ABOUT THE SURVEY

743 complete responses

Online:
18 October – 14 November 2019
This event has fulfilled my educational goals and my expected learning outcomes.

I have learned information at this event that will help me to improve my practice.

The event was excellently organised.

The education provided at this event was consistently very good or excellent.

QUALITY RATINGS

CERTIFICATION

This event has fulfilled my educational goals and my expected learning outcomes.

I have learned information at this event that will help me to improve my practice.

The event was excellently organised.

The education provided at this event was consistently very good or excellent.

(Rating question)
How old are you?

- Over 55: 23%
- < 35 years: 14%
- 35-45 years: 32%
- 46-55 years: 31%

n = 723
(Single choice question)

n = 710

90% male

10% female
WHAT ARE YOUR MAIN FIELDS WITHIN SURGERY?

1 = 10 pax

- Spinal Surgery
- Neurosurgery
- Orthopaedic Surgery
- Other Clinical practice
- Trauma Surgery

(Multiple choice question)
WHAT ARE YOUR MAIN FIELDS WITHIN RESEARCH?

1 = 10 pax

Clinical Studies

Basic Science

Others

Biomechanics

Epidemiology

Economics

(Multiple choice question)
WHICH WERE YOUR TOP THREE LEARNING POINTS?

1. About Scoliosis
2. About Cervical
3. Robotics
QUALITY RATINGS
MEMBERSHIP SERVICES

Reduced registration fee 4.4
Education events / courses 4.3
Newsletter 4.1
EUROSPINE booth 4.3

n = 197
n = 195
n = 194
n = 187
QUALITY RATINGS
MEMBERSHIP SERVICES

EUROSPINE on YouTube
4.0
n = 132

European Spine Journal
4.3
n = 192

(Rating question)
Are you a member of EUROSPINE?

Yes 33%

n = 595
QUALITY RATINGS
PRESENTATIONS

- Pre-day courses: 4.1 (n = 335)
- Free papers: 3.9 (n = 664)
- Debates: 4.1 (n = 659)
- Lunch symposia: 4.1 (n = 626)
WHAT WAS YOUR ATTENDEE STATUS?

- **Poster Presenter**: 2% 3% 8% 15% 71%
- **Industry**: 2%
- **Presenters Oral Communication**: 3%
- **Faculty**: 8%
- **Participants and others**: 15%
- **n = 672**
WHAT WAS THE BEST THING / WERE THE BEST THINGS ABOUT THE CONGRESS?

- High quality of presentations (e.g. qualified researchers, excellent technical presentations) 36%
- Structure of the scientific programme (e.g. not too many parallel sessions) 36%
- Networking opportunities (e.g. EUROSPINE booth, social programme) 26%
- Other 2%

n = 873
IS THE CME-CPD IMPORTANT FOR YOU?

- **66%**
  - Yes, needed for my national accreditation validation

- **18%**
  - Not for my personal validation, but CME accreditation is proof of scientific quality

- **16%**
  - Not needed for validation, I just need a participation confirmation

*(Single choice question)*

n = 661
How often did you visit the e-poster area?

- 55% 1–5 times
- 26% Never
- 19% I will look at the e-posters from back home

n = 673

(Single choice question)
HOW DO YOU RATE THE POSTER LOUNGE?

- Excellent: 16%
- Good: 49%
- Fair: 11%
- Poor: 3%
- Not Visited: 21%

n = 594

(Single choice question)
WHAT DO YOU THINK OF THE PROGRAMME?

- The programme was for specialists: 70%
- There was not enough in the programme to interest specialists: 15%
- None of the above: 12%
- There was too much in the programme for generalists: 3%

n = 639
HOW DO YOU RATE THE BALANCE BETWEEN CLINICAL AND ACADEMIC PRESENTATIONS?

- 84%: There was a good balance between clinical and academic presentations
- 10%: There was too much emphasis on academic presentations
- 6%: There was too much emphasis on clinical practice

n = 478

(Single choice question)
How do you rate the balance between surgical and non-surgical topics?

- There was a good balance between surgical and non-surgical topics: 63%
- There was too much emphasis on non-surgical topics: 16%
- There was too much emphasis on surgical topics: 20%

n = 167

(Single choice question)
REGARDING PARALLEL SESSIONS YOU BELIEVE?

- The programme was well-balanced between parallel and single sessions: 72%
- There were too few parallel sessions: 12%
- There were too many parallel sessions: 16%

n = 636
WHAT CAN EUROSPINE DO IN ORDER TO BETTER SERVE YOUR NEEDS WITHIN THE SPINE COMMUNITY?

“Giving more opportunities in oral presentations for young surgeons in order to obtain their innovative theories.”

“Continue to promote the latest research and techniques in the field.”

“Increase e-Learning sessions.”

“Promote the use of PatientLine by members.”

“To enhance quality and targeting of specific surgical methods, to choose right patients for surgery.”

“Mantain online comunication.”

“More discussions about prevention of surgery!”

(Open question)
“Best results in spine surgery.”

“Difference between the treatments in different countries.”

“I think that we are over-treating degenerative spine surgically. We need to compare future clinical outcomes for patients treated surgically versus conservatively.”

“Operative video and 3D video presentation.”

“Regenerative treatment.”

“Robotic surgery.”

“Endoscopic surgery vs conventional open longterm results of fusion techniques of this century.”

SOME OF THE SUGGESTED CONTROVERSIAL TOPICS AT THE CONFERENCE
“Less emphasis on deformity and a better balance of neurosurgical topics. Invited lectures on new technologies.”

“A More debates.”

“Add clinical cases discussion; more time for questions.”

“A The poster area could be more visible and promoted. Right now it didn’t really draw any attention.”

“A Some of the parallel sessions did not have enough seats.”

“A Minimal invasive surgery.”

AREAS WHERE EUROSPINE COULD HAVE IMPROVED THE MEETING FOR PARTICIPANTS
QUALITY RATINGS
CONFERENCE

Commercial exhibition: 4.3 (n = 670)
Pre-congress registration procedure: 4.6 (n = 590)
On-site registration procedure: 4.5 (n = 575)
Congress publications: 4.2 (n = 678)
QUALITY RATINGS
CONFERENCE

Staff friendliness: 4.5
On-site catering: 3.9
Paper and bagless: 4.1

n = 672
n = 682
n = 703
BALANCE BETWEEN MAIN PROGRAMME AND INDUSTRY SESSIONS

- 83%: Good balance between the main programme and industry sessions
- 5%: I would have liked more industry sessions
- 7%: There was too much emphasis on industry sessions
- 5%: None of the above

n = 630 (Single choice question)
QUALITY RATINGS
CONFERENCE FEATURES

The Spine Times: 4.1
n = 630

EUROSPINE app: 4.4
n = 680

ARS included in the app: 4.2
n = 629

Abstracts reachable via app: 4.3
n = 681

(Rating question)
There was sufficient time for discussions, questions & answers and learner engagement.

The information presented consistently was supported by a valid scientific evidence base.

The speakers consistently were very good or excellent.

The location and venue of the event were very good or excellent.

QUALITY RATINGS
CERTIFICATION

3.9
n = 659

4.0
n = 664

3.8
n = 671

4.2
n = 675

(Rating question)
There was no bias in any of the programmed educational events.

The range of companies in the industrial exhibition was sufficient.

The offered teaching programme was very good or excellent.

Quality Ratings Certification:

- There was no bias in any of the programmed educational events: 4.0 (n = 636)
- The range of companies in the industrial exhibition was sufficient: 3.9 (n = 659)
- The offered teaching programme was very good or excellent: 4.1 (n = 585)
WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING EVENTS ARE YOU PLANNING TO ATTEND IN 2020?

- EUROSPINE 2020 Annual Meeting: 62%
- 35th Annual Meeting of NASS: 14%
- Global Spine Congress 2020: 17%
- 36th Annual Meeting CSRS European Section: 6%

n = 832

(Single choice question)