Hello, I am Melinda Dósa from Budapest. I’ll show you, that Eastern Europeans are reluctant to participate in conferences, and ... this has a positive feedback effect...
Geographic imbalance in Earth and Planetary sciences within Europe

East vs. West – historical division (see Matenco, EGU 2019-12478)

Conference participation statistics are presented:

- IUGG (International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics)
- EGU2019 – atmospheric sciences session
- EPSC (European Planetary Science Congress)
- ESPM (European Solar Physics Meeting)

I have analysed data of the following 4 conferences.

IUGG – „sister” of EGU, held every 4 years
EGU AS: atmospheric sciences – Only AS, because I did not receive a summary of abstracts from the organisers, and to get the data from the website is reeeaaaly cumbersome.
I picked AS, because there is an atmosphere everywhere, all regions can potentially carry out research of the atmosphere. I suppose there is less bias here.
Global participation rates
IUGG 2011, 2015 & 2019

Participation from the different regions at the last 3 IUGG meetings. The 3 meetings were held on different continents. Each time the „local scientists“ have the highest participation rates.

Nr of participants from different regions

- Conference in Europe
- Conference in Canada
- Conference in Australia

Location is important!
Eastern vs. Western European participation rates: EGU

EGU participation of the last 3 years shows a similar trend:
- vast majority (above 70%) from Europe
- The division between Eastern and Western Europe is 6-8 % versus 64-67%
- If normalised to the number of authors in these regions, the number of Western participants should be 4 times the number of Eastern European participants. (e.g. 15% - 60%)

EGU over the last years: 6-8 % vs 64-67%

If normalised to the number of authors per country, ideally:
Western participants ~ 4* Eastern Participants
(see Matenco et al, 2019.)
The planetary science congress held in Eastern Europe attracted a large number of Eastern Europeans!

This will be our first success story to analyse in detail.

**SUCCESS STORY Nr1**

---

**Eastern vs. Western European participation rates: EPSC**

If normalised to the number of authors per country, ideally:

Western participants ~ 4* Eastern Participants (see Matenco et al, 2019.)

---

**EPSC Riga (Eastern Europe)**

18% (!)

---

**EPSC Berlin**

6%
Eastern vs. Western European participation rates: \textbf{ESPM}

If normalised to the number of authors per country, ideally:

Western participants ~ 4* Eastern Participants (see Matenco et al, 2019.)

Another meeting (in solar physics) held in Eastern Europe and attracting MUCH more Eastern Europeans...

\textbf{SUCCESS STORY Nr 2}
Are they really success stories??
Is „Participation” the most important factor?

Let’s have a closer look on what „participation” can mean..

• e.g.1. IUGG 2015 Prague
• e.g.2. EGU 2019 Vienna (Session AS)
• e.g.3. EPSC 2017 Riga
• e.g.5. ESPM, Budapest
Participation: Talk vs Poster

English speaking regions + Western Europe tend to have (much) more talks.

Eastern Europe belongs to the poster-regions.
Participation: Conveners, Chairs
IUGG 2015 Prague
(4790 abstracts, 39% WEU, 9% EEU)

Most conveners and session chairs are from North America or Western Europe. Much more, than the participation rates would suggest... WEU particip.: 39%, WEU conv. 51% EEU particip.: 9%, EEU conv. 4%
Participation: Talks & solicited talks

Western Europe and North America:

Much higher percentage of talks are solicited/keynote talks
EGU 2019 session: atmospheric sciences
(1650 abstracts, 60% WEU, 4% EEU)

- 90% of the conveners come from Western Europe
- the vast majority of abstracts are presented by Western Europeans....

EGU „atmospheric sciences” is a Western European session.
It’d be interesting to check other sessions as well.
And what’s the situation with our success stories?

- e.g. 3. EPSC 2017 Riga
- e.g. 5. ESPM, Budapest
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Western Europe</th>
<th>Eastern Europe</th>
<th>Non-Europe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of abstracts</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>63 (~7% of all abstracts)</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral presentations</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>27 (~5% of all orals)</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keynote talks</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15 (all from US)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eastern European participants at Riga made up 18% of all participants. **BUT** only 7% of the abstracts were presented by Eastern Europeans, and only 5% of talks were made by EEU scientists.
## Participation: Talk vs Poster, Conveners

### ESPM 2015 Budapest

(255 abstracts, 56% WEU, 25% EEU)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Western Europe (Participants: 56%)</th>
<th>Eastern Europe (Participants: 25%)</th>
<th>Non-Europe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of abstracts (Oral + poster)</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~22% of all abstracts</td>
<td>(Why so low??)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral presentations</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~14% of all orals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keynote talks</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.5% of all keynotes, no local)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Active participation of Eastern Europeans is much better: 57 abstracts: **22% of total**

14% of talks and 4.5% of keynotes is a very low number at such a high participation rate.
Conclusions

• Location predefines global participation rates
• Eastern Europe is underrepresented in European conferences
  • participation rate is ~6-8%, it should be ~15%
• Organising meetings in Eastern Europe boosts local participation
• **Active participation** (conveners, talks, keynote) of Eastern Europeans is still to be supported.
• Invite at least 1 local keynote speaker, encourage locals to show their expertise.