“D

on’t NOT do an ex-
periment just be-
cause it involves
learning a new tech-
nique or model system. Science
should never be limited by what
you already know. It should only
be limited by your imagination,
which, as a scientist, should be
limitless.” This helpful advice has
inspired Biological Sciences post-
doctoral fellow Dr. Sarah Kuce-
nas to excel as a scientist. It’s
the driving force that guides her
aspirations.

Sarah has been at Vanderbilt
for four and half years, working
in the Appel Lab on developmen-
tal neuroscience using zebrafish
as a model organism. Although
Dr. Bruce Appel has moved his
lab to Denver, Colorado, Sarah
has stayed and is finishing her
work up in the laboratory of Dr.
Jonathan Gitlin, Chair of the De-
partment of Pediatrics. Sarah
and her husband, Adam, who is
a member of the Air National
Guard and a Metro Nashville
police officer have a five-year-old
boxer, Roxy, and just added a
new member to the family, Dyna,
a four-month-old Bullmastiff.
When Sarah isn’t in the lab,
she enjoys spending time with
her family and outdoor activities,
specifically white water rafting.

Before coming to Vandy, Sarah
was a graduate student in the
lab of Dr. Mark Voigt at Saint
Louis University. She investi-
gated the developmental roles of
P2X receptors, ATP ligand
gated cation channels in the
nervous system. By disrupting
the function of the receptors and
found that in the absence of nor-
mal P2X receptor function, cra-
nial neural crest cells failed to
migrate normally, the embryos
developed craniofacial defects
and cranial sensory neuron de-
velopment was perturbed1,2.

Upon completion of her gradu-
ate work, Sarah was drawn to
the Appel lab and grew more
interested in the developmental
and genetic aspects of neurobi-
ology. Sarah’s current work in-
volves the investigation of nerv-
ous system assembly and how it
matures in the zebrafish em-
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Molly Fricke Brown, a student in Dr. Gregory Mathews laboratory, researches neuropharmacology, specifically synaptic transmission, and she already has a first-author publication in the *Journal of Neurochemistry* titled “Glutamine uptake by System A transporter maintains neurotransmitter GABA synthesis and inhibitory synaptic transmission.” She heads up the Pharmacology Graduate Student Association and is the Vice-President of Academic Affairs on the Graduate Student Council. Additionally, Molly is a teaching assistant in an undergraduate lab section in Biological Sciences. You could say that Molly has fully immersed herself in numerous aspects of graduate student life here at Vanderbilt!

The Mathews lab studies how the metabolism of major inhibitory neurotransmitter GABA regulates inhibitory synaptic transmission in the rat brain. Molly’s first project focused on the role of System A glutamine transport in regulating inhibitory post-synaptic currents in hippocampal pyramidal neurons. These neurons use GABA synthesis to maintain synaptic vesicle filling and require the precursor glutamate, possibly from glutamine. She found that inhibition of glutamine transporters reduced vesicular GABA content and that astrocytes constitutively supply glutamine to inhibitory neurons to maintain the filling of these vesicles. From these results, she concluded that glutamine transporters support inhibitory synaptic strength by maintaining GABA vesicle filling. These results are seen in immature rats, but not adults, suggesting an age-dependent change in the role of glutamine uptake on GABA regulation. Molly is currently investigating the developmental regulation of the System A transporter.

Molly hit the ground running when she arrived at Vanderbilt in Fall 2005. Pharmacology and Dr. Mathews’ research had interested her from the start and she made great progress her first year in the lab by following up on preliminary data from a former post-doc, landing her first first-author paper early in 2007. Molly states that this process taught her a lot: “I had the great opportunity to set up my system and data organization early on in my graduate career,” she says, and this has served her well since. “Early” is a word that applies to Molly in several ways; she also joined the Pharmacology Graduate Student Association soon after entering the department. “Students have a very strong voice in the Pharmacology training programs and the GSA is a big part of that,” she says. She felt very fortunate to be a graduate student at Vanderbilt and knew she wanted to give back to this community, which led to her interest in the Graduate Student Council. Attending a meeting led to participating as an at-large member and eventual recruitment by the outgoing VP of Academic Affairs to take over that position. This officer organizes the annual Graduate Student Research Symposium, which occurred this past March. In Molly’s words, “The research symposium was well attended and... I thoroughly enjoyed our keynote address by Dr. Susan Basalla—there was standing room only, indicating that we certainly have tapped a need regarding improving Vanderbilt’s career services for graduate students.” In addition to her own GSC duties, Molly has served on other GSC committees and co-organized the recent seminar on Gender Dynamics and Communication. She admits that juggling Pharmacology GSA, GSC, and TA responsibilities in addition to research in the lab have made her busier than expected, but adds that she has learned a great deal and developed new skills by taking advantage of these opportunities. These experiences have opened up career options beyond her initial goal of pharmaceutical research and she is now also considering teaching and education administration.

Coming to Vanderbilt with a BS in pharmaceutical science, Molly was intent on working toward a career in the pharmaceutical industry. Undergraduate research in industrial and physical pharmacy had not been a great fit, but ultimately guided her in the direction of biomedical research. In fact, she credits the graduate student in that undergraduate research lab as the most influential scientist in her science career. Her advice to incoming graduate students would be “to remember that your thesis research does not have to define you as a person and monopolize your time and energy. I encourage students to continue to pursue hobbies, passions and personal interests—it will help you stay sane and not lose yourself in the midst of the emotional ride that can often define the graduate student experience.” Given what she has accomplished as a graduate student both inside and outside of the lab, she will definitely make an impact in any field.

**Stats on Molly**

**Born:** Pendleton, IN  
**Undergrad:** Purdue University, IN 2005  
**Grad school:** 4th year graduate student, Pharmacology  
**VP Academic Affairs — Graduate Student Council**  
**President — Pharmacology Graduate Student Association**  
**Favorite lab escape:** Baking!
“I love science and I want the people who train in my lab to love science. This career is a tough road! If you don’t love coming into work everyday, then it isn’t worth it. So it is my goal to create an atmosphere that will be inspirational to all.”

In addition to her research, Sarah has been actively involved in sharing her knowledge and expertise by teaching undergraduates in the lab and graduate students in a methodology course. As the post-doc representative for the Program in Developmental Biology (2006-2007), Sarah was involved in organizing speakers and events. Additionally, she has won multiple awards for poster and presentation categories at meetings, including grand prize for the post-doctoral category at the Southeast Regional Society for Developmental Biologists meeting in 2007. This award included a travel grant to attend the first Pan American Congress in Developmental Biology conference in Cancun, Mexico.

Now that her education and training phases are culminating, Sarah is preparing to take flight on her own. While she is excited about her future, which currently includes multiple job offers, she keeps herself grounded with goals for her own lab and her general philosophy: “I think a PI, regardless of rank, should run a lab that fosters collaboration and enthusiasm. I love science and I want the people who train in my lab to love science. This career is a tough road! If you don’t love coming into work everyday, then it isn’t worth it. So it is my goal to create an atmosphere that will be inspirational to all.”


---

**Perspectives: State of the IGP**

Jeffrey Bylund

As the spring semester comes to a close, many of us are looking forward to the end of another school year and the beginning of summer. For the 2008-09 Interdisciplinary Graduate Program (IGP) students this may be especially so, as we look forward to the completion of our general curriculum and the start of “serious research” as we choose a Final Preceptor and settle in for the rest of our graduate career.

This is also a good time to reflect on the current state of the IGP. The IGP has changed in small ways through the years to become what it is today. Some of these changes include a reshuffling in the order of departmental presentations, the inclusion of flextime questions on exams, and an increase in the number of total students accepted into the program, with the 2008-09 class the largest to date.

Now, there is word that some major changes will be in store for IGP as the Biomedical Research, Education, and Training (BRET) office conducts a thorough review of the program, including a full audit by an external agency. As major tweaking of the IGP is considered, there seems to be consensus among the latest class about what kinds of changes would be welcomed.

A common sentiment expressed in the halls after class is that lectures tend to skip the introductory material that many of us were hoping to encounter. While the detailed, in-depth approach is certainly challenging and full of information, it is less effective when it comes to helping students gain an understanding of the subject in the context of biomedical research at large. The students in the IGP class come from varied backgrounds and are generally looking to be introduced to a new subject and become comfortable with it, not overwhelmed by it.

Another common sentiment seems to be that the end of the semester tends to run a bit long. By the time the second semester rolls around, some students are ready to join a department, and many would rather be reading papers based on their field of interest instead of the latest flextime paper. Allowing students to choose which IGP classes they’d like to take during the second semester via an à la carte system might be a welcome change.

There are also many things that everyone generally agrees on as being very effective. These include the variety of labs available for rotations, the exposure to many different disciplines and ways of doing science, and the overall congenial collaborative spirit that is encouraged in such an interdisciplinary environment.

Overall, the IGP seems to be in good shape. There is plenty of participation from many excellent departments and those who organize and manage the program are world class researchers who know what it takes to do good science in an ever more dynamic field. Hopefully the combined perspective of students and faculty can come together to help shape IGP 2.0 into an even more excellent program in the coming years.

---

_Preparing to submit a manuscript or grant proposal? Need help with clarity, flow, or language? Enlist the free, confidential services of the select, trained editors in the Vanderbilt Editors’ Club! Submit online at: [https://medschool.mc.vanderbilt.edu/editors_club/](https://medschool.mc.vanderbilt.edu/editors_club/)_
On January 28, 2009, all members of the Vanderbilt community received an ominous email from Chancellor Zeppos that spoke of campus-wide budget cuts, decreased discretionary spending, and freezes in hiring and salaries in response to the recent world-wide economic downturn. Graduate students and post-docs alike nervously laughed it off, hoping the economic strife would not hit home in their own department or lab. With decreased National Institutes of Health (NIH) funding levels in recent years, the future of scientific research has become a legitimate concern, even at a top university such as Vanderbilt. Now with the stimulus package granting $10.4 billion to Research & Development (R&D), many are hopeful that research has once again become a priority to legislators. But, what does the economic crisis really mean for graduate students and post-docs in the biomedical sciences, especially in light of the NIH stimulus package?

The two goals of the NIH stimulus money are to create and sustain scientific jobs and to pursue scientific opportunities. To accomplish these goals, funds have been allocated to several different areas: Scientific Instrumentation, Building Construction and Renovation, and even for the enhancement of Biomedical Core Facilities. However, the bulk of the stimulus ($8.2 billion) will go to “scientific research priorities” through competitive grant funding. Among these opportunities are supplements and/or revisions to existing grants, new challenge grants, and funding of recently peer-reviewed R01s. Supplements are intended to either significantly expand the scope or increase the tempo of active research grants through hiring new personnel, investing in new technology, or forming collaborations. Current students and post-docs are prime candidates for hire as the NIH has specifically recommended them as a means to accomplish new scientific objectives. Additionally, NIH supplements can be used to add slots to already active Institutional Training Grants, positions that are coveted by both pre- and post-doctoral trainees. Overall, this influx of money has the potential to have a large impact on graduate student and post-doctoral support.

However, all of this money must be obligated by the NIH by fall of 2010 and is required to be used for research projects within the next two years. So, where will this leave scientists come fall of 2012? There is some speculation that the research community will be right back where it started, albeit with more personnel to support and several unfinished research projects that took longer than the allotted two years. Problems could be particularly acute for new students and post-docs that were hired with funds from the NIH economic stimulus. However, there is evidence that this ‘running off the cliff’ phenomenon will not happen. After two static years of NIH funding, the FY2009 omnibus bill was signed into law on March 11th giving the NIH budget a boost of 3.2%, which equates to approximately $1 billion.

According to a study conducted by Families USA, this increase has the ability to support over 4,450 new research jobs across the country. Even though BRDPI (Biomedical Research and Development Price Index, calculated each year by the Bureau of Economic Analysis to estimate the cost of medical research) predicts this budget increase only keeps even with inflation, it is still a start. Furthermore, total federal money appropriated to R&D increased by nearly $7 billion.

For Vanderbilt faculty, students, and post-docs, an increase in total federal funding is quite encouraging. Since 2001, external funding at Vanderbilt has more than doubled, and the university now ranks 20th in federal awards for R&D in Science and Engineering. Overall, awards at Vanderbilt are up 5% from last year, even in light of the recent economic downturn. If the past six years are any indicator of things to come, Vanderbilt should fare quite well with the $10.4 billion the NIH is now distributing. However, to whom much is given, much is expected. In order to sustain this increased funding, the government must know and understand the accomplishments and discoveries made in the laboratory. Thus, once the money is allocated, it is up to the scientists (especially budding scientists) to not only obtain compelling results, but also to share their findings with congressmen appropriating the money.

Despite the current stormy economic climate, Vanderbilt continues to grow and thrive in the area of scientific research. With the recent influx of stimulus funding to the NIH, coupled with an increase in the overall federal R&D budget, the future could remain bright for Vanderbilt trainees.

2. From the Director: NIH’s Role in the ARRA (www.nih.gov/about/director)
3. NIH’s Role in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). (www.nih.gov/about/director)
4. NIH Notice of the Availability of Recovery Act Funds. (grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/
7. ACD Hears US Stimulus Package Could Spur NIH Finances. NIH Record, January 9, 2009
Biochemistry’s New Graduates

The Department of Biochemistry wishes to congratulate its recent graduates. Twelve students were awarded PhDs this year. Their dissertation research covered a variety of topics ranging from the analysis of lipid distribution by MALDI imaging mass spectrometry to the mechanisms of genome maintenance during replication.


These recent graduates have pursued career paths as varied as their research interests. Dr. Charlie Knutson is currently a post-doctoral associate at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in the lab of Dr. Steven R. Tannenbaum. His research focuses on the chemistry and biology of tissue damage associated with diseases of chronic inflammation, including Crohn’s disease and ulcerative colitis. Dr. Joseph Deweese will start his postgraduate career at Lipscomb University’s College of Pharmacy as an Assistant Professor in the Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences. Dr. Daniel Mordes has returned to medical school at Vanderbilt University after defending his thesis in September. He plans to pursue a research-oriented residency after medical school.

In Memoriam

Anne Karpay was awarded a posthumous PhD for her studies in the “Application of Solution NMR Spectroscopy to Multi-Span Integral Membrane Proteins, Including G Protein-coupled Receptors.” Anne passed away January 5, 2008 after a four-year struggle with breast cancer. In the words of her advisor Dr. Chuck Sanders, “Anne had an absolute passion for science that was matched only by her passion for friendship and life in general.” For everyone in the Department of Biochemistry, Anne was a more than a student; she was a very good friend. Anne is deeply missed.

Biological Sciences: Teaching Opportunities

Have you ever wondered how you can gain independent teaching experience during your training at Vanderbilt University? Some graduate students and post-doctoral fellows highly value teaching opportunities because it is only through interaction with students that one can determine if a teaching career is something to pursue. Others would like to develop a teaching portfolio. Whatever the case, teaching allows for the development of mentoring skills that are important for nearly every scientific career path. The Department of Biological Sciences is unique in that it is one of the few departments at Vanderbilt that offers a structured program through which graduate students and post-docs can lead and develop their own research component in a semester-long laboratory course through a newly instituted alternative laboratory module for Introduction to Biological Sciences (BSCI 111). Steve Baskauf, the Laboratory Coordinator for the introductory course, developed this module in the fall of 2007 in an effort to provide undergraduate students with an opportunity to engage in longer-term research projects designed to foster critical thinking skills. Undergraduates have a choice of taking the standard lab component of the second semester of the course (BSCI 111B) or the new lab component (BSCI 111C), which features a mentor-led project and two credit hours.

Graduate students from departments or programs outside of Biological Sciences—including Pharmacology, Pediatric Cardiology, and Neurology—have recently taken advantage of the unique experience that this newly developed course offers. According to Baskauf, BSCI 111C is an alternative to the traditional “cookbook” laboratory course and allows undergraduates to obtain real research experience as an introduction to biomedical research.

Interested in mentoring/teaching? Contact Steve.Baskauf@vanderbilt.edu

At the beginning of the semester, students are encouraged to choose a project and mentor. With a 4:1 student:mentor ratio for sub-projects, students work very closely with their mentors and collaborative teammates and present a poster and a paper at the end of the semester. Students have been very responsive to this newly structured laboratory alternative, and enrollment has tripled from the first year to its current, second year. Clearly, there will continue to be a need for enthusiastic and experienced graduate students and post-docs to serve as mentors for this lab course. In return, mentors will receive experience in developing training projects and mentoring skills that are valuable in nearly every research career.
Dr. Robert Carnahan, Director of VMAC, states, “The core’s aged to visit www.vanderbilt.edu/vicb/ for more information. Researchers interested in utilizing VICB core facilities are encouraged to visit www.vanderbilt.edu/vicb/ for more information.

The focus of the CDB retreat is to provide a relaxed atmosphere in which primary and joint faculty, graduate students, post-doctoral fellows and research staff are able to update fellow labs on their current research pursuits and initiate discussions about their work. This year, many students and post-doctoral fellows presented posters and twelve students were chosen to present 15-minute talks. The department also honors one graduate student and one post-doctoral fellow for their achievements during the year. This year, the awards were given to Rachel Roberts-Galbraith, a graduate student in Dr. Kathy Gould’s laboratory and Dr. Elizabeth Tran, a post-doctoral fellow with Dr. Susan Wentz.

In addition, following tradition, a speaker was invited from an outside institution to present the keynote address. This year, CDB invited Jeffrey Gordon, M.D, from the Center for Genome Sciences at Washington University School of Medicine in St. Louis. In his talk titled “The human microbiome project: exploring the microbial side of ourselves,” Gordon expounded on the topic of human and microbial synergy, specifically in the digestive system. His lab focuses on the characteristics and factors that influence the stability of the human microbiome. He hypothesizes that the microbiome is affected by human lifestyle choices and thereby affects human health. Some of the questions he has addressed include: How do we acquire our microbiota? And, do humans have a replicable gut microbiome, or are microbial landscapes specific to each individual? The CDB department thoroughly enjoyed learning about this unique perspective on human wellness, as well as spending a day sharing science and socializing together!

The Vanderbilt Institute for Chemical Biology (VICB) is entering its 7th year as the primary organization devoted to the application of chemistry to the solution of important biomedical problems. The VICB is a trans-institutional center with 70 members from 18 departments. A primary focus of the institute is to provide research and training in the area of chemical biology. A collection of core facilities provides access to techniques and equipment at the frontier of biomedical research. Recently, the Chemical Synthesis Core (CSC) hired a new director. Dr. Alex Waterson joins the CSC from the medicinal chemistry department at GlaxoSmithKline. When asked about services the CSC can provide, Waterson stated, “The Chemical Synthesis Core is equipped with a variety of advanced equipment, including automated purification systems and an experienced full-time professional staff. We are available to take on a wide variety of projects that range from the gram synthesis of tool compounds to the resynthesis of hits to follow up high throughput screen results. The core is even able to take on full scale medicinal chemistry hit optimization campaigns.” Often the core’s services are more affordable than outside vendors.

Another VICB core facility is the Vanderbilt Monoclonal Antibody Core (VMAC), a shared resource dedicated to the generation, purification, and characterization of monoclonal antibodies. Dr. Robert Camahan, Director of VMAC, states, “The core’s central mission is to make state of the art hybridoma/monoclonal antibody technology cost effective and readily available to Vanderbilt investigators.” Efforts to upgrade and redevelop the facility have “led to significant improvements in the success and throughput of monoclonal development projects, enhancements in the quality and efficiency of antibody purifications, and the introduction of numerous new services including antigen preparation and polyclonal affinity purification.”

The VICB’s other core services include the Small Molecule NMR Core and the High-throughput Screening Facility. Researchers interested in utilizing VICB core facilities are encouraged to visit www.vanderbilt.edu/vicb/ for more information.

Dr. Marylyn Ritchie’s lab, in collaboration with other members of the International Warfarin Pharmacogenetics Consortium, reported on a pharmacogenetic algorithm for warfarin dosing in the February 19 issue of the New England Journal of Medicine. Globally, warfarin is the most popular prescribed blood thinner. Determining the appropriate dose of warfarin is challenging because the optimum dose varies widely among patients and taking an inappropriate dose can be fatal.

Pharmacogenetics, the study of genetic differences in drug response among individuals, may facilitate appropriate warfarin dosing and minimize negative outcomes. Using 4043 patients of a 5700 international patient cohort, Ritchie and colleagues developed a pharmacogenetic algorithm to predict optimal dose of warfarin, combining clinical factors, demographics and variation in the cytochrome P450, family 2, subfamily C, polypeptide 9 (CYP2C9), and vitamin K epoxide reductase complex, subunit 1 (VKORC1) genes, known to contribute to warfarin dosing variability. The authors then compared the effectiveness of this pharmacogenetic algorithm to an algorithm based on clinical data only and to a fixed-dose model, in a validation cohort of the remaining 1009 patients. The pharmacogenetic algorithm accurately identified the optimal warfarin dose for more patients in the low dose and high dose categories than the clinical algorithm and fixed-dose model; however, the three models performed equally well for patients in the average dose category.

Overall, dose estimates determined by the pharmacogenetic algorithm were closer to the actual dose than were estimates from the clinical algorithm for 60% of patients and were closer to the actual dose than estimates from the fixed-dose model for 69% of the patients. As a result, the pharmacogenetic dosing algorithm presented by Ritchie and colleagues lays the foundation for a prospective clinical trial to determine the effectiveness of warfarin dose estimations incorporating genetic information.
Neuroscience: Changing of the Guard

In 2008, the directorship of the Vanderbilt Brain Institute (VBI) was handed over to Dr. Mark Wallace (see A.B.S.T.R.A.C.T. 2:1 p. 9). Dr. Wallace, Associate Professor of Hearing and Speech Sciences and Psychology, succeeded Dr. Elaine Sanders-Bush, who served as the Institute’s director since its inception. These were, of course, enormous shoes to fill, but Dr. Wallace took up the reins at full steam. While working quietly in the background to reorganize the VBI and the ever-expanding Neuroscience Graduate Program, his first major executive responsibility was to appoint a new director of graduate studies (DGS). In November of 2008, Dr. Wallace announced that Dr. Douglas G. McMahon—then concluding his term as DGS for the Department of Biological Sciences—would take over as DGS for the Neuroscience Graduate Program in January 2009. In his formal announcement of the appointment, Dr. Wallace said of Dr. McMahon that he “has an exemplary record of success in the research, teaching and mentoring arenas, making him ideally suited for his new role in neuroscience graduate education and training.” Dr. McMahon completed his graduate training under Dr. Gene Block, currently Chancellor of UCLA, at the University of Virginia and post-doctoral research under Dr. John Dowling at Harvard. As Professor of Biological Sciences and Pharmacology at Vanderbilt, McMahon studies mechanisms of neural plasticity in three linked subsystems of the central nervous system: the visual, circadian and serotonergic systems that together mediate sense of sight, drive daily rhythms and influence mood.

Microbiology & Immunology

The immune system is a powerful organ, capable of easily killing most organisms that invade the host. However, this capability comes with a problem: If the immune system is misdirected, it can destroy the body’s own organs. For example, autoimmune diabetes occurs when the host immune system inappropriately targets its own pancreatic beta cells. This process is accompanied by B cells, the cell type which produces antibodies, with specificity for beta cell targets. How the immune system prevents the formation of B cells specific for insulin, a key auto-antigen in autoimmune diabetes, is the research focus of Dr. James Thomas’ laboratory.

Pathology: “Superhealer” stem cells

Currently, a highly pursued area of medical research is the study of stem cells, cells that possess self-regenerative capabilities and have important potential therapeutic applications. Maria Alfaro, a graduate student in Dr. Pampee Young’s lab, recently published a paper in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Science [Vol. 105(47), pp.18366-71] on the use and modulation of mesenchymal stem cells (MSCs) in myocardial repair.

In this paper, the authors addressed the function of stem cells in tissue regeneration and wound healing. They show that the expression of the gene secreted frizzled-related protein 2 (sFRP2) directly regulates MSC proliferation, engraftment, and formation of wound granulation tissue. The sFRP2 gene encodes a protein that functions as a secreted inhibitor of the canonical Wnt signaling pathway. Identification of sFRP2 as a stem cell engraftment enhancer was accomplished by comparing gene profiles and functional activities of MSCs from wild-type mice with those from MRL/MpG mice, a strain known as a “superhealer” due to the fact that these mice have increased ability to repair injured tissue. These MSC comparisons showed that MRL/MpG mice had greater MSC proliferation and engraftment as well as increased expression of sFRP2. Treatment of MSCs with recombinant sFRP2 greatly increased their proliferation. Further support for the role of sFRP2 in promoting the regenerative capabilities of MSCs came from the over-expression of sFRP2 in MSCs (sFRP2-MSCs), which increased MSC proliferation and engraftment. More importantly, injection of sFRP2-MSCs or MRL-MSCs into post-infarcted mouse hearts caused enhanced repair and greater regain of myocardial function. Knock-down of sFRP2 by shRNA in MRL-MSCs showed a loss of these enhanced regenerative activities.

Overall, the authors have revealed sFRP2 as a key molecule in modulating the efficacy of potential MSC-based therapies for wound and myocardial repair. Exploiting this mechanism could improve stem cell therapies.

See amazing “superhealer” pictures: www.bu.edu/sjmag/scimag2008/Story pages/DARPA Mouse.html
‘Peer Review’: Advice for Research Trainees  Hosted by Rachel Roberts-Galbraith

Dear Reviewers: My advisor is an incredibly serious person who requires weekly meetings with us. However, every time I step into his office, I am terribly distracted by a large, framed, ridiculous portrait of my advisor, dressed as a Jedi knight. I spend so much time and energy focusing on not laughing that I can barely talk about my research progress. Office visits are required. Help! - Meeting Misery in MRBIII

Reviewer 1: Does your advisor leave his door open when he is out for a short period of time (during a seminar, for example)? If so, go in and stare at the picture. Repeat as necessary until you are completely desensitized and it is no longer funny.

Reviewer 2: When you walk into your advisor’s office for your next meeting, confidently turn the photo face down. Explain calmly to your advisor that while you respect his right to decorate his personal space as he sees fit, you are distracted by the photo during your meetings. Then, when you are finished, put the photo back in its place. If you’re doing this for the sake of scientific communication, your advisor can’t argue with you! May the Force be with you!

Reviewer 3: For your advisor’s next birthday (or next major grant renewal) give him a collage of lab member photos, framed. The gift can be from the whole lab but the card should read: “To replace that crazy Jedi photo that scares away all the rotation students.”

Dear Reviewers: I just finished the IGP and joined a lab that I thought was the right fit. Now my advisor is encouraging me to choose a project and get started, but I feel totally lost. When I arrive in the morning I just don’t know what to do. My advisor thinks I am totally independent, but I am overwhelmed. Have I chosen the wrong lab? - Post-rotation Blues

Reviewer 1: It sounds like you are having trouble making the adjustment from rotation student to graduate student. While in your rotation you probably had someone telling you what to do every day, but now you don’t. This is just another stage in your scientific development. Re-read some recent papers from your lab and see what interests you the most. Get a calendar to plan your experiments a week at a time. And don’t be scared to get your feet wet.

Reviewer 2: Your advisor can’t help you if you don’t ask. You’re only in the wrong lab if your advisor refuses to help you at all. I recommend scheduling a meeting with your advisor to discuss your project options. Come prepared, but be honest about your feelings.

Reviewer 3: You’re a deer in the headlights, and you’re stuck in the middle of the road. Get un-stuck by talking to the graduate students and post-docs in your lab to see what they are working on and what projects are available. You can even ask them for advice on what scientific questions they find interesting to guide your first few experiments.

If you have questions for the reviewers, email us at peerreviewers@gmail.com and we’ll try to help!

Dear Reviewers: I am a post-doctoral fellow trying to finish up a paper so that I can go on the job market. This paper has been in the works for nearly a year, but we still have not submitted it. Sometimes my mentor takes weeks to return a draft. Other times, she will repeatedly change her mind about data to include/exclude. I don’t know how much longer I can wait. - Impatient to Publish

Reviewer 1: Hopefully your advisor is well-intentioned and just wants your paper to be published in the best journal possible. You should discuss with her your frustration about publishing sooner rather than later and see if you can reach a compromise.

Reviewer 2: Get a “final draft” together and tell your mentor that you would like to submit in 2 weeks. As a post-doc, you are really supposed to be (at least partly) a master of your own fate. If you are happy with your paper, your advisor should be willing to hear you out.

Reviewer 3: Perhaps you should send your draft to other professors you trust (e.g., your previous doctoral advisor, others in your department). This might give you a better idea whether you or your advisor is right about your paper’s readiness for submission.