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**Evaluation Summary**

17 evaluation forms in English returned (10 from AM session, 7 from AM+PM session)

1. **Participants thought that the session was –**
2. **Participants found the session -**

**3. (a) What people liked best *from AM session* –**

* ‘The explanations’
* ‘Amanda’s presentation skills’
* ‘Interaction with each other’
* ‘Speakers’
* ‘Opportunity to get involved in group work then discuss as under group’
* ‘Language was kept to a beginner level by presenters’
* ‘Why is evidence important’
* ‘To get basic idea from the discussion and useful examples’
* ‘Open form of workshop’
* ‘Informative participation’

 **(b) What people liked best *from AM + PM session* –**

* ‘Excellent but informal presentation’
* ‘Presenters interaction with consumers and with humour’
* ‘Explanations about good trials’
* ‘Amanda’s morning presentation – fascinating, and Juan and Antonio’s theatre!’
* ‘Explanation of evidence based trials, what factors make a trial reliable, etc. Explanation of what Cochrane review is about, purpose, history etc. Explanation of why trials need to be randomized etc.’
* ‘Loved the slower pace which was necessary because of the translation going on, it gave more time for capturing and processing the information. Loved the checklists. All the examples were very helpful’
* ‘I also loved the small group work. It neatly helped to understand everything. This process made the info less intimidating’

**4. (a) What people liked least *from AM session* –**

* ‘It wasn’t focused on how to correctly interpret a systematic reviews findings’
* ‘Too much weighted to Spanish’
* ‘Disconcerting with both languages but understood why a good idea. Thought it was above basic consumer level’
* ‘Not keeping to time/schedule’
* ‘All very relevant however layout wasn’t good for effective communication as groups’
* ‘There were professionals present who obviously had prior knowledge’
* ‘Bilingual session’
* ‘Coffee’
* ‘Missed out on fun as conflict with newcomers session’

 **(b) What people liked least *from AM + PM session* –**

* ’The delay caused by dual presentation – fun, but used a lot of time’
* ‘Cochrane review consumer checklist – found it too complex and confusing’
* ‘I entered 15 minutes late so missed the introduction, I wish the presenters names and emails were listed on the workshop pack, no presenter was re-introduced after lunch, which would have been helpful’

**5. Suggestions for future sessions –**

* ‘Adding the study designs’
* ‘Limit to laypersons’
* ‘Less content’
* ‘More basic info – separate true newcomers to reviews – not Cochrane
* ‘Keep updating the presentation as time passes and evidence changes’
* ‘End the session by explaining how one can become involved in commenting on reviews, and what reviewers look for in consumers they choose’
* ‘It would be better to give more information about the checklist for review’
* ‘More time on interpreting, focus on how to avoid misinformation’

**6. One thing from the day that will be remembered –**

* ‘Ethical research is good to both , doctor and participants’
* ‘Activia problem!’
* ‘How the trials proceed’
* ‘The easy way the information was presented. The session was informative, engaging and always interesting’
* ‘Opportunity to network, demystified Cochrane’
* ‘Amanda & Gill (as always)’
* ‘That I need it again, especially the ITT’
* ‘My doctor may well not be right! Or be practicing the best medicine. As a consumer I can play a larger part in my treatment than I thought’
* ‘Amanda’s skills’
* ‘Good clinical trials sequence’
* ‘That it was great! Beyond my expectations! I hope the podcast will be posted somewhere’