27件の回答

概要

How was the resolution of image?
very good 14 51.9%
good 13 48.1%
poor 0 0%
very poor 0 0%

How was the image movement?
very smooth 14 51.9%
smooth 11 40.7%
sluggish (slow) 2 7.4%
very sluggish (very slow) 0 0%

How was the quality of sound?
very good 13 48.1%
good 13 48.1%
poor 1 3.7%
very poor 0 0%

How was the preparations?
How was the program?

- very good: 12 (44.4%)
- good: 15 (55.6%)
- poor: 0 (0%)
- very poor: 0 (0%)

Will you attend another teleconference session next time?

- yes: 25 (92.6%)
- probably yes: 2 (7.4%)
- probably no: 0 (0%)
- no: 0 (0%)

If you found any problems in teleconference, please write any comments you may have.

If possible, the conference chair should declare the session time assignment first.

Present: Simone Guaraldi, Maria Aparecida Ferreira (endoscopy), Ivanir Martins (pathologist), Juliana, Crislei and João, residentes) 20:05 > pathologist presentation (Martha Lucia Montes, Colombia): (+) good and relevant theme // (-) too long / slides with too many written words from which some letters were too small / it was used black text on red square background (not easy to read) / slides were done in a panoramic version 16:9 (better 4:3) and its lateral border was supressed and we didn't succeed on having it better in the 4:3 version. The imagens were "foggy" - we cound't see nicely contour of several slaides. The ones with lateral margin had some similarity with the previous comment but in general it was good.

20:25 > precursor lesions (Miguel Tanimoto, Mexico): (+) good imagem and sound trasmission quality // (-) some few slides included too small fonts (hard to read), we expected him talking more about precursor lesions. 20:45 > padronization (Kenshi Yao): (+) very good, good sound amplification, in time, good discussions // (-) talk too fast. 21:05 > Hp
erradication (Trespalacios): good slides but some of them included too small text and I could not read it. IDEAS: Write the rules of presentations including minimal font size (see Yao presentation), Harmonize image quality (best = >300dpi) by writing down the minimal rules to participate (size, quality of image...) (see Tanimoto presentation)

Some participants tend to leave MIC open when not needed.

The video was very good from Kyushu but I could see well the other stations and they told me my video image wasn’t good, it was freeze. The sound was very good in all stations but China.

The slides are not well set. The right side is cut off. We used the recommended format (16:9) but it's still not working.

It was my first time in the conference. Good experience. About the conference my suggestions and opinion: a) uniformization of slides (size, letters..) and video; b) excellent material of Dr Yao. The goal of Shimizu'Projet is improve early detection in Latin America. So, Dr Yao would speak this theme in topics and discussion with all centers. What’s the routine of this centers to detect early cancer? In Brazil only 12-15% of gastric cancer are early!!!! Here, in INCA, is about 30%, but it is a cancer hospital. We must change ! In my opinion the fist step is: a) teaching the morphologic types of EGC. For it, most endoscopists performe examination with convencional scopes (low-definition). Many still use fibroendoscopes. They get frustrated when they go to a congress and see many pictures only with magnify and so on. It is not their reality; Lack these ressources; b) doctors do not use chromoendoscopy. Don’t like; c) do not clean the mucosa neither do a systematic study of the mucosa; d) no capture imagens to review f) no integration with pathologists. Then, it will be a challege: Learning in morphological types, and systematization of exame. c) I hope in the future we improve early cancer detection. I would like to know more about the SSS for LA, and we are available for a pilot study. Thanks so much for this great opportunity.

I think (Including me) We should be more precise in our presentations and comments. Probably a common template for slides and presentations could be of help. (Letter size and colors for instance) Electronic summary edition of presentations performed during the year could be fine Evaluation of the academic obtained outcome, for a devoted publication on tele medicine continuous education

The sound from the main site wasn’t very clear, specially if compared to other sites. In general, the quality of image and sound were very well. But in some stations it was not so good. I think, it was a local problem.

No

**Which is your station?**

![Pie chart showing station preferences](https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1d1DR1mWUAe_eQdimV93KDq3MKzj47bh3wBlxA-OsUf0/viewanalytics)
What is your occupation?

- medical doctor: 19 (70.4%)
- engineer: 7 (25.9%)
- その他: 1 (3.7%)