eular | EUROPEAN ALLIANCE OF ASSOCIATIONS FOR RHEUMATOLOGY

Survey Analysis:

11th EULAR Online Course on Systemic Sclerosis

Total number of learners: 64

Survey format: Participants are asked to rate on how much they agree with the statement on a scale of 1 to 10; 10 being the best score.

Geographical Report:

SSC_2123

Georgia, Tunisia, South Africa, Austria, United States, Kuwait, Malaysia, Australia, United Arab Emirates, Czech Republic, France, Switzerland, Russia, Germany, Israel, Chile, United Kingdom, Japan, Romania, Netherlands, Belgium, India, Portugal, Spain, Italy

Top 5 countries:

Italy	8
Spain	6
Portugal	5
India	4
Belgium	4

Module 1 – Introduction Module
Number of survey participants: 26

Q1: The module was very well organised.

Score	Percentage
10	42.31%
9	11.54%
8	3.85%
7	30.77%
6	7.69%
5	3.85%
4	-
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q2: The learning objectives and actual teaching content matched well

Score	Percentage
10	42.31%
9	11.54%
8	19.23%
7	23.08%
6	-
5	3.85%
4	-
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q3: Overall the learning material was well presented and clear

Score	Percentage
10	46.15%
9	7.69%
8	11.54%
7	26.92%
6	-
5	7.69%
4	-
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q4: The interactive cases were very helpful to my practice

Score	Percentage
10	50%
9	19.23%
8	11.54%
7	7.69%
6	-
5	11.54%
4	-
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q5: The self-assessment questions at the end of each section really helped me to master the topic

Score	Percentage
10	46.15%
9	19.23%
8	15.38%
7	7.69%
6	-
5	7.69%
4	-
3	3.85%
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q6: The overall quality of the images/graphs/videos/PowerPoints imbedded in the content was excellent

Score	Percentage
10	42.31%
9	26.92%
8	11.54%
7	11.54%-
6	-
5	3.85%
4	-
3	3.85%-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q7: The amount of text for this module was

Score	Percentage
Too short	-
Just right	73.08%
Too long	26.92%

Q8: The study time estimated for this module was

Score	Percentage
Too short	3.85%
Just right	69.23%
Too long	26.92%

Q9: What are the three best features of this module for you

introduce to systemic sclerosis, epidemiology, and general features
the fact that the documents can be downloaded (pdf form) and printed to study with the evaluation material is great
The very well-structured information Up to date Essential information
Good interactive cases
organised, clear and useful information
Differential diagnosis, biomarkers, diagnosis
Detailed description of the topic, good self-assessment questions, emphasis on the important points
to differentiate between ACR/EULAR criteria and VEDOS self-assessment questions differential diagnosis images
Clinical cases
simple language in depth explanation of subject good explanation for answers
Synthesis, schematization, Figures
information
Self-assessments with nice questions and clear explanation of correct answers Well-organized topic material IDDs
I really appreciated the good structured, short but still complete overview of the main topics
Very nice module
The self assessment quiz, the initial pdf, very interesting topic
Great information in one place. Perfect interactive cases. Perfect self-assessment tests.
- complete - easy learning - clear
Pathogenesis, Clinical association, complete information
Photos and their explanations. Furthermore, it was very clear
practical input, clinical cases, good presentations
clear explanations organized topics

**Q10: Please give any suggestions or comments here**

| |
|---|
| The answer for biopsy (punch vs deep biopsy) in eosinophilic fasciitis in 2 different assessments was not the same. One assessment punch biopsy was wrong and in the other it was correct… |
| I would only appreciate time for studying, but it's my problem, the course is perfect. The only thing that didn't fit me well was the capture about localised scleroderma, which seems too comprehensive to me. |

Module 2 – Pathogenesis
Number of survey participants: 19

Q1: The module was very well organised.

Score	Percentage
10	21.05%
9	31.58%
8	15.79%
7	5.26%
6	10.53%
5	10.53%
4	-
3	5.26%
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q2: The learning objectives and actual teaching content matched well

Score	Percentage
10	21.05%
9	31.58%
8	15.79%
7	5.26%
6	10.53%
5	15.79%
4	-
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q3: Overall the learning material was well presented and clear

Score	Percentage
10	21.05%
9	26.32%
8	15.79%
7	5.26%
6	15.79%
5	5.26%
4	5.26%
3	-
2	5.26%
1	-
0	-

Q4: The interactive cases were very helpful to my practice

Score	Percentage
10	21.05%
9	26.32%
8	26.32%
7	5.26%
6	10.53%
5	5.26%
4	5.26%
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q5: The self-assessment questions at the end of each section really helped me to master the topic

Score	Percentage
10	26.32%
9	26.32%
8	21.05%
7	10.53%
6	5.26%
5	10.53%
4	-
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q6: The overall quality of the images/graphs/videos/PowerPoints imbedded in the content was excellent

Score	Percentage
10	31.58%
9	21.05%
8	21.05%
7	-
6	15.79%
5	5.26%
4	5.26%
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q7: The amount of text for this module was

Score	Percentage
Too short	-
Just right	57.89%
Too long	42.11%

Q8: The study time estimated for this module was

Score	Percentage
Too short	5.26%
Just right	57.89%
Too long	36.84%

Q9: What are the three best features of this module for you

| |
|---|
| I honestly thought it was too in depth
Wasn't sure what was relevant (to me as a clinician) and what was not |
| IDD, THE QUESTIONS, VERY INTERESTING TOPIC |
| the new auto-antibody not well known for me before
cell role in parthenogenesis
in depth discussion very good |
| Organization, images, synthesis |
| Image and final tests |
| It is difficult question |
| Oriented questions, topics subdivision and structural organization |
| nice module |
| nothing more to say |
| pathology |
| interactive cases |
| Interactive cases |
| role of myofibroblasts, autoimmunity, vascular features |

Q10: Please give any suggestions or comments here

The genetics need to be reviewed so tough
Genes belonging to vascular pathways have been consistently linked to SSc pathogenesis -> Answer was wrong in 2f

## Module 3 – Clinical Manifestations: Skin, Peripheral Vascular

Number of survey participants: 18

Q1: The module was very well organised.

Score	Percentage
10	50%
9	27.78%
8	5.56%
7	5.56%
6	5.56%
5	-
4	5.56%
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q2: The learning objectives and actual teaching content matched well

Score	Percentage
10	38.89%
9	33.33%
8	11.11%
7	5.56%
6	5.56%
5	-
4	5.56%
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q3: Overall the learning material was well presented and clear

Score	Percentage
10	38.89%
9	33.33%
8	11.11%
7	5.56%
6	5.56%
5	-
4	5.56%
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q4: The interactive cases were very helpful to my practice

Score	Percentage
10	38.89%
9	22.22%
8	16.67%
7	5.56%
6	11.11%
5	-
4	5.56%
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q5: The self-assessment questions at the end of each section really helped me to master the topic

Score	Percentage
10	38.89%
9	33.33%
8	11.11%
7	-
6	5.56%
5	5.56%
4	5.56%
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q6: The overall quality of the images/graphs/videos/PowerPoints imbedded in the content was excellent

Score	Percentage
10	61.11%
9	22.22%
8	5.56%
7	-
6	5.56%
5	-
4	5.56%
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q7: The amount of text for this module was

Score	Percentage
Too short	-
Just right	94.44%
Too long	5.56%

Q8: The study time estimated for this module was

Score	Percentage
Too short	5.56%
Just right	88.89%
Too long	5.56%

Q9: What are the three best features of this module for you

| |
|---|
| Utility of capillaroscopy, treatment of digital ulcers, differentiation Primary / secondary Raynaud |
| Precision EBM and structure of the texts |
| details of classifications of nailfold capillaroscopy
skin assessment methods
topic arrangement |
| The images provided for the different capillaroscopic patterns |
| Interactive cases |
| nice module |
| capillaroscopy, macrovascular disease of the lower limbs |
| The contents, the way they were presented and images |
| Images, schematization, clarity |
| none in particular |
| The IDD, the clinical cases, very interesting topic |
| It was ok |
| everything was fine
Thank you |

**Q10: Please give any suggestions or comments here**

None

Module 4 – Heart Involvement

Number of survey participants: 18

Q1: The module was very well organised.

Score	Percentage
10	27.78%
9	44.44%
8	-
7	11.11%
6	5.56%
5	-
4	11.11%
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q2: The learning objectives and actual teaching content matched well

Score	Percentage
10	27.78%
9	44.44%
8	-
7	5.56
6	11.11%
5	-
4	11.11%
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q3: Overall the learning material was well presented and clear

Score	Percentage
10	27.78%
9	44.44%
8	-
7	5.56%
6	11.11%
5	5.56%
4	5.56%
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q4: The interactive cases were very helpful to my practice

Score	Percentage
10	33.33%
9	27.78%
8	-
7	16.67%
6	16.67%
5	5.56%
4	-
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q5: The self-assessment questions at the end of each section really helped me to master the topic

Score	Percentage
10	27.78%
9	33.33%
8	
7	5.56%
6	22.22%
5	11.11
4	-
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q6: The overall quality of the images/graphs/videos/PowerPoints imbedded in the content was excellent

Score	Percentage
10	33.33%
9	38.89%
8	-
7	5.56%
6	11.11%
5	11.11%
4	-
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q7: The amount of text for this module was

Score	Percentage
Too short	-
Just right	88.89%
Too long	11.11%

Q8: The study time estimated for this module was

Score	Percentage
Too short	-
Just right	94.44%
Too long	5.56%

Q9: What are the three best features of this module for you

| |
|---|
| all the subjects were well treated and clear |
| precise information, clinical cases, well defined topics |
| Images, Schematization, Clarity |
| very nice module |
| excellent cases |
| organised, easy to follow |
| a flowchart on clear treatment options would have been nice |
| The use of MRI as part of the study, the high prevalence of arrhythmias , and the management of diastolic dysfunction |
| I liked Interactive clinical cases |
| none in particular |
| step wise approach for how I can deal with SSC with cardiac involvement importance of diastolic dysfunction more advanced investigations to assess cardiac problem like biopsy and cardiac MRI |
| everything was ok |
| Treatment for myocarditis |
| It was good structured |

Q10: Please give any suggestions or comments here

None

## Module 5 – Pulmonary Interstitial / Vascular Involvement

Number of survey participants: 18

Q1: The module was very well organised.

Score	Percentage
10	38.89%
9	27.78%
8	5.56%
7	5.56%
6	11.11%
5	11.11%
4	-
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q2: The learning objectives and actual teaching content matched well

Score	Percentage
10	38.89%
9	27.78%
8	5.56%
7	5.56%
6	16.67%
5	5.56%
4	-
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q3: Overall the learning material was well presented and clear

Score	Percentage
10	38.89%
9	27.78%
8	5.56%
7	11.11%
6	5.56%
5	11.11%
4	-
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q4: The interactive cases were very helpful to my practice

Score	Percentage
10	38.89%
9	27.78%
8	5.56%
7	5.56%
6	11.11%
5	11.11%
4	-
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q5: The self-assessment questions at the end of each section really helped me to master the topic

Score	Percentage
10	38.89%
9	27.78%
8	5.56%
7	5.56%
6	11.11%
5	11.11%
4	-
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q6: The overall quality of the images/graphs/videos/PowerPoints imbedded in the content was excellent

Score	Percentage
10	38.89%
9	27.78%
8	11.11%
7	5.56%
6	5.56%
5	11.11%
4	-
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q7: The amount of text for this module was

Score	Percentage
Too short	-
Just right	94.44%
Too long	5.56%

Q8: The study time estimated for this module was

Score	Percentage
Too short	-
Just right	94.4%
Too long	5.56%

Q9: What are the three best features of this module for you

| |
|---|
| Very interesting information |
| organised, concise, relevant information |
| focused clinical cases, clear explanations, well-structured chapter topics |
| Really enjoyed final quiz |
| all was good |
| Images, Clarity, Schematization |
| very nice module |
| DETAILS OF PH
VIDEO OF 6 MINUTE WALK TEST
ASSESSMENT OF ILD |
| assessment of PAH and ILD |
| management of HT pulmonary, screening ILD , prognostic factor of both diseases |
| I appreciated all the features of this module, especially the video |
| EXCELLENT cases |
| none in particular |

10: Please give any suggestions or comments here

| |
|---|
| LACK OF OTHER TYPES OF INTERSTITIAL LUNG DISEASE
ASSESSMENT OF INTERSTITIAL LUNG DISEASE IN DEPTH DISCUSSION NOT ADD
ANYTHING SAME AS MODULE |

Module 6 – Clinical Manifestations: GI

Number of survey participants: 16

Q1: The module was very well organised.

Score	Percentage
10	31.25%
9	25%
8	12.5%
7	-
6	18.75%
5	12.5%
4	-
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q2: The learning objectives and actual teaching content matched well

Score	Percentage
10	31.25%
9	25%
8	6.25%
7	18.75%
6	6.25%
5	12.5%
4	-
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q3: Overall the learning material was well presented and clear

Score	Percentage
10	31.25%
9	25%
8	6.25%
7	12.5%
6	6.25%
5	18.75%
4	-
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q4: The interactive cases were very helpful to my practice

Score	Percentage
10	25%
9	25%
8	12.5%
7	6.25%
6	6.25%
5	18.75%
4	-
3	-
2	6.25%
1	-
0	-

Q5: The self-assessment questions at the end of each section really helped me to master the topic

| Score	Percentage
10	31.25%
9	31.25%
8	6.25%
7	6.25%
6	6.25%
5	18.75%
4	-
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q6: The overall quality of the images/graphs/videos/PowerPoints imbedded in the content was excellent

Score	Percentage
10	31.25%
9	31.25%
8	12.5%
7	6.25%
6	6.25%
5	6.25%
4	6.25%
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q7: The amount of text for this module was

Score	Percentage
Too short	6.25%
Just right	75%
Too long	18.75%

Q8: The study time estimated for this module was

Score	Percentage
Too short	6.25%
Just right	81.25%
Too long	12.5%

Q9: What are the three best features of this module for you

| |
|---|
| Clarity, Schematization, Images |
| importance of oesophagi assessment, therapeutic approaches, CBP association with Systemic Sclerosis |
| good questions |
| organised, concise, helpful for daily practice |
| The organization of topics |
| very nice module |
| none in particular |
| All was good |
| interactive clinical case one |
| SIBO, pseudo-obstruction, GAVE |
| well designed clinical cases, structured material with clear topics, comprehensive approach to the topic |
| the iconography |

10: Please give any suggestions or comments here

None

## Module 7 – Clinical Manifestations: Kidney Involvement in Systemic Sclerosis

Number of survey participants: 15

Q1: The module was very well organised.

Score	Percentage
10	33.33%
9	33.33%
8	6.67%
7	6.67%
6	13.33%
5	6.67%
4	-
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q2: The learning objectives and actual teaching content matched well

Score	Percentage
10	33.33%
9	33.33%
8	6.67%
7	6.67%
6	13.33%
5	6.67%
4	-
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q3: Overall the learning material was well presented and clear

Score	Percentage
10	33.33%
9	26.67%
8	13.33%
7	6.67%
6	13.33%
5	6.67%
4	-
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q4: The interactive cases were very helpful to my practice

Score	Percentage
10	26.67%
9	33.33%
8	6.67%
7	6.67%
6	13.33%
5	13.33%
4	-
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q5: The self-assessment questions at the end of each section really helped me to master the topic

Score	Percentage
10	26.67%
9	40%
8	13.33%
7	6.67%
6	13.33%
5	-
4	-
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q6: The overall quality of the images/graphs/videos/PowerPoints imbedded in the content was excellent

Score	Percentage
10	40%
9	33.33%
8	6.67%
7	6.67%
6	13.33%
5	-
4	-
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q7: The amount of text for this module was

Score	Percentage
Too short	0%
Just right	100%
Too long	0%

Q8: The study time estimated for this module was

Score	Percentage
Too short	0%
Just right	100%
Too long	0%

Q9: What are the three best features of this module for you

| |
|---|
| physiopathology of crisis renal, management and how we suspect |
| very nice module |
| none in particular |
| normotensive SRC |
| Clinical cases |
| clear topic discussion, intriguing questions, nice presentation of clinical cases |
| it was very clear
thank you |
| excellent questions |
| Images, Clarity, Schematization |
| concise, organised, enough info |

Q10: Please give any suggestions or comments here

None

## Module 8 – Clinical Manifestations: Musculoskeletal, Disability

Number of survey participants: 16

Q1: The module was very well organised.

Score	Percentage
10	31.25%
9	25%
8	12.50%
7	6.25%
6	6.25%
5	18.75%
4	-
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q2: The learning objectives and actual teaching content matched well

Score	Percentage
10	31.25%
9	31.25%
8	6.25%
7	6.25%
6	6.25%
5	18.75%
4	-
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q3: Overall the learning material was well presented and clear

Score	Percentage
10	31.25%
9	31.25%
8	6.25%
7	6.25%
6	12.5%
5	12.5%
4	-
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q4: The interactive cases were very helpful to my practice

Score	Percentage
10	37.5%
9	12.5%
8	12.5%
7	12.5%
6	12.5%
5	12.5%
4	-
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q5: The self-assessment questions at the end of each section really helped me to master the topic

Score	Percentage
10	31.25%
9	25%
8	12.5%
7	12.5%
6	-
5	18.75%
4	-
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q6: The overall quality of the images/graphs/videos/PowerPoints imbedded in the content was excellent

Score	Percentage
10	31.25%
9	31.25%
8	6.25%
7	12.5%
6	6.25%
5	12.5%
4	-
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q7: The amount of text for this module was

Score	Percentage
Too short	0%
Just right	93.75%
Too long	6.25%

Q8: The study time estimated for this module was

Score	Percentage
Too short	6.25%
Just right	81.25%
Too long	12.5%

Q9: What are the three best features of this module for you

| |
|---|
| concise, useful, good for practice |
| nice |
| I particularly liked interactive clinical cases |
| diagnosis, assessment, and management of arthritis in Sclerodermia |
| very nice module |
| Images, Schematization, Synthesis |
| all the subjects were clear |
| none in particular |
| thank you |
| clinical cases, IDDs and main topics treated were good |
| myositis |
| great questions |

Q10: Please give any suggestions or comments here

None

Module 9 – Management

Number of survey participants: 16

Q1: The module was very well organised.

Score	Percentage
10	31.25%
9	31.25%
8	6.25%
7	-
6	6.25&
5	18.75%
4	9.25%
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q2: The learning objectives and actual teaching content matched well

Score	Percentage
10	31.25%
9	25%
8	12.5%
7	-
6	6.25%
5	18.75%
4	6.25%
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q3: Overall the learning material was well presented and clear

Score	Percentage
10	31.25%
9	31.25%
8	6.25%
7	-
6	6.25%
5	18.75%
4	6.25%
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q4: The interactive cases were very helpful to my practice

Score	Percentage
10	31.25%
9	25%
8	6.25%
7	-
6	12.5%
5	18.75%
4	6.25%
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q5: The self-assessment questions at the end of each section really helped me to master the topic

Score	Percentage
10	31.25%
9	31.25%
8	6.25%
7	-
6	6.25%
5	18.75%
4	6.25%
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q6: The overall quality of the images/graphs/videos/PowerPoints imbedded in the content was excellent

Score	Percentage
10	31.25%
9	25%
8	12.5%
7	-
6	12.5%
5	18.75%
4	-
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q7: The amount of text for this module was

Score	Percentage
Too short	6.25%
Just right	81.25%
Too long	6.25%

Q8: The study time estimated for this module was

Score	Percentage
Too short	6.25%
Just right	81.25%
Too long	12.50%

Q9: What are the three best features of this module for you

| |
|---|
| management pulmonary hypertension, DMRADS role in Systemic sclerosis and follow up |
| Interactive clinical cases |
| good questions |
| THANK YOU |
| Management, HCST |
| ok |
| very nice module |
| Images, Schematization, Synthesis |
| none in particular |
| all the subjects were well treated |
| concise, good for practice, right amount of information |
| clinical evidences, clear indications for drug use and patient outcomes |

Q10: Please give any suggestions or comments here

None

![eular EUROPEAN ALLIANCE OF ASSOCIATIONS FOR RHEUMATOLOGY]

Module 10 – Special Conditions

Number of survey participants: 58

Q1: The module was very well organised.

Score	Percentage
10	31.25%
9	25%
8	6.25%
7	6.25%
6	-
5	12.5%
4	-
3	12.5%
2	-
1	-
0	6.25%

Q2: The learning objectives and actual teaching content matched well

Score	Percentage
10	31.25%
9	25%
8	6.25%
7	6.25%
6	-
5	12.5%
4	-
3	12.5%
2	-
1	-
0	6.25%

Q3: Overall the learning material was well presented and clear

Score	Percentage
10	31.25%
9	25%
8	6.25%
7	6.25%
6	-
5	12.5%
4	-
3	12.5%
2	-
1	-
0	6.25%

Q4: The interactive cases were very helpful to my practice

Score	Percentage
10	31.25%
9	18.75%
8	6.25%
7	6.25%
6	6.25%
5	12.5%
4	-
3	12.5%
2	-
1	-
0	6..25%

## Q5: The self-assessment questions at the end of each section really helped me to master the topic

Score	Percentage
10	31.25%
9	25%
8	6.25%
7	6.25%
6	-
5	12.5%
4	-
3	12.5%
2	-
1	-
0	6.25%

Q6: The overall quality of the images/graphs/videos/PowerPoints imbedded in the content was excellent

Score	Percentage
10	37.5%
9	25%
8	6.25%
7	12.5%
6	-
5	6.25%
4	-
3	6.25%
2	-
1	-
0	6.25%

Q7: The amount of text for this module was

Score	Percentage
Too short	12.5%
Just right	81.25%
Too long	6.25%

Q8: The study time estimated for this module was

Score	Percentage
Too short	12.5%
Just right	81.25%
Too long	6.25%

Q9: What are the three best features of this module for you

| |
|---|
| According to me three best features this module was clear, not too long and interesting |
| Systemic sclerosis sine scleroderma futures, treatment and diagnosis |
| Images, Schematization, Synthesis |
| it was the last one lol |
| not bad |
| nothing |
| good |
| Very nice module |
| concise, good for practice |
| modules 10 are not available!! |
| Excellent questions |
| THANK YOU |
| none in particular |

10: Please give any suggestions or comments here

Post-Exam

Number of survey participants: 16

Q1: The exam was very well organised.

Score	Percentage
10	31.25%
9	18.75%
8	12.5%
7	12.5%
6	12.5%
5	6.25%
4	6.25%
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q2: This exam matched my expectations

| Score	Percentage
10	18.75%
9	12.5%
8	18.75%
7	18.75%
6	12.5%
5	12.5%
4	-
3	-
2	6.25%
1	-
0	-

Add an explanation if you wish

the time was to short, because many questions were very long
too hard, not enough time to think and answer
x-ray was very small in question 1.

Q3: How well prepared did you feel for this exam

Score	Percentage
10	6.25%
9	6.25%
8	12.5%
7	6.25%
6	43.75
5	18.75%
4	6.25%
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q4: This exam was a fair test of my current capabilities

Score	Percentage
10	12.5%
9	12.5%
8	6.25%
7	25%
6	18.75%
5	12.5%
4	6.25%
3	6.25%
2	-
1	-
0	-

Post-Course

Number of survey participants: 16

Q1: The module was very well organised.

Score	Percentage
10	50%
9	18.75%
8	12.5%
7	12.5%
6	6.25%
5	-
4	-
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q2: I found it easy to navigate around the course

Score	Percentage
10	37.5%
9	31.25%
8	12.5%
7	12.5%
6	-
5	-
4	6.25%
3	-
2	-
1	-
0	-

Q3: The study time estimated for this course was

Score	Percentage
Too short	-
Just right	87.5%
Too long	12.5%

Q4: What are the strong points and positive features of this course

- excellent questions
- Modules were very detailed
- Medicine based evidence
- good information
- Comprehensive
- organised, applicable in daily practice
- the iconography + recent literature references

Q5: What was the most difficult module for you

- Module 2
- kidney
- the immuno/genetics one (module 2)
- Module 10
- pathogenesis
- cardiac involvement
- Pathogenesis

Q6: Do you have any suggestions for the course organizers and authors

- more practical tips and cases for treatment
- Please introduce a module for how to interpret PFT and assessment of 6 minute walk test and mRSs assessment

Q7: Would you recommend this course to other learners

Score	Percentage
Yes	93.75%
No	6.25%