



ACNP Study Group Guidelines

DEADLINE for ACNP member chairs to create submission and add presenters: May 9, 2023*

DEADLINE for individual participants to complete disclosures: May 23, 2023*

DEADLINE for chairs to review, finalize and submit session: May 25, 2023*

**All deadlines occur at 5:00 PM Central*

All study group participants are expected to attend and participate in-person.

NEW THIS YEAR: Study Groups will be 2 hours in length.

- ❖ Study groups are issue-oriented **2-hour sessions** with a **maximum of 8 participants**, including chair, co-chair, and moderator. Examples are topics relating to ethics or policy matters. Study groups should focus on discussion of a clearly articulated set of questions or problems in the field.
- ❖ Study groups are informal with more audience participation than panels. Individual participants do not have a set time to speak, but rather talk informally among themselves with the audience. To foster this atmosphere, it is strongly recommended that each participant utilize no more than 3 slides. Chairs are encouraged to include diverse panel participants that can address questions from multiple viewpoints.
- ❖ Study groups **must be chaired** by an ACNP member, to include all categories of membership (Associate Member, Member, Fellow, Emeritus).
- ❖ There is a limit of 3200 characters for the text of the abstract submission. This includes title (250 characters) and proposal body (2950 characters), not including spaces.
- ❖ The College requires all clinical trials to be registered in a public registry prior to submission. For more information, please reference the official statement.
- ❖ All materials submitted for presentation at the 2023 ACNP Annual Meeting will be published in *NPP* and should be original and not previously published. Following publication authors may reuse their work with the sole requirements of full citation and link to the original publication online.
- ❖ Study Groups will be scheduled on the assumption that all participants agree to be available on all days of the Annual Meeting. Chairs of proposed sessions should verify that their participants will be available at all times throughout the meeting. The Executive Office will make every effort to not schedule any presenters on the last day if they presented on the last day the previous year.
- ❖ A maximum of \$4,000 will be available to support travel for non-member participant and associate member expenses. No honoraria can be paid from these funds.

- ❖ **Non-member participants who received financial support for participation for the 2022 Annual Meeting are not eligible to receive financial support in 2023. Chairs must inform non-members of this policy.**
- ❖ Registration fees are waived for non-member participants and associate members, but they must still register for the meeting.
- ❖ Audiovisual equipment available for every study group: laptop, LCD projector, laser pointer, podium, and microphone.
- ❖ [Click here](#) for a sample abstract.

Evaluation Process

Each proposal is assigned to three members of the Program Committee for review who assign a numerical value of 1-9 (similar to the NIH review system) based on the below criteria:

- a. Well-articulated, overall theme with justified components
- b. Scientific merit
- c. Scientific innovation
- d. Scientific rigor
- e. Topic recently represented at the ACNP meeting
- f. Gender/minority diversity inclusion
- g. Likely to be well attended
- h. Member/non-member speaker balance
- i. Institutional/geographic diversity

Selection Process:

Based on the reviewer scores, proposals are grouped into an “accept” category (around the top third of submitted proposals, typically ranked consistently in the 1-2 range across the three reviewers), a “discuss” category”, and a “reject” category (around the bottom third of proposals receiving consistently less strong scores). Each of the proposals in the “discuss” category, typically comprising ~40% of all submitted proposals, is discussed during a day-long Program Committee meeting held in July; structured discussions led by the three original reviewers follow a system modeled after NIH study sections that allows the entire committee to contribute and vote on each of the proposals in this category. Committee members are also given the opportunity to pull out proposals from the “reject” category for discussion and vote by the whole committee.