

Abstract PTU-013 Table 1

	Lobo et al, 2001	Current study		
		Pre teaching (n = 56)	Post teaching (n = 36)	p value
Not confident in prescribing	14%	25%	6%	p = 0.02
Unsatisfactory or poor teaching in Medical school	34%	34%	-	-
Not given guidelines at induction	67%	48%	-	-
Fluid balance charts not checked regularly	3%	18%	22%	p = 0.6
Correct sodium content of normal saline	34%	10%	64%	p < 0.0001
> 2 litres normal saline prescribed	32%	9%	5%	p = 0.7

chart review with seniors or other relevant teaching sessions, their main source of knowledge was postulated to be from our teaching. More attention should be given to this subject in medical schools and guidance should be given at Trust inductions.

Disclosure of Interest None Declared

REFERENCES

- Walsh SR *et al.* Perioperative fluid management: prospective audit. *Int J Clin Pract.* 2008 Mar; 62(3):492–7. Epub 2007 May 30.
- De Silva AN *et al.* Improving peri-operative fluid management in a large teaching hospital: pragmatic studies on the effects of changing practise. *Proceedings of the Nutrition Society* 2010; 69: 499–507.
- Lobo DN *et al.* Problems with solutions: drowning in the brine of an inadequate knowledge base. *Clinical Nutrition* 2001; 20(2):125–30.

PTU-014 IMPACT OF PRIMARY CARE EDUCATION ON THE TWO WEEK WAIT REFERRAL PROCESS FOR GI CANCERS

doi:10.1136/gutjnl-2013-304907.107

¹S Biswas, ²A Willington, ³A Ellis. ¹Gastroenterology; ²Medicine, Royal Berkshire Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, Reading; ³Gastroenterology, Horton General Hospital, Banbury, UK

Introduction The two week wait referral process was introduced in 2000 to improve cancer prognosis in the UK with an anticipated 20% reduction in cancer-related deaths. The cancer yield has in fact been reported as 9–16%. Referrals should be made on the basis of NICE guidance. Previous studies have highlighted that as few as 53% of referrals from Primary Care have been within NICE guidance. The Government's nine-week "Be clear on cancer" campaign launched in January 2012 via online, TV and radio adverts to increase public awareness of bowel cancer symptoms impacted our service. The proportion of colonoscopies done for the two-week wait service increased from 27% to 48% in the month after the campaign. It is clearly important that referrals made are appropriate to justify this service requirement. This study compares referrals and outcomes before and after a GP education session.

Methods Two week wait GI Referrals to the Horton General Hospital between December 2011 and February 2012 were assessed. A presentation was given to Primary Care Practitioners in May highlighting NICE guidance and referrals were re-audited in June 2012.

Results 100% of referrals met the two week wait target (to clinic, CT scan or endoscopy) and the mean time to first test was 9 days. The results are summarised below. 24% of Upper GI referrals did not meet NICE guidance, mostly patients referred with anaemia above the referral threshold or for dyspepsia without concerning features. The cancer pick-up was 8.6% (2 oesophageal, 2 gastric and 4 pancreatico-biliary). 26% of Lower GI referrals were non-compliant with guidance (mostly due to rectal bleeding or change in bowel habit shorter than the required time). Cancer pick-up was 5.1%. All but one GI cancer was detected in appropriately referred patients.

In June 2012 compliance improved to 81% of upper GI and 79% of lower GI referrals. Reasons for referral outside NICE guidance

were similar to the previous cohort. Cancer detection rose to 12.9% for Upper GI and 8.6% for Lower GI cancers. All cancers in the second audit were in appropriately referred patients.

Abstract PTU-014 Table

	Dec 2011-Feb 2012		June 2012	
	Upper GI	Lower GI	Upper GI	Lower GI
Mean age	71 years	61 years	70 years	68 years
Gender	46% male	43% male	38% male	43% male
% compliance with NICE guidance	76%	74%	81%	79%
Cancer pick up	8.6%	5.1%	12.9%	8.6%

Conclusion The study highlights the importance of communication with Primary Care Practitioners who are responsible for referrals for GI cancer exclusion. There have been previous education sessions but despite this there remains an advantage in re-stating the message and keeping regular contact. The cancer detection rate improved with better compliance with NICE guidance and may indicate the value of adhering to this guidance. Larger studies are required to validate this.

Disclosure of Interest None Declared

PTU-015 TRAINEE ENDOSCOPIC PROCEDURES BY DEANERY AND YEAR OF TRAINING IN THE UNITED KINGDOM: AUGUST 2011 TO JULY 2012. ARE WE DOING ENOUGH?

doi:10.1136/gutjnl-2013-304907.108

¹T Ambrose, ²P Dunkley on behalf of Joint Advisory Group for Endoscopy (JAG), ¹A Ellis on behalf of Specialist Advisory Committee (SAC). ¹Gastroenterology, Horton General Hospital, Banbury; ²Gastroenterology, Gloucestershire Royal Hospital, Gloucester, UK

Introduction The burden of acute medicine on specialty trainee registrars (StR) is rising. Anecdotal evidence suggests that fewer endoscopic procedures are being performed by gastroenterology (GI) StR's and that trainees although competent at the time of being awarded their CCT may have less confidence in their endoscopic skills when compared to a historical cohort. The annual review of competency progression (ARCP) decision aid includes indicative numbers of procedures which should be undertaken annually. Since September 2010 all endoscopic procedures undertaken by UK GI trainees have been recorded on a national electronic record (the Joint Advisory Group Endoscopy Training System (JETS)).

Methods We obtained anonymised records from the JETS database for the period 3 August 2011 – 31 July 2012. We analysed the data by trainee grade (ST3–7, locum appointment for training (LAT's)), deanery, numbers and type of procedure, and annual numbers of endoscopy lists (dedicated training, ad-hoc training, and service). Duplicate entries & blank entries were removed.

Results A total of 721 records were obtained from the 19 UK deaneries. 183 blank records were deleted leaving 538 for analysis. 49 (9.1%) were ST3 trainees, 101 (18.8%) ST4, 142 (26.4%) ST5, 120 (22.3%) ST6, 102 (18.9%) ST7, and 24 (4.5%) LAT. Significant