

Workshop summary

“Real World Applications of Photoionization”

62nd ASMS Conference on Mass Spectrometry and Allied Topics, Baltimore, MD

Monday, 5:45 – 7:00 pm, Room 307-308

Chaired by: Jack Syage and Ralf Zimmermann

The workshop followed the oral session “Photoionization” that occurred Monday afternoon and chaired by Helene Cardasis. We thought the selection of six talks were very good and represented significant developments in PI. We invited one of the presenters and a collaborator of another speaker to be discussion leaders for the evening workshop. We had four discussion leaders:

- Summary of vacuum-PI vs. APPI vs. Other PI
Ralf Zimmerman
- Laser Desorption VUV Lamp Ionization for ITMS
Qinghao Wu (Stanford)
- Development of an APPI Source for APGC
Hendrik Kersten (U Wuppertal)
- It's not just about DART and DESI - ambient analysis by DAPPI
Tiina Kauppila (U Helsinki)

The workshop demonstrated continued strong interest in the subject matter as it attracted a large audience (someone counted 50 people), but not as large as last year. This may be partly attributable to our room being at the very end of the hallway and the furthest from the refreshments. We also didn't do a good job this past year mobilizing the Photoionization interest group and getting the word out in advance. We will do much better next year. In any case, on the whole there was a very high quality of audience participation as evidenced by strong and rigorous discussion on the varied topics. Many of the top luminaries in the field were also present to provide stimulating viewpoints and discussion.

We felt that having four discussion leaders and keeping to a minimum introductory material by Jack and Ralf gave a better flow. Last year we gave some introductory slides and had five presenters and felt a bit rushed to get everyone to the podium. The constant, however, was no lack of audience participation. Discussion was continuous and high quality.

Naturally feedback from the audience is usually slanted positively and we got our fair share of that. Even those who didn't participate in discussion expressed high regard. One person said he was just mesmerized by the expertise in the room and the back and forth discussions that were both provocative and tutorial. I liked that because I tried to make my comments more instructional to those in the audience. However, we all know that many people are not afraid to voice constructive criticism so the lack of that may indicate that we hit a good resonance and balance on the subject matter and discussion. The good attendance and the intensive discussions induced by the short topical lectures underline the dynamic character of the field and encourage workshops and sessions on future meetings as well as building up the interest group.