How was the image sharpness?

- Very good: 74%
- Good: 26%
- Poor: 0%
- Very poor: 0%
How was the image movement?

- **Very smooth**: 37%
- **Smooth**: 63%
- **Sluggish (slow)**
- **Very sluggish (slow)**
How was the quality of sound?
How was the technical preparations?

- 38% easy
- 46% very easy
- 17% time-consuming
- 0% very time-consuming
- 0% I didn’t take care of technical preparation.
How was the program?

- 41% very good
- 37% good
- 22% poor
- 0% very poor
- 0% I am not a medical doctor

Mentimeter
Was this conference program meaningful?

- Very meaningful: 30%
- Meaningful: 48%
- Not meaningful: 22%
- Meaningless: 0%
- I am not a medical doctor: 0%
Will you attend another teleconference session next time?

- yes: 67%
- probably yes: 22%
- probably no: 11%
- no: 0%
- I am not a medical doctor: 0%
Feel free to write any comments you may have.

At the beginning of the session the volume of the TEMDEC microphone was high.

The sound was not very good this time.

Dear colleagues, thank you very much for the invitation. We look forward to the next conference.

Open the topics to another area, such as colorectal cancer.

Great event with excellent academic quality. Knowledge useful in our daily practice. Thanks.

The sound from Kyushu was too high, and sometimes with noise. In sometimes the sound from USP was echo.

Maybe next time we must try to make a more interactive teleconference. Time isn’t enough for everybody who wants to make questions sometimes.

The scientific level of the Teleconference has improved, mainly the dynamic process with interactions between centers.

The scientific level of the Teleconference has improved, mainly due to the interactions between centers.
Which is your station?
Which is your occupation?

- 73% medical doctor
- 27% engineer
- Other