The Ugandan participants, the feed emphasis on what to improve. For ers and participants or not enough back is given by the Ugandan train may appear as if not enough feed in the training program in Uganda, it and their peers. To the Dutch involved participants receive from the trainers successful learning within these based on Dutch expertise. Part of that has been implemented in Uganda, alation-based team training program the design and evaluation of a simu back style can also have impact on the Dutch. This difference in feed to the article and only have a minor issue Ugandans feel very positive about (givers of indirect negative feed) receive feedback when Dutch people (givers of direct negative feedback) appear to them that gut discounting, slighting, or criticizing the Dutch or not showing appreciation. This may be related to the linear-time versus relationship-based cultures. It is important to be aware of these differences when working internationally. It is important to be aware of your own culture, how it might differ from others and what consequences this may have for your technology or study design. The eight scales of the Culture Map can be used as a basis for reflecting on these differences.

To avoid mishaps and to smoothen implementation in other countries, it is essential to involve local staff and to remain flexible and curious.

Developing and successfully launching a new medical product in the market is a fantastic challenge and experience, but it is usually underestimated how much time, effort and investments it takes. A continuous drive, passion and determination is needed from everyone in the company to make it happen. But the bare truth is that most startups fail.

There are many areas to consider simultaneously when developing a new product. When analyzing the root causes why most startups fail, technology push is often mentioned. There is a sincere belief of many entrepreneurs that the market will (easily) adopt a new product and is willing to pay a lot of money for it. And this is where things often go wrong, especially when the launch of a new product requires a change in ways of working, training, education, clinical evidence, budget increase and cost reduction. Let’s also not forget that there is great diversity in how healthcare systems work in different countries. Who is the customer? Who are the decision-makers? Who are the informal decision-makers? All these factors need to be considered from the start of a development of a new product.

Another root cause is the relatively late response and feedback on a new product of potential users in the market. Clinical studies to investigate clinical outcomes and economical benefits take a lot of time. Of course, approval from a Medical Ethical Committee (METC) is required and the product needs to be safe. But the question, however, is whether it is possible to collect feedback from the market much earlier in the development process of a new product and how to set up shorter clinical studies, covered by the approval of a METC. Could a minimum viable product be defined and approved in close collaboration with potential customers that make it possible to carry out clinical studies and collect feedback from the market much faster? This is certainly an area where close collaboration between industry, hospitals and universities is needed.

Both technology push and late market feedback make it difficult for companies to raise sufficient funding for market implementation. Many companies have limited budget when launching a new product and hope sales will increase revenue quickly. But this rarely happens and companies get in trouble. Proof of concept, clinical and economical evidence and market acceptance are required to get new sources of funding that support the company in growing the business. The earlier a company can mitigate the risks as described above, the higher the chance of getting funding and creating success.

The initiative of eMETC is a good example of a close collaboration between industry, hospitals and university and forms a perfect base for discussing, searching and experimenting with new ways of working.