Key Indicators

WBNC 2020 – Virtual edition

460 Participants
47 Nationalities
55 Speakers
5 Continents
76 Abstracts
36 Endorsers

Thank you!
Key Indicators over editions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abstracts</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trends on registrations and active participation
Participants per type of interaction

Before the congress starting date
- Virtual: 47%
- Onsite: 53%

At the end of the congress
- Virtual: 52%
- Onsite: 48%
Registration trend (on-site vs virtual)

Week 2022
Congress week is the 27

Early Reg. Fee deadline
Registrations

Supported by the Congress Registrations
- Junior professionals supported by Registries & Associations: 35%
- Junior professionals identified by faculty: 30%
- Faculty & invited guest: 24%
- Sponsors (included in packages): 11%

Paying Registrations
- Supported by the congress: 54%
- Supported Group: 19%
- Self paying: 81%
Some participants registered but did not attend the live sessions.

This trend is almost the same for paying participants and supported by the congress ones.
Some paying participants registered but did not attend the live sessions.

This trend more important for participants sponsored by company (paying but not self paying)
Some participants registered but did not attend the live sessions.

This trend is definitively more important for virtual participants.
Registrations trends: conclusions

➢ Participants tend to register later and later. 13% of the final registrations arrived the same week of the event.

➢ At the early fee deadline (4 weeks to go) only 57% of participants (both paying and free) were registered.

➢ Active attendance is definitively prevalent in on-site participants (98% of active participation vs registered participants) in comparison with virtual ones (67%).

➢ Active attendance is prevalent in self-paying participants (90% of active participation vs registered participants) in comparison with sponsored ones (62%).

➢ Around 18% of people registering (both paying or free) do not attend the conference.
Demography
Participants per Continent

- Europa: 60%
- Asia: 18%
- America North: 12%
- America South: 1%
- Middle East: 3%
- Australia Africa: 5%
- Africa: 1%
Participants per Continent
(on-site vs virtual participation)
Participations per Nationality

- United Kingdom: 15%
- Italy: 12%
- United States of America: 10%
- Turkey: 9%
- Germany: 6%
- Netherlands (The): 5%
- Spain: 5%
- Australia: 5%
- China: 1%
- Belgium: 1%
- Portugal: 1%
- Austria: 1%
- Singapore: 2%
- Canada: 2%
- Czech Republic: 2%
- Greece: 2%
- France: 2%
- Israel: 3%
- India: 3%
- Korea (Republic of): 1%
- Portugal: 1%
- China: 1%
- Other: 11%
Participants per Specialties

- Respiratory Medicine: 63%
- Not provided: 20%
- Microbiology / Biology: 5%
- Specialised Nurses: 1%
- Internal Medicine: 2%
- Physiotherapy: 2%
- Infectious Diseases: 3%
- Pharma Staff: 4%
- Specialised Nurses: 1%
- Internal Medicine: 2%
- Physiotherapy: 2%
- Infectious Diseases: 3%
- Pharma Staff: 4%
- Microbiology / Biology: 5%
Participants per age group and gender
Perceived Quality
Participants quality evaluation (on 5)

- Quality of the event - scientific: 4.8 (Prague 2022), 4.7 (Virtual 2020), 4.7 (Milan 2017)
- Quality of the event - organisation: 4.7 (Prague 2022), 4.6 (Virtual 2020), 4.7 (Milan 2017)
- Relevance of the event for my clinical practice: 4.7 (Prague 2022), 4.7 (Virtual 2020), 4.7 (Milan 2017)
- Efficacy of the learning formats used during the event: 4.6 (Prague 2022), 4.8 (Virtual 2020), 4.6 (Milan 2017)
- Ways the event affected the participant's practice: 4.7 (Prague 2022), 4.7 (Virtual 2020), 4.7 (Milan 2017)
- There were no commercial bias: 4.6 (Prague 2022), 4.5 (Virtual 2020), 4.6 (Milan 2017)
## Participants quality feedbacks on Round Tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round Table Feedback</th>
<th>How would you rank it?</th>
<th>Would you be so kind to give feedbacks on your experience?</th>
<th>Are there any suggestions you would make to improve it?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difficult to treat NTM</td>
<td>5. Excellent</td>
<td>Practical information on how to handle difficult cases. Nice to see how EU do thing differently from US.</td>
<td>The experts pretty well know what makes NTM difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Excellent</td>
<td>Meeting not too big so very easy to discuss with expert, really a great moment. The Welcome and attention was great.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Exacerbations in bronchiectasis</td>
<td>5. Excellent</td>
<td>really enjoyed the good discussions and interactivity with the audience, PJ asked the audience on tips for her Dx and Rx algorithm to make even more better, that’s really nice to share global opinions/ expertise to manage patients better</td>
<td>Time was gone fast, may be a bit more time could be arranged for a next one (depending on the size of the audience)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Excellent</td>
<td>very interactive with audience (many thanks to Tony De Soyza). PJ and Adam were great</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Very good</td>
<td>Good unstructured section and good guided voting to set of debate</td>
<td>Very happy to have it repeated as it was ; Audience could bring more cases to help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult to treat pathogens</td>
<td>4. Very good</td>
<td>it was nicer with 2 people leading a session as becomes more interactive and ice breaking, but Charles did a great job</td>
<td>No discussion at all regarding viruses, which I thought was weird, even if there are really no effective treatments (but social distancing 🤣)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Excellent</td>
<td>Really good session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Excellent</td>
<td>The talk was informal with lots of interaction and food for thought. I definitely left it feeling very inspired.</td>
<td>I presented a case myself and would have liked to see other cases presented from delegates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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