Meetings That Flatter, but May Not Deliver

The e-mails come from Amber, Rainy, Dora, and Arlene. “How are you doing now?” some begin. “Hope this e-mail finds all the best on you.” Flattering and solicitous and written in bewitchingly mangled English, the e-mails have the hallmarks of spam offering carnal pleasure—except they are actually far tamer. They are invitations to attend scientific meetings in China organized by a company that bills itself as the “World Leading Provider of Intelligence Exchanges in Life Sciences.”

BIT Life Sciences, based in Dalian, a seaside city in Northeast China, stages conferences on a staggering array of topics, from vaccines and biodiversity to diabetes, cancer, cloud computing, HIV/AIDS, and algae. The meetings, which are often billed as an “Annual World Congress,” sometimes coin names for new disciplines, such as “Endobolism” and “Drug Designology.”

BITeomics, the parent company, says it has 400 employees and holds at least 70 conferences a year that “tens of thousands of people” have attended since 2001.

Welcome to the bizarre world of what some call “predatory” conferences: scientific confabs, sometimes sparsely attended, that seem to come into being primarily to make money. Jeffrey Beall, a librarian at the University of Colorado, Denver, who monitors a subset of open-access journals that he calls “predatory,” sees a similar phenomenon in BIT conferences. “They have the same conflict of interest as predatory publishers,” he asserts. While predatory journals charge fees to publish papers, these conferences make money through registration fees that are bundled with charges for accommodation, meals, and program materials. (Typical bills run in the $2000 range. BIT, which stands for Bio Integration Technology, also has a subsidiary that offers to help book air flights, hotels, and tours.) “The more papers they accept, the more money they make,” Beall says, as people with accepted talks are more likely to attend. While most scientific conferences have a similar financial equation, the vast majority are organized by nonprofits with members drawn from the scientific community, rigorously peer review submissions, and strictly limit the number of presentations. “Predatory” conferences, on the other hand, Beall says, “are accepting papers that may not be valid science: They bear the imprimatur of science even though they never go through the same quality control.”

While BIT Congress claims to be “the largest-scale conference company in Asia Pacific,” it has competition in what Beall says is an expanding industry. “They’re just one in the landscape,” he says. He has also taken aim at the OMICS Group, a company based in India that stages conferences and publishes open-access journals that Beall considers “predatory” (see p. 60). (OMICS strongly objects to being deemed “predatory” by Beall and has threatened to sue him for $1 billion.)

For most societies, the annual meeting is also a moneymaker. Registration and exhibitor fees can contribute significantly to an organization’s bottom line. SfN’s annual meeting, for example, generated 43% of its overall revenue of $29 million last year and netted $3.8 million after expenses, according to the society’s 2012 report.

The two major meetings put on by the Materials Research Society (MRS) each year do even better for the organization. Fueled by a record combined attendance of 13,750, the meetings produced 68% of the society’s $11 million in revenues last year, contributing $4.6 million to its bottom line.

AGU’s fall and spring meetings added $1.5 million to the organization’s coffers in 2011, a big help in a year in which overall expenses of $39 million exceeded revenues by almost $5 million.
The allure of such profits, meanwhile, has created a growing number of “predatory” scientific meetings that appear to exist solely for making money (see p. 76). Not all meetings are money spinners, of course. The general science meeting organized each year by the AAAS (which publishes Science) is not “anyone’s principal scientific meeting,” CEO Alan Leshner acknowledges. That secondary status limits how much the organization can charge registrants and exhibitors. As a result, he says, revenues are insufficient to cover many no-charge activities “that are central to our mission,”

The American Geophysical Union’s fall meeting in San Francisco keeps growing.

We are a bridge to the professional world.

—FRANCIS WANG, BIT LIFE SCIENCES

Others, however, express serious misgivings about BIT. Some scientists—including officials such as Janet Woodcock, who directs the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research at the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, and Roger Glass, director of the Fogarty International Center at the U.S. National Institutes of Health—say they had no clue they were listed as advisory board members of a program committee until they were notified by Science. Immunologist Jeffrey Bluestone at the University of California, San Francisco, was billed as a “renewed” speaker for a meeting in 2011 that he did not agree to attend. “I have never and will never go to a BIT conference,” Bluestone says. “I have been trying for years to get them to stop including me on their lists.” Attendees of some BIT conferences say they felt duped. “None of the colleagues that were supposed to be there were at the meeting,” says Mario Clerici, an immunologist from the University of Milan in Italy who chaired a session at a World AIDS Day meeting in 2011. “Ninety percent of the audience and of the speakers were Chinese, the rest a curious collection of people from exotic places. The general feeling was that of being stranded on a raft in the sea with a bunch of people who had never been sailing. In short: great opportunity to visit China. When he arrived at his session, there were only three other people there—including one from his own institution. ‘I don’t tell that story to many people because it’s kind of embarrassing,’ Schust says. ‘I think lots of people are getting sucked into it. It kind of cheapens the whole research agenda.’ To his surprise, BIT Life Sciences now lists him as a program committee advisory member of an upcoming meeting.

Wang told Science that BIT Life Sciences’ conferences list people as advisory board members only if they have agreed to serve that role. Speakers sometimes back out, she stated, which may explain why they are wrongly listed on a program. She acknowledged that on occasion, researchers receive invitations to speak at conferences outside their fields. “Some mismatched invitations can’t be avoided,” she wrote. Such issues are “the problems of a young organizer’s fast growth.” And she argued that it’s “absurd” that people would attend BIT Life Sciences meetings purely out of vanity. “Do you really believe, each year, those 10,000 professional professionals from more than 70 countries are all stupid? They are so easily hoaxed? And will they pay a good price and fly all the way to China just because they are flattered?”

At the end of some BIT Life Sciences invitations, researchers can opt out of future solicitations. “We will definitely unsubscribe requests from the bothered experts in our database,” Wang stated. The company is young, growing quickly, and trying to improve, she stressed: “In the garden of conferences, BIT is only a new flower bud with unyielding life power.”
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