analyse the outcome of patients diagnosed to have pancreatic cancer in clinical practice in North London.

Methods In this duel centre retrospective study, a years worth of pancreatic cancer diagnoses was compiled using the North London Cancer Network Multi-disciplinary team meeting data base. The patients records were then searched gathering information on their dates of diagnosis; referral to our hepatobiliary surgeons at a local tertiary referral centre; whether they had a pre-operative stent; the date of their surgery (if they survived long enough to have it) and they’re ultimate outcome.

Results 68 patients within our sector received a diagnosis (histological/endoscopic/radiological) of pancreatic cancer over the course of 1 year (May 2010—May 2011). Of this cohort 20 (29.4%) were referred for surgical opinion. During the lag between diagnosis and surgical review, 9 (45%) patients received endoscopic biliary drainage and stent insertion (all were 1st pass). The total number to ultimately receive their Whipple’s was 5 (25%). In four patients in whom surgery was felt to be an option, aggressive disease and complications leading to a lengthy in patient stay at the point of diagnosis meant that the physical condition of the patient had deteriorated to the point where they were no longer fit for surgery/ inoperable. Only one patient proceeded straight to operation without prior stenting. Two patients had their operations privately. Unfortunately details of any post operative complications are not available.

Conclusion Our experiences of pancreatic cancer is that at the point of diagnosis most cancers were inoperable 48 of 68 (70%). Within our study period only 5 of 68 (7%) patients had surgery for pancreatic cancer. The majority of patients even when initially considered for surgery (75%) do not end up having a resection. When patients are referred with symptoms of obstructive jaundice, knowing that the majority will not undergo surgery and also knowing in clinical practice that it is difficult to get surgical resection within 10 days of diagnosis, the humane thing to do instinctively is to stent and achieve biliary drainage. Achieving biliary drainage helps in improving the patients symptom profile and additionally allows chemotherapeutic options in those whose jaundice resolves.
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PMO-099 A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF LAPAROSCOPIC VS OPEN DISTAL PANCREATECTOMY
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D J Maide,* Y Khale, J Packer, N De Liguori, R Deshpande, D O’Reilly, D Sherlock, B J Ammorn. The HPB Unit, North Manchester General Hospital, Manchester, UK

Introduction The laparoscopic approach to distal pancreatectomy for benign and malignant diseases appears to offer advantages and is replacing open surgery in some centres. However, well-designed studies comparing laparoscopic distal pancreatectomy (LDP) to open distal pancreatectomy (ODP) are limited. We present a single-institution study comparing the outcomes of LDF to ODP.

Methods The demographic details, clinical characteristics and outcomes of patients who underwent laparoscopic distal pancreatectomy were compared to those who had the surgery performed by open technique. The two approaches were compared on an intention-to-treat basis. Data shown represent medians. The two approaches were compared on an intention-to-treat basis. Data shown represent medians. The two approaches were compared on an intention-to-treat basis. Data shown represent medians. The two approaches were compared on an intention-to-treat basis. Data shown represent medians.

Results Between 2002 and 2009, 32 patients (20 female) underwent 16 LDP and 16 ODP respectively. The laparoscopic and open groups were comparable for age (57 vs 63 years, p=0.584), sex distribution and tumour size (3.9 vs 4 cm, p=0.939). Both groups had a comparable number of malignant cases (56% vs 50%, p=1.0). Although LDF took longer to complete (287.5 vs 240 min, p=0.061), it was associated with significantly lower blood loss (300 vs 500 ml, p=0.051) but comparable perioperative transfusion rate (p=0.471). The laparoscopic approach was associated with a significantly higher spleen-preservation rate (overall: 50% vs 12.5%, p=0.05; benign pathology: 85.7% vs 25%, p=1.0). LDF patients had a significantly lower HDU stay (1 vs 4.5 days, p=0.001) and a significantly lower postoperative hospital stay (6.5 vs 13.5 days, p=0.001). There was no significant difference in the postoperative morbidity and the R0 resection margin status.

PMO-098 DIAGNOSTIC YIELD OF ERCP AND EUS FNA IN A TERTIARY PANCREATIC CANCER CENTRE
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1 D Mc Clements,* 1 H Smart, 1 P Whelan. 1Department of Gastroenterology, Royal Liverpool University Hospital, Liverpool, UK; 2Department of Hepatobiliary, Royal Liverpool University Hospital, Liverpool, UK

Introduction Patients with suspected pancreatic malignancy on cross sectional imaging are often referred for endoscopic investigations with a view to obtaining a definitive histological diagnosis. We aimed to assess the diagnostic yield of brushings and biopsies taken at endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography (ERCP) and endoscopic ultrasound with fine needle aspiration (EUS FNA) in patients with pancreatic malignancy proven by operative histology.

Methods A retrospective audit of 125 patients undergoing surgery for pancreatic malignancy at the Royal Liverpool University Hospital (RLUH) from January 2009 to December 2011 was carried out. Of these patients, 35 underwent investigation at RLUH and are included in this analysis, two of these required two investigations.

Fifty patients had ERCP at an external Trust and 40 patients went straight to surgery without endoscopic intervention. Data were extracted from the pancreatic surgery database and electronic patient records for demographics and histology reports taken at the time of endoscopy and surgery.
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