



EACCME® Event Report

To complete the EACCME® application process, please upload the event report onto your event page on the EACCME® website. Event reports must be submitted at the latest 4 weeks after the accredited event has taken place.

Event title: 15th Annual World Congress on Pulmonary Vascular Disease

Event city: Athens

Event date: 22 – 26 June 2022

EACCME® reference number:

Number of participants: 350

Please provide breakdown (in %) of international participation:

European participants	47%
American participants	41%
Canadian participants	3%
Other: please specify	9% Australia (0.6%), Argentina (0.3%), Brazil (0.9%), Casablanca (0.3%), Colombia (0.3), India (0.6%), Japan (1%), Mexico (0.3%), Morocco (0.6%), Mozambique (0.3%), Nigeria (0.6%), Singapore (2%), South Africa (0.6%), Turkey (0.6%), Uganda (0.3%)

Number of evaluation forms submitted: 27

Number of EACCME® certificates distributed: 74

Summary of evaluation forms completed by the participants:

Your feedback as a provider must include at least the information listed below. Please refer to the EACCME® participants' evaluation form for the information to be provided below:

<i>Category</i>	<i>Number of</i>	<i>Mean score</i>
-----------------	------------------	-------------------

	<i>respondents</i>	
Quality of the event	* –	* –
Relevance of the event	* –	* –
Suitability of formats used during the event	* –	* –
Ways the event affected the participant's practice	* –	* –
Commercial bias	* –	* –

*See attached document (EACCME Feedback Analysis) for more detailed answered.

Joint Symposium with the ESC:

EACCME participants' feedback analysis

1 – Quality of the event

To the question 'How useful for your professional activity did you find this event?', participants responded as follows:

- 70% found it 'Extremely useful'
- 18% found it 'Useful'
- 12% Found as 'Fairly Useful'

To the question 'If this activity was not useful, please explain why?'

- High quality lovely event

Programme

- 70% of participants found the programme 'Excellent'
- 18% of participants found the programme 'Good'
- 12% of participants found the programme 'Fairly Good'

Organisation

- 70% of participants found the organisation 'Excellent'
- 12 % of participants found the organisation 'good'
- 18% of participants found the organisation 'Fairly Good'

To the question 'What was the best aspect of this events?' participants said:

- Connecting with the PVRI community
- Basic science integration
- Did not attend all
- Welcome ceremony
- Speaker quality
- Location and science
- Socialising
- Integration of basics and clinics
- The combination between basic and clinical science
- The incredibly nice atmosphere of PVRI

To the question 'What was the worst aspect of this events?' participants said:

- N/A
- Hard to say
- Did not attend all
- Session in parallel to lunch break
- Too many overlapping sessions
- Too packed full a programme, eg, sessions during lunch
- N/A
- Too packed a schedule
- No city tour option
- Too long sessions
- Printed programmes, reports, etc.
- The boards were too narrow for the poster sessions

2- Relevance of the event

To the question 'Did the event fulfil your education goals and expected learning outcomes?', participants responded as follows:

- 70% found it 'Very much'
- 24% found it 'Somewhat'
- 6% found as 'Not Much'

To the question 'Was the presented information well-balanced and consistently supported by a valid scientific evidence base?', participants responded as follows:

- 65% found it 'Very much'
- 35% found it 'Somewhat'

To the question 'How useful for you personally were the sessions?', participants responded as follows:
1st Session Title:

- 59% found it 'Extremely useful'
- 41% found it 'Useful'

3- Suitability of formats used during the event

To the question 'was there adequate time available for discussion, questions & answers and learner engagement?', participants responded as follows:

- 59% found it 'Yes always/almost always'
- 35% found it 'Yes, Sometimes'
- 6% found it 'Only rarely'

To the question 'Can you indicate any innovative elements during the activity?', participants responded:

- Best innovative session format – Deep phenotyping, Roundtable of registries, comparing and contrasting
- Best opportunity – Post Covid-19 debate; consider a smaller group with equal female representation
- The group omics session
- More discussion time needed
- Afternoon off for tours
- Many sessions could have been shorter, the messages could have been given more efficiently
- A lot of presentations were seen many times before, (even at the last PVRI conference)

4- Ways the event affects clinical practice

To the question 'Will the information you learned be implemented in your practice?', participants responded as follows:

- 41% found it 'Very much'
- 47% found it 'Somewhat'
- 12% found as 'Undecided'

To the question 'Can you provide ONE example how this event will influence your future practice', participants responded:

- Asking about pre-term birth in PAH PH
- Thinking about obesity, estrogen, estrogen metabolites as a potential risk factor disease beyond HFpEF
- Use of PDEi and Switching to Riociguat
- Discussion in therapeutic approaches used
- I do basic research, not applicable
- I am not a clinician
- iPVD sessions, there were new ideas and concepts presented

5- Commercial bias

To the question 'Did all the faculty members provide their potential conflict of interest declaration with the sponsor as a second slide of their presentation?', participants responded as follows:

- 35% found it 'Yes, all'
- 47% found it 'Yes for the majority'
- 6% found it 'Yes, but only a small part'
- 6% found as 'No'
- 6% found as 'Undecided/don't know'

To the question 'Can you provide an example of biased presentation in this activity?', participants responded:

- N/A
- Not having the board visiting the poster sessions
- None
- Simonneau REPLACE study

To the question 'Do you agree that the information was overall free of commercial and other bias?', participants responded as follows:

- 76% found it 'Strongly agree'
- 18% found it 'Rather agree'
- 6% found as 'Undecided/don't know'