

addition, the time from referral to insertion increased significantly across these periods ($p < 0.01$). In the later part of 2011 an increase in referrals and appropriate insertions was observed—without a concomitant rise in complications.

Conclusion Introduction of a “virtual” team for PEG assessment reduced the number of procedures required (freeing time for other endoscopic procedures), and post-insertion complications. There was a non-significant trend for improved 30-day mortality. A “minimal input” approach to PEG assessment based on a detailed referral form is therefore feasible, safe and associated with significantly reduced rates of post-procedure morbidity.

Competing interests None declared.

PMO-085 SAFETY AND SUBSEQUENT USE OF PROPHYLACTIC PERCUTANEOUS GASTROSTOMY PLACEMENT BY ENDOSCOPICALLY ASSISTED GASTROPEXY AND DIRECT PUNCTURE USING THE FRESenius® PEXACT KIT IN HEAD AND NECK CANCER PATIENTS

doi:10.1136/gutjnl-2012-302514b.85

¹S F Habib,* ¹O Noorullah, ¹N Stern, ²S N Rogers, ¹S Ahmed. ¹Department of Gastroenterology, University Hospital Aintree, Liverpool, UK; ²Maxillofacial Surgery, University Hospital Aintree, Liverpool, UK

Introduction Maintaining oral nutrition in Head and Neck cancer patients undergoing treatment can be challenging. Therefore, patients deemed at risk of malnutrition are referred for prophylactic gastrostomy. Due to risk of tumour implantation at gastrostomy site with conventional “pull through” technique, we changed our practice to direct puncture gastrostomy in 2004, using the Fresenius® PEXACT kit. We have previously reported series of 319 patients.¹

Methods All procedures performed between January 2010 and June 2011 were identified using the endoscopy reporting system. Information regarding readmissions, complications, mortality, dietetic assessment and use of gastrostomy tube was obtained from hospital patient records.

Results 91 gastrostomies were identified in 91 patients, 49 (54%) had advanced T3/T4 cancers, 10 (11%) with T2 disease. 69 (76%) were males. Mean age = 55 years (range 32–78). Insertion was successful in all patients. All patients had prophylactic antibiotics prior to the procedure. There were no immediate procedure related complications (two immediate complications, one requiring a laparotomy, in cohort reported earlier, $n=319$).¹ There were no deaths within 7 days of procedure. Five patients died within 30 days (5.4%). Four were due to disease progression, one patient had a cardiac arrest in the community 23 days after the procedure. There was 1 (1.09%) unplanned admission 3 weeks after the procedure with bleeding from gastrostomy site requiring laparotomy. (14 unplanned admissions 30 days post procedure in earlier cohort, $n=319$).¹ There were no readmissions within 7 days. No cases of tumour implantation reported to date. Late displacement of gastrostomy tube (>30 days after insertion) was common (6.5%, same as in earlier cohort).¹ To date we have managed to get information regarding use of gastrostomy tube in 58 out of 91 patients. Available data date so far has shown 46/58 (79.3%) patients used their gastrostomy tube for 2 weeks or more. 12/58 (20.6%) did not require use of gastrostomy tube.

Conclusion Endoscopically assisted gastropexy and direct puncture is a safe and reliable method of gastrostomy tube placement. Overall, our complication rate has fallen, with only one delayed major procedure related complication during this period. There have been no procedure related deaths or cases of tumour implantation.

Competing interests None declared.

REFERENCE

- Ahmed S, Bowering K, Polavarapu N, *et al*. PEXACT®: analysis of 319 procedures performed at the digestive diseases unit, University Hospital Aintree. *Gut* 2010;**59**: A143. doi:10.1136/gut.2009.209049k

PMO-086 HOW USEFUL IS FEEDING JEJUNOSTOMY IN UPPER GASTRO INTESTINAL CANCER SURGERY—A RETROSPECTIVE REVIEW

doi:10.1136/gutjnl-2012-302514b.86

V Daya Shetty,* Department of Upper GI Surgery, Salford Royal Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Bolton, UK

Introduction A retrospective review of outcome of 100 consecutive open feeding jejunostomies performed as part upper GI cancer surgery in our Centre in the last 3 years.

Methods 100 consecutive patients undergoing open insertion of Freka feeding jejunostomy as a part of Upper GI cancer surgery in the last 3 years are included. All feeding tubes were inserted approximately 30cms distal to the duodenojejunal flexure. The average procedure time for jejunostomy placement was 20 min. The feeding jejunostomy was flushed with water on the night of surgery and a standardised feeding regime initiated used from the first postoperative day. The standard regime was water at 20 mls/h on day 1 followed by feed (Jevity/Osmolyte) at 30 mls/h on day 2. The rate of feed was increased on daily increment of 10 mls/h/day to achieve target rate based on patient's nutritional requirements. All patients were discharged with feeding jejunostomy in situ. It was removed at first follow-up clinic appointment 2 weeks after discharge if patient was nutritionally stable.

Results A total of 100 patients (male: female=66:34) who had feeding jejunostomy tubes inserted are included. The indications were cardio-oesophagectomy (77%); total gastrectomy (19%); inoperable tumour at laparotomy (3%) and in one patient prior to neoadjuvant chemotherapy. There were no intra operative procedure related complications. The median duration the feeding jejunostomy was in situ was 28 days (range 3–238 days). Postoperative feeding tube related complications were seen in 14% ($n=14$). These include tube fallout ($n=5$); minimal leak ($n=2$) and skin puncture site cellulitis ($n=7$). Enteral feed related complications were seen in 15% ($n=15$). These complications were minor and they included diarrhoea ($n=9$), abdominal cramps and bloating ($n=4$). Major complication was seen in only 6.8% ($n=2$) both due to feed (Jevity) forming a solid bezoar which caused small bowel obstruction. Laparotomy was necessary in one patient, with full recovery. The other patient died following small bowel infarction. The availability of enteral route was particularly beneficial in 30 of our patients, to provide additional nutritional support for longer than anticipated, due to post operative difficulties including poor oral intake, anastomotic leak, and respiratory complications. In our series in only 5% ($n=5$) additional parenteral nutrition was necessary. This includes chyle leak—($n=3$) and dislodged feeding tube ($n=2$).

Conclusion Feeding jejunostomy aids early establishment of enteral nutrition in patients undergoing upper GI cancer surgery. It is useful in providing continued nutritional support in patients who develop perioperative complications where oral route for nutrition is otherwise unavailable or inadequate, although jejunostomy tube placement and usage can also be a source of morbidity.

Competing interests None declared.

PMO-087 LAPAROSCOPIC INSERTION OF FREKA FEEDING JEJUNOSTOMY AS A PART OF LAPAROSCOPIC THORACOSCOPIC CARDIO-OSOPHAGECTOMY—A REVIEW OF OUR OUTCOME

doi:10.1136/gutjnl-2012-302514b.87

V Daya Shetty,* K Akhtar. Department of Upper GI Surgery, Salford Royal Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Salford, UK

Introduction A retrospective review of outcomes of laparoscopic insertion of feeding jejunostomy as a part of laparoscopic thoracoscopic cardio-oesophagectomy.