post ERCP pancreatitis, as observed in previous studies. Following adopting the technique of balloon sphincteroplasty there has been a statistically significant improvement in the success of stone extraction. A subsequent reduction in referrals to tertiary centres for failed ERCP has also been observed.
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Service development II

PTU-241

A PRAGMATIC APPROACH TO INVESTIGATION OF IRON DEFICIENCY ANAEMIA IN THE ELDERLY

doi:10.1136/gutjnl-2012-302514c.241

J L Hulley,* M Gunn, J Robertson. Department of Gastroenterology, Royal Victoria Infirmary, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, UK

Introduction Recent British Society of Gastroenterology (BSG) guidelines recommend all post-menopausal women and all men with confirmed iron deficiency anaemia (IDA) should be considered for upper and lower gastrointestinal investigation. Increasing demands on limited resources mean a straight-to-test approach is commonly adopted in busy gastrointestinal units. In the elderly this may result in poor attendance and inappropriate endoscopic investigations in high-risk patients.

Methods We looked at one year’s experience of a nurse-led one-stop IDA service which offered an initial clinic visit to discuss the most appropriate mode of investigation in patients aged 75 years and older. Four options were considered: bi-directional endoscopy, OGID and CT colonography with faecal tagging, plain CT scan of abdomen/pelvis or treatment of anaemia without investigation.

Results Data were collected retrospectively for the period of April 2010 to July 2011; 244 patients were referred over the year. Ninety-six were 75 and over; 67 female, 30 male. Age range of 75–97. Fifty-nine patients had confirmed IDA based on the haemoglobin level, mean corpuscular volume (MCV) and ferritin. Twenty-seven patients were iron deficient without anaemia. Ten patients had normocytic anaemia. In the IDA group: 25/59 (42.3%) patients qualified for bi-directional endoscopy. 16/59 (27%) patients opted for alternative investigations and 18/59 (30.5%) either were not suitable, chose not to be investigated or did not attend their appointments. In the iron-deficient group: 6/27 (22%) underwent bi-directional endoscopy. 7/27 (26%) had alternative investigations and 14/27 (51.8%) were not investigated for reasons as outlined in the IDA group. In the normocytic anaemia group: 4/10 (40%) had IDA, 1/10 (10%) underwent bi-directional endoscopy. Only 32/96 (33%) patients initially referred to the IDA service underwent bi-directional endoscopy.

Conclusion Only a third of elderly patients referred for investigation of IDA were appropriate for bi-directional endoscopy. A straight-to-test approach in this group of patients is likely to result in inefficiencies in endoscopy slots and inappropriate investigations in a high-risk group. We recommend a one-stop initial clinic assessment in this group of patients.
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PTU-242

CAN ENDOSCOPIC ULTRASOUND AND ERCP BE PERFORMED SAFELY IN THE SAME PATIENT DURING THE SAME SESSION?

doi:10.1136/gutjnl-2012-302514c.242

J S Leeds.* Department of Gastroenterology, Aberdeen Royal Infirmary, Aberdeen, UK

Introduction ERCP should be considered as a therapeutic modality in the vast majority of cases but some patients may have to wait for the appropriate diagnostic test. Endoscopic ultrasound (EUS) can be used to detect pancreatobiliary pathology especially in situations where cross sectional imaging techniques have reduced accuracy (eg, <10 mm bile duct stones). When such pathology is identified, same session ERCP theoretically could be performed but there is limited data on safety, patient comfort and complications. The aim of this study was to evaluate a recent service development whereby EUS can be immediately followed by ERCP.

Methods Our unit performs around 350 ERCP’s and 250 EUS procedures per annum. Since April 2011, there has been facility to perform EUS on the ERCP lists. All referrals are vetted and if deemed appropriate are listed for EUS ± ERCP on the same list. All patients listed for both procedures had their notes reviewed and demographics, indication, sedation requirements, comfort scores, need for ERCP and final diagnosis recorded. Median pethidine dose, midazolam dose and comfort scores were compared in those who EUS and ERCP vs EUS alone.

Results During the period April 2011–December 2011, 34 patients (median age 72 years) were listed for EUS ± ERCP. Indications for EUS prior to ERCP included dilated ducts (n=13), abnormal enzymes (n=10), other imaging unclear (n=4), possible sphincter of Oddi dysfunction (n=3), fine needle aspiration (n=4). 10/34 (29.4%) patients did not undergo subsequent ERCP as the EUS showed no indication. 16 were found to have bile duct stones, 4 had a neoplasm, 3 had sphincter of Oddi dysfunction and 1 a pancreatic duct stone (all confirmed at ERCP). There were no differences in demographics or indication in patients undergoing EUS and ERCP vs EUS alone. Median midazolam doses were significantly higher in those undergoing both procedures (4 mg vs 3 mg, p=0.003) than median pethidine dose (25 mg vs 25 mg, p=0.12) or comfort scores (1.0 vs 1.0, p=0.25). At ERCP, 18 patients underwent sphincterotomy and duct trawl, five patients had a stent inserted and one patient underwent choledochoscopy. No complications occurred in either group.

Conclusion EUS and ERCP can be performed safely in the same session but patients often need extra sedation for the second procedure. This does not appear to be detrimental to patients comfort or associated with an increased complication rate. A larger cohort should be examined prospectively and include analysis of list dynamics, cost effectiveness and patient preference.
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Introduction FC is a marker of GI inflammation. Four commercial ELISA-based assays are available, two polyclonal (Calpro [“C”]),