

Workshop evaluation report

AIDS2010 Interactive Workshop on Scientific Writing: Scientific Integrity and Ethical Issues in Publishing in the Field of HIV and AIDS

Thursday 22 July 2010, 11.00-12.30, Mini Room 2 (120 pax), Reed Messe Vienna

Out of approximately 120 participants we received 46 evaluation sheets for this workshop from respondents. The evaluation is based on the correct responses by the respondents, incorrect responses were disregarded.

Participants:

Out of 41 respondents 37% indicated as their main occupation being a researcher, with another 22% identifying themselves as health care workers, 17% as educators/mentors and 12% of the respondents were students.

The workshop attracted a range of authors, from experienced to junior authors; half of the 46 respondents noted having already written and submitted more than one manuscript, 13% indicated that they had never written and submitted a manuscript, 26% indicated that they were currently in the process of writing and submitting a manuscript and 11% of respondents indicated that they had written and submitted one manuscript to date.

Respondents were highly motivated to attend the workshop based on its 'title and description' (74% of respondents), as well as to 'further develop and strengthen skills' (63% of respondents). In addition, 9% of respondents indicated that the workshop was recommended to them.

Content:

Overall, 85% of participants rated the workshop modules as either 'very useful' or 'useful'. Overall, the individual modules were rated very similarly with 'authorship' receiving the highest score (96% of participants chose 'very useful' or 'useful'). The

module ‘seven deadly sins’ was rated by 94% of respondents as ‘very useful’ or ‘useful’, the module ‘ethical decisions’ was rated by 86% of respondents as ‘very useful’ or ‘useful’ and the module ‘patient data’ received a ‘very useful’ or ‘useful’ score by 66% of respondents.

Comments:

In total we received 24 comments from respondents out of which 15 dealt with time-related issues. In particular participants called for more time to allow for discussions. Two participants suggested providing more material and print-outs of the slides. Other suggestions included the option to bring own case studies to the discussion, targeting the discussions more towards the HIV/AIDS field, further expanding on multicultural norms and supporting authors from developing countries. Respondents also commented that they would like to see the topic ‘good clinical practice’ covered, a web-based resource and improved microphone set-up to allow for better audience participation.