56pNI5CllrNjQ5LzIwG-nkmV_Sh9wtaK_Dugd-ii/edit?usp=sharing^[P]_[SEP]

WP changes/ discussion:

CS- in Chat highlighted paperpile as a referencing tool for Chrome with googledocs.

Action Point- GN to look into paperpile and add references that are in WP currently.

UB- Glossary of terms Need to add QC and QA and ideally stay consistent throughout the WP. In chat, Guidelines and Standards should be added too.

UB- life sciences alone or material sciences too. We mention materials at the beginning and never again.

CN- we should stick to life sciences.

UB- define who we are as a group and that we are predominantly life scientists. Make this statement up front to highlight why we focus on that, but that the tools we describe would be applicable to all light microscopes.

UB- Executive summary is vague on microscope types, but WGs aims state confocal a lot.

RN- this is only a starting point and we need to cover all Light microscopes.

UB- WP flow of text is good, and general format/layout of WP. Just references to add from CS comments.

RN- asked where we were with timelines for Nature Methods. CB- 2 page outline has been sent. CB will build a draft from the current WP document. Suggested the 2 page outline could be sent round the whole WG8 group.

Action Point- CB email all with Nature Method outline.

RN- has had discussions regarding funding with German research Foundation, who also pointed out Science Europe as a funding agency.

CB- would like a standard format for WG sections.

RN- pointed out that many haven't yet decided on tools to use so the proposed layout would be difficult to fill.

AN- Sections look better now after edits anyway, so could be left.

RN- WG sections should be sent back to WGs to approve the changes we've made.

Action Point- send out WG sections to each WG. **RN**

Discussion for next meeting- allow group to review the WP as is and make suggestions for edits. Allow time for incorporation of Figures. Decided next meeting Nov 10th, 10am EST, 4pm CET, 3pm UK.

All Action Points:

Action Point- GN and UB to update lists and GN to share googledoc with new members too.

Action Point- LG and RN to modify Figures for requested changes.

Action Point- Sebastian M. to expand this Figure. **[Any other volunteers to help?]**

Action Point- CS, AN, JW and LS will discuss names for imaging scientists (generally agreed upon that one) and experimental scientists.

Action Point- GN to look into paperpile and add references that are in WP currently.

Action Point- CB email all with Nature Method outline.

Action Point- send out WG sections to each WG. **RN**

Zoom Chat:

From Mišo Mitkovski to Everyone: (1:28 pm)

^[P]_[SEP]Way too detailed question on my part: could it be that people who "never" do QC rely on maintenance contracts and associated checks by the respective company?^[P]_[SEP]

From Ian Dobbie to Everyone: (1:29 pm)

^[P]_[SEP]I would assume so, but they probably just don't think about how QC on their instrument affects their results and the science produced.^[P]_[SEP]

From Ulrike Boehm to Everyone: (1:30 pm)

^[P]_[SEP]Good points^[P]_[SEP]

From Josh Moore to Everyone: (1:33 pm)

^[P]_[SEP]Sorry everyone. I'm double booked, but always good to listen in on what's going on. Hope all are well. ~Josh^[P]_[SEP]

From Alex Laude to Everyone: (1:36 pm)

^[P]_[SEP]Good point @Julia - a complicated figure describes a complicated and complex problem!

Perhaps include as an appendix to emphasise it.^[P]_[SEP]

From Laurent Gelman to Everyone: (1:44 pm)

^[P]_[SEP]we want also companies to read it!^[P]_[SEP]

From Caterina Strambio De Castillia to Everyone: (1:45 pm)

^[P]_[SEP]I suggest Imaging Scientist and Experimental Scientist (or Bench-Side Scientist)^[P]_[SEP]Or Imaging Scientist and User^[P]_[SEP]

From Mišo Mitkovski to Everyone: (1:46 pm)

[P]
[SEP]Also, granting agencies and people part of institute governance hierarchies (so they realize what it takes)[P]
[SEP]

From Laurent Gelman to Everyone: (1:46 pm)

[P]
[SEP]Indeed Miso[P]
[SEP]

From Alison North to Everyone: (1:47 pm)

[P]
[SEP]@Caterina - I think we would need to call it "facility user" rather than just "user" because any scientist using a microscope in their own lab is a microscope user.[P]
[SEP]

From Caterina Strambio De Castillia to Everyone: (1:48 pm)

[P]
[SEP]@Alison, yes for a qualified "user" but not just Facility, because there are plenty of people that use Microscopes outside facilities... What about Microscope Users?[P]
[SEP]In any case it is very important to clarify what we mean by each of these categories of potential reader of the manuscript[P]
[SEP]

From Ian Dobbie to Everyone: (1:51 pm)

[P]
[SEP]https://docs.google.com/document/d/1TVx56pNI5CIrNjQ5LzIwG-nkmV_Sh9wtaK_Dugd-il/edit?ts=5f9aa8bd#[P]
[SEP]

From Caterina Strambio De Castillia to Everyone: (1:53 pm)

[P]
[SEP]@Ulrike and @Glyn RE: References I strongly suggest using Paperpile (<https://paperpile.com/>) which is a very hand tool to manage references in GoogleDoc. The very good thing about Paperpile is that multiple people can put in references at the same time. The only caveat is that it has to be used on Chrome[P]
[SEP]

From Alison North to Everyone: (1:53 pm)

[P]
[SEP]I also have Access Denied for taht link[P]
[SEP]

From Claire Brown to Everyone: (1:53 pm)

[P]
[SEP]It has to be a gmail address[P]
[SEP]

From Caterina Strambio De Castillia to Everyone: (1:54 pm)

[P]
[SEP]You might need to provide your gmail[P]
[SEP]

From Mišo Mitkovski to Everyone: (1:54 pm)

[P]
[SEP]mitkovm@gmail.com (Miso Mitkovski)[P]
[SEP]

From Me to Everyone: (1:54 pm)

[P]
[SEP]https://docs.google.com/document/d/1TVx56pNI5CIrNjQ5LzIwG-nkmV_Sh9wtaK_Dugd-il/edit?usp=sharing[P]
[SEP]

From Lucas Schuetz to Everyone: (1:54 pm)

[P]
[SEP]lucas.schuetz@embl.de (Gmail enterprise)[P]
[SEP]

From Me to Everyone: (1:54 pm)

[P]
[SEP]that link should work for everyone[P]
[SEP]

From Ian Dobbie to Everyone: (1:54 pm)

[P]
[SEP]No, it doesn't have to be gmail but it has to be associate with a google account[P]
[SEP]

From Alex Laude to Everyone: (1:55 pm)

[P]
[SEP]alexjlaude@gmail.com[P]
[SEP]

From Alison North to Everyone: (1:55 pm)

[P]
[SEP]Sorry, my zoom just crashed. My gmail is ajnnyc2143@gmail.com[P]
[SEP]

From Mišo Mitkovski to Everyone: (2:05 pm)

[P]
[SEP]What is life? :-)[P]
[SEP]

From Caterina Strambio De Castillia to Everyone: (2:07 pm)

[P]
[SEP]@Miso Good Point[P]
[SEP]

From Christian Kukat to Everyone: (2:09 pm)

[P]
[SEP]Erwin Schrödinger wrote a book about it. ;-) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/What_Is_Life%3F[P]
[SEP]

From Alex Laude to Everyone: (2:09 pm)

[P]
[SEP]Happy with that... as long as we do not alienate other microscopy communities but state our background and focus up front we should capture their interests...[P]
[SEP]

From Caterina Strambio De Castillia to Everyone: (2:15 pm)

[P] I want to bring to everyone's attention another Glossary clarification point: Guidelines vs. Standards.[SEP]

From Laurent Gelman to Everyone: (2:16 pm)

[P] yes, very important Indeed, Caterina![SEP]

From Caterina Strambio De Castillia to Everyone: (2:16 pm)

[P] What do we mean by Standards: Slides to measure optical characteristics? Or Metadata Standards Or Protocol best practices?[SEP] etc. etc.[SEP]

From Julia Fernandez to Everyone: (2:17 pm)

[P] Are with Caterina about Guidelines vs. Standards.[SEP] Meant agreed[SEP]

From Me to Everyone: (2:17 pm)

[P] Standards may also refer to ISO documentation for example[SEP]

From Ian Dobbie to Everyone: (2:18 pm)

[P] Do the service checks even do any QC? I think they mostly just look and solve obvious problems, or issues pointed out to them.[SEP]

From Me to Everyone: (2:21 pm)

[P] a zeiss service for example on a confocal checks laser alignment, pmt alignment, pmt baselines, among others.[SEP]

From Claire Brown to Everyone: (2:21 pm)

[P] Companies also look if things are within their minimum specifications which can be very broad and not always high quality.[SEP]

From Ian Dobbie to Everyone: (2:22 pm)

[P] But not chromatic alignment. We had a Zeiss system with > 1um Z shift between channels. Has taken 2 years for them to accept this is a fundamental issue and sachets replacing the machine[SEP]

From Claire Brown to Everyone: (2:22 pm)

[P] I think one really important for imaging scientists is a recommendation of the standard samples. There are so many to choose from. So that has to be included somehow but perhaps can be part of the definition of standards.[SEP]

From Laurent Gelman to Everyone: (2:23 pm)

[P] yes, samples need standardisation :-)! [SEP]

From Ian Dobbie to Everyone: (2:23 pm)

[P] Yes standard samples and also some expected results.[SEP]

From Claire Brown to Everyone: (2:26 pm)

[P] I reached out to a contact at Olympus and they wanted to recommend their marketing manager to join QUAREP...[SEP]

From Orestis to Everyone: (2:28 pm)

[P] at eurobioimaging, somebody from olympus is at the head of the industrail board, we should check if he is the same person[SEP]

From Claire Brown to Everyone: (2:28 pm)

[P] One thing I think would really help would be to have a consistent format for presenting each WG with suggested titles of sections. (1) Need for the WG, (2) Tools to be used, (3) measurements to be made, (4) data and measurement output.[SEP]

From Alison North to Everyone: (2:28 pm)

[P] @Ulrike - I believe you said you hadn't yet incorporated all comments? Can you let us know when you have done that?[SEP]

From Me to Everyone: (2:29 pm)

[P] no, we have done all.[SEP]

From Alison North to Everyone: (2:30 pm)

[P] OK, great, thanks![SEP]

From Ian Dobbie to Everyone: (2:37 pm)

[P] Nex year?[SEP]

From Me to Everyone: (2:37 pm)

[P] 2023 looks quiet[SEP]

From Ian Dobbie to Everyone: (2:39 pm)

Tues 10th CET 4pm? 3pm UK time I liked the “At Least!” at 6pm it might be wine time?

From Claire Brown to Everyone: (2:41 pm)

I would say one more pass with the figures and glossary before sending it to them.

From Alison North to Everyone: (2:42 pm)

@all - if we give them the opportunity to comment on the whole thing, we should at least tell them that this is not the final version yet.

From Claire Brown to Everyone: (2:45 pm)

Thanks Ulrike!

From Christian Kukat to Everyone: (2:46 pm)

Thank you very much!

From Alex Laude to Everyone: (2:46 pm)

Second that - its a tough job!