


### Q1 Please state your overall opinion about the conference


Answered: 28 Skipped: 0



	Very satisfactory	Satisfactory	Average	Less satisfactory	Not satisfactory	Total	Weighted Average
How would you rate the composition of the programme?	60.71% 17	39.29% 11	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	28	1.39
How would you rate the overall scientific level?	64.29% 18	35.71% 10	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	28	1.36
How would you rate the extent of questions and discussion after the lectures?	28.57% 8	46.43% 13	25.00% 7	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	28	1.96
How would you rate the level of interactivity?	35.71% 10	46.43% 13	17.86% 5	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	28	1.82
How would you rate your opportunity to network with fellow researchers?	71.43% 20	28.57% 8	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	28	1.29

### Q2 Please state your opinion about the poster sessions


Answered: 28 Skipped: 0



	Very satisfactory	Satisfactory	Average	Less satisfactory	Not satisfactory	Total	Weighted Average
How would you rate the format of the poster sessions?	42.86% 12	46.43% 13	10.71% 3	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	28	1.68
How would you rate the duration of the poster sessions?	35.71% 10	46.43% 13	17.86% 5	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	28	1.82
How would you rate the extent of feedback and discussion?	50.00% 14	28.57% 8	21.43% 6	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	28	1.71

### Q3 Please state your opinion about the organisation of the conference


Answered: 28 Skipped: 0



	Very satisfactory	Satisfactory	Average	Less satisfactory	Not satisfactory	Total	Weighted Average
How would you rate the overall organisation of the conference?	71.43% 20	28.57% 8	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	28	1.29
How would you rate the information given about the conference?	35.71% 10	42.86% 12	17.86% 5	3.57% 1	0.00% 0	28	1.89
How would you rate the board and accommodation of the conference venue?	82.14% 23	14.29% 4	3.57% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	28	1.21

### Q4 Do you consider yourself a researcher within

Answered: 28 Skipped: 0



Answer Choices	Responses
Basic research	67.86% 19
Clinical research	3.57% 1
Both basic and clinical research	28.57% 8
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>

## Q5 Overall comments or suggestions for improvement

Answered: 6 Skipped: 22

#	Responses	Date
1	The waiters were a little too aggressive at the conference dinner. They took away things from the table too fast and did not look very happy to be there and wait on us.	6/2/2016 9:24 AM
2	The international invited speakers were of a very high quality, while the national speakers were of a more varying quality. Considering the limited numbers of posters, there was too much time for poster viewing, but the breaks were good for talks with the speakers, networking, etc.	5/31/2016 11:58 AM
3	The last session on Friday could have been split into 2x2 talks with 30 min break in between from the last 1 h break before that session. The invoice to pay the conference fee was not having a proper electronic format, which led to some troubles beforehand.	5/30/2016 8:58 AM
4	The program and venue were excellent. There seemed to be too many poster sessions (basically at every coffee break), therefore it would be nice if there had been announced two main sessions when to meet the authors.	5/28/2016 12:12 PM
5	Very high quality of the presentations and with a very good coverage of glycobiology in a broad sense. It might be a possibility to let the poster presenters have a 3 min flash presentations - of course depending on the number of posters presented	5/27/2016 10:14 PM
6	Excellent meeting with a very interesting program and great opportunities for networking. Meetings should always be organised in this way. Would have been nice to have a little more information about the meeting available on the web in advance.	5/27/2016 6:45 PM