WATER INSUFFLATION VS NARROW BAND IMAGING. WHICH MODALITY PRODUCES RELIABLE IMAGES OF TERMINAL ILEUM AT COLONOSCOPY?
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Introduction Terminal ileal (TI) images are reliable indicators of completeness of colonoscopy. Studies have shown that TI image provide more convincing than caecal images to verify completion of colonoscopy. Acquisition of TI images after water insufflation (WI) has been found to produce reliable images. We wanted to identify if TI images after WI through the biopsy channel or narrow band images of TI produce more reliable as part of image documentation.

Methods 4 images of terminal ileum were captured using Olympus colonoscopy®. They were 1 captured with conventional white light endoscopy (WLE), 1 captured with white light endoscopy + water insufflation (WLEWI), 1 captured with narrow band imaging (NBI) and 1 captured with NBI + water insufflation (NBWI).

Without informing that these were TI images, the 4 terminal images were sent to endoscopists by email along with an invitation to participate in a survey using survey monkey® portal. Using the survey the respondents marked each image as follows: not terminal ileum = 1, may be terminal ileum = 2, most likely terminal ileum = 3, definitely terminal ileum = 4.

Results 36 endoscopists completed our survey. 49% were gastroenterology Specialist registrar, 40% were consultant gastroenterologists and 11% were colorectal surgeons. Most of the respondents (n = 31) were from the UK, 4 were from the United States and 1 was from the rest of the Europe.

19.4% (n = 7) of respondents had colonoscopy experience of 1–2 years, 30.6% (n = 11) had colonoscopy experience of 3–5 years, 19.4% (n = 7) had colonoscopy experience of 5–9 years 30.6% (n = 11) had colonoscopy experience of more than 10 years.

Responses in Table 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abstract PWE-067 Table 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not TI (Score 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May be TI (score 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most likely TI (score 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely TI (score 4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion Water insufflation on terminal ileum using the biopsy channel of colonoscope produce more reliable images compared to White light or narrow band images (NBI). Combination of NBI and water insufflation together produced the most reliable images.
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FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH REPORTED PAIN DURING COLONOSCOPY: A RETROSPECTIVE STUDY

doi:10.1136/gutjnl-2013-304907.358

Introduction Colonoscopy is generally perceived as being a painful procedure. Nonetheless, pain is a rather subjective experience for individuals and can be multifactorial. The aim of this study was to identify the predictors of pain during colonoscopy.

Methods 1824 consecutive colonoscopies performed in 2010 were identified. Data was retrospectively collected on gender, patients’ medical co-morbidities, type and effectiveness of bowel preparation, medication used during the procedure, endoscopists’ performance and endoscopic findings such as presence of diverticular disease. Logistic regression analysis was used to identify independent predictors of pain during the procedure.
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Results Male patients were found to be less likely to develop pain during colonoscopy (odds ratio [OR] 0.43, 95% CI 0.35–0.53, p < 0.001). Those who had any malignancy in the past (OR 0.69, 95% CI 0.49–0.97, p = 0.02) and previous abdominal surgery (OR 0.63, 95% CI 0.47–0.84, p = 0.02) were less prone to having pain. Better bowel preparation improved the comfort of the procedure (OR 0.67, 95% CI 0.54–0.85, p = 0.001) however those who used Moviprep as bowel preparation were more likely to complain of pain (OR 1.83, 95% CI 1.34–2.49, p < 0.001). Higher dose of pethidine requirement was found to be associated with increase likelihood of reporting pain (OR 1.03, 95% CI 1.02–1.04, p < 0.001) but no association was found with the use of midazolam or buscopan. High performance endoscopists were found to cause less pain (OR 0.55, 95% CI 0.27–0.46, p < 0.001). The presence of diverticular disease showed a strong trend towards increasing probability of pain although it did not reach statistical significance (OR 1.4, 95% CI 1.1–1.8, p = 0.07). Age and medical co-morbidities like rheumatological and neurological problems did not have any significant association.

Conclusion Likelihood of having abdominal pain during colonoscopy was found to be associated with being female, having poor bowel preparation and the procedure being performed by non-high performing endoscopists. Patients with past history of malignancy were also noted to have less tendency of having pain. The association of higher dose of pethidine and reported pain was likely to reflect the need of larger doses in such situation. Interestingly, history of previous abdominal surgery did not increase the likelihood of reporting pain and in fact had the opposite effect. The reason for why patients who had Moviprep as bowel preparation were more likely to complain of pain is unknown and this may need to be explored in future studies.
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Introduction Despite increasing awareness of the potential hazards of endoscopic sedation, complications from sedation remain a major concern. Serious harm or death resulting from sedation overdose is now a Department of Health ‘never event’. Previous work by our group (2000–2005) demonstrated a steady sedation reversal incidence of 0.27%. Trust guidelines, in line with the current British Society of Gastroenterology safe sedation guidelines (2005), were developed in 2005 (revised 2011). We present the results of a retrospective survey, evaluating whether the incidence and risk factors for sedation reversal events have changed.

Methods Our Trust is a large tertiary referral endoscopic centre across 3 sites. A retrospective analysis of all endoscopy (n = 73,989) was performed, including all sedated endoscopic procedures carried out between 2007 and 2012 (n = 52,553). Flumazenil or naloxone administration was used as a marker of sedation overdose requiring reversal. The results were compared to the previous single-site audit of 2000 to 2005 (n = 20,569). Reversal episodes were analysed for associations with total sedation dose given, patient ASA grade, age and procedure undertaken. Statistical analysis was carried out using chi squared test and the linear regression model (Origin®).

Results In total 149 sedation reversals were recorded, representing 0.28% of all sedated endoscopic procedures, with no significant difference from the reversal rate (0.27%) recorded between 2000 and 2005 (p = 0.79). Mean dose of midazolam used in reversal events was 3.1mg (range 0.5–14mg). Mean dose of opioid (as pethidine equivalent) was 47.9mg (range 12.5–150mg). Higher than recommended doses of midazolam (5mg) or opioid (pethidine equivalent 50mg) were administered in 7.4% and 6.7% of reversal events, respectively. Endoscopic Retrograde Cholangiopancreatography (ERC) was most associated with sedation reversal (1%). Mean dose of midazolam varied by procedure type and was highest for ERC (5.1±2.9mg) and lowest for flexible sigmoidoscopy (1.7±0.6mg; p < 0.01). Mean dose of pethidine or opioid equivalent was highest for ERC (78±38.7mg) and lowest for colonoscopy (33±13.4mg; p < 0.01). Sedation reversal was positively associated with increasing patient ASA grade (p < 0.05).

Conclusion Despite the emergence of national and local guidelines, aimed at safe sedation practise, there was no decline in our Trust’s rate of sedation reversals over the last 12 years. Furthermore, the findings suggest there is a subgroup of patients, and a subset of endoscopic procedures, which still carry a significant risk of oversedation requiring reversal. This may support the growing interest in alternative sedation strategies for prolonged therapeutic endoscopic procedures such as ERC.
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