

WG8 5th meeting 19/11/20

Agenda:

1. Welcome new participants (5 min)
2. Agreement on the minutes of the previous meeting (see attachment) (1 min)
3. Agreement about recording the meeting (1 min)
4. Update on open action items:
 - a. Action Point- to ask WGs to read over final text and edit WP WG section accordingly. (Roland, Glyn and Ulrike) (1 min)
 - b. Action Point- contact WG11 and ask to provide a summary. (Roland) (1 min)
 - c. Action Point- edit ISO manual and pass round to authors for submission to ArXiv. (Glyn) (2 min)
 - d. Action Point- upload the finalised definitions doc to the bwsyncandshare website and update of the WP. (Alison) (4 min)
 - e. Action Point- SM to update Fig design- others to pass on suggestions directly to him and UB will create and share a gdoc for funnel input items. (Sebastian and ALL) (10 min)
 - f. Action Point- make all bars as %age and group the second Fig by light path tested. (Laurent) (5 min)
 - g. Action Point- Glossary items and definitions: create gdoc and share (Ulrike and ALL). (10 min)
 - h. Action Point- write first draft of Nature Methods manuscript in next 1-2 weeks. (Claire) (1 min)
 - i. Action Point- arrange meeting with Michelle Peckham. (Alex) (5 min)
5. Next steps / action items:
 - a. Incorporation of all figures with captions into the WP (5 min)
 - b. Completion of the glossary (12 min)
 - c. Finalization of the affiliation section with more than 100 participants (12 min)
 - d. Final stylistic revision of the WP (12 min)
6. Scheduling of the next meeting (3 min)

Attendees

Glyn Nelson, Ulrike Boehm, Arne Seitz, Julia Fernandez, Roland Nitschke, Alex Laude, Alison North, Aurelien Dauphin, Caterina Strambio, Christian Kukat, Hella Hartmann, Johann Bischof, Steve Bagley, Tobias Rasse, Alexia Ferrand, John Eriksson, Sebastien Munck.

Minutes

1. Arne introduced himself as a light microscopy facility manager at EPFL.
2. Minutes were agreed upon.
3. No one disagreed to recording, so started.
4. A) WG sections are all confirmed. Some discussion over Centre of Field definition in WG4. UB proposed to remove and leave vaguer at this point until the WG have defined it.

4B) AN has written a draft for the new WG11. Several people have looked at it and agreed it. Would like to get some publishers in the group. RN- working on this. UB- Jen Waters would be a good candidate. AN- need to ensure we aren't always asking people with too much on their plate already, so they won't be able to contribute.

4C) GN has edited the ISO manual that was first set out at the pre QUAREP meeting in April. It is now on the ArXiv preprint server: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2011.08713>

4d and g) Definitions- on googledoc with some updates. All can still contribute to.

Action Point- all to add to Glossary:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1A5r3HIoyHb3ZeOVNa_xJUSZUtOCP9y0qPrTOI64dbM/edit

4e). Figures. Funnel inputs for QC Fig1.

Fig 1. AN- Sebastian (not present in meeting until later)- did he look at chat comments from last meeting? UB- will contact him. Could set up online voting for choices of input to funnel. RN- fig is needed. UB- it is there as an eyecatcher. CS- needed and shouldn't take too long to decide on inputs.

UB- others can propose inputs (same googledoc as the Glossary, above)

AS- should look like something to do with microscopes

JF- is happy to help SM with Fig. AN and AD agreed to help too. Will set up a mini group with SM to design Fig1. Inputs to fig should be mentioned in WP.

Action Point: create mini group for Fig 1- SM, FF, AN and AD

LG- what do we want to say with the fig? If an eyecatcher, then it is not important, but if not, then has to reflect the WP content. We can also have concepts as inputs that are not precise if these are used jargon in the field.

UB- fig originally planned as an overview of the WP by SM.

LG- what is the Fig title

[AN- proposed a title in chat]

CS – what is the content of the WP and explain some of the terms.

RN- likes LGs Idea to concentrate everything through funnel down to QUAREP terms/aims

LG- the field is basically a mess and could be shown as a cloud.

TR- Fig as shown is conceptually wrong for Quality Management, as it is downstream of funnel.

UB- we can finalise the WP for preprint and add Fig later.

LG- can have a generic fig and not worry about the content (inputs to funnel) too much.

CS- fig should show what we are and what we are endeavouring to do

LG- show that we start with lots of terms and concepts and that we are trying to put some order to them.

CK- agrees with LG about multiple terms for inputs.

GN- too many terms would mean we need to describe them all in the WP- could be in Glossary but would need to be discussed in WP.

TB- a word cloud of terms could be presented and say we want to narrow it down

AS- agrees- a word cloud above the funnel and this then narrows down to the points of QUAREP.

UB- CB said similar in a previous meeting re. pillars supporting QUAREP.

RN- likes this idea of a cloud.

CS- cloud above and showing directionality to QUAREP choices.

GN- a rainbow of cloud terms could be narrowed via a filter to QUAREP choices to try and keep to a microscopy theme.

[LG- showed a concept already drawn very similar going to a camera]

UB- the mini group can take this further.

RN- re the map figure, he has posted updated ppt fig to bwsync server.

JE- just joined. Gave an update from a Eurobioimaging meeting which has an industry boards with an advisory panel. They are interested in working with QUAREP.

UB- would be great to tighten bonds between us.

4f) ELMI survey results Fig2a and b (used tools, (a) and frequency of tests (b)):

LG introduced the current layouts. Fig2a essentially unchanged. 2b reordered into groups as suggested at last meeting and shown as %ages.

CS- Fig2a better as %ages too, to highlight how few people are using tools for QC. For Fig2b-ordering by prevalence of use within the subgroups suggests some are more important than others.

AF- order Fig2a by homemade v. commercial? although happy with the frequency order as is.

GN- nice as is, and we can state it is shown by rank in the title.

CS- we don't want to bias it.

UB- what is the question the fig is answering? - could add as order in questionnaire in case there is bias due to order suggested in survey.

More discussion on order of Fig2a from multiple people.

Voted on whether to order as currently by frequency. This gained majority support.

UB- all to comment on phrasing and categories in 2b. She will share to everyone.

Action Point: UB to share LG Fig2.

Action Point: All to comment on category titles and phrasing.

4h) Nature methods. UB said CB had drafted a 2-page manuscript- this is currently being looked at by several people. Short deadline of end of November.

4i). AL- had discussions with J. micro editor Michelle Peckham. Would be keen to publish QUAREP outputs. Could publish the original ISO manual (point 4c above).

WP could be as a letter to the editor and could be timed to coincide with the Nat.

Methods publications. The QUAREP output could be published as a special edition.

Open access shouldn't be a problem if the authors come from countries with OA agreements in place. Otherwise, Michelle would push Wiley for OA anyway. AL also discussed other options with RN.

RN- has talked to editors of Microscopy and Analysis and Image and Analysis news format publications (EMS). They would be happy to publish introduction to QUAREP and an overview of a WG each edition.

AL- where do we want the WHP to go?

UB- Open Access is important.
AL- not a problem with J. micro.
GN- J. micro too good an opportunity to miss and can still do news articles in Microscopy and Analysis.
RN- agreed.
AN- likes J. micro.
CS- looks good and agrees.

AL- as an aside, had contact with a group establishing themselves to look at phototoxicity and bleaching. This has been discussed in WG1, but not covered by it. Should we invite to QUAREP?
Some agreement from others.
UB- send further info to RN for invite.
RN- will discuss this in WG9.
Action Point- add to WG9 Agenda- RN

UB- updated SM who had just joined re. Fig1.

5. Next Steps.

5a) Get figures finalised, categories agreed upon for Fig2b and word cloud for Fig2a.
5b) Glossary input needed for funnel inputs/ word cloud
5c) participant list. Currently in country, city, institute, name order. RN will email to all QUAREP asking to fill in spreadsheet. If not filled in, not on WP.
Several agreed.
5d) Stylistic revision of WP. Needs reading through by people not so involved in writing to look at flow and structure. AF and CS agreed to do so.
CS. Reference format. UB- stopped using paperpile as it required purchasing to share. Gone back to manual addition and bibtex for the final doc. Asked CS to send bibtex files for new refs.

Action Points: Give Fig2 input and Glossary input -ALL
Action Point: email to all requesting full name and address for WP- RN
Action Point: check WP for style, flow, and structure- CS and AF.

6) Next meeting.

UB- Thanksgiving in US next Thurs/Fri. Suggested Tue or Wed. Too difficult for others. Decided upon 1/12/20 10am EST, 4pm CET, 3pm UK.

Action Points:

Action Point- add to Glossary:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1A5r3HIoyHb3ZeOVNa_xjUSZUtOCP9y0qPrTOI64dbM/edit -ALL
Action Point: create mini group for Fig 1- SM, FF, AN and AD
Action Point: share LG Fig2.- UB
Action Point: comment on Fig2 category titles and phrasing. - ALL
Action Point- add photobleaching WG proposal to WG9 Agenda- RN
Action Point: email to all requesting full name and address for WP- RN

Action Point: check WP for style, flow, and structure- CS and AF.