

Results

Abstract PWE-112 Table 1

Male : female	34% : 66%
Age range	16–89 years
Mean age	41.7 years
FBC in past year	100%
Proportion anaemic patients	23%
If anaemic, were iron studies done	91.3%
Was the patient on iron if appropriate?	80%
Recommended type of iron?	100%
Was Hb rechecked after 4 weeks	81.2%
If Hb did not rise, was IV iron given?	100%

Conclusion Our study demonstrated good compliance with national guidance in screening for anaemia annually in IBD patients. Appropriate iron preparations were given in all patients. Only 81% patients commenced on iron had Hb rechecked after 4 weeks. Our study showed similar prevalence of iron deficiency in IBD patients to other studies but better detection and treatment (3).

We have a full-time IBD Specialist nurse who monitors patients' tolerance of iron supplements. Patients are advised to telephone if they have side effects of medications and are not able to tolerate them. The presence of a nurse may improve bloods monitoring and iron prescription but may not be a service that can be provided nationally. Our IBD clinics are run by consultants only, which may also facilitate adherence to guidelines.

REFERENCES

- 1 Bloom S *et al.* Guidelines for the management of inflammatory bowel disease in adults. *Gut* 2011;60:571–607
- 2 Befrits R, *et al.* Guidelines on the diagnosis and management of iron deficiency and anemia in inflammatory bowel diseases. *Inflamm Bowel Dis* 2007;13:1545–53
- 3 Obermeier F *et al.* High prevalence but insufficient treatment of iron-deficiency anemia in patients with inflammatory bowel disease: results of a population-based cohort. *Gastroenterol Res Pract.* 2012;2012:595970

Disclosure of Interest None Declared.

PWE-113 DIAGNOSTIC BENEFIT OF MRE FOLLOWING CT

¹S Dharmasiri*, ¹R Boud, ¹A Dower, ²N Hennessy, L Standing ¹, ¹A Richards-Taylor, ¹T Hollingworth, ¹S Weaver, ¹H Johnson, ¹S McLaughlin. ¹Gastroenterology, Royal Bournemouth Hospital, Bournemouth, UK; ²Radiology, Royal Bournemouth Hospital, Bournemouth, UK

10.1136/gutjnl-2014-307263.373

Introduction In patients presenting with symptoms suggestive of IBD (abdominal pain and/or diarrhoea) in common with ECCO guidelines colonoscopy is the first line test at our institution. In our practice magnetic resonance enterography (MRE) is then performed in those patients where there is a continuing clinical suspicion of small bowel Crohn's disease.

However in patients who present to non-IBD physicians Computed tomography of the abdomen and pelvis with contrast (CTAP) is often the first line investigation.

In this situation MRE is commonly performed to exclude small bowel disease following review in the gastroenterology clinic. We are not aware of studies that have evaluated the additional diagnostic yield of MRE in this clinical scenario.

Aim to establish the additional diagnostic yield of MRE in patients previously investigated with CTAP and ileo-colonoscopy.

Methods Our radiology department maintain a prospective electronic database. We searched for all patients who underwent CTAP followed by MRE within the same 12 month period between February 2005 and February 2013. Electronic medical records were then reviewed.

Results 80 patients were identified. The mean age at time of MRE was 49 (range 17–87), 45 (56%) were female. Indication for these investigations were: assessment of known Crohn's disease; 18 (23%), abdominal pain; 34 (43%). Mean time between CTAP and MRE; 127 days (range 3–352). Final diagnosis was Crohn's disease; 37 (45%), coeliac disease; 4(5%), irritable bowel syndrome 4(5%). In 11(14%) MRE added further information or changed the management for the patient. Of this group in 3 patients MRE identified terminal ileal (TI) inflammation that was not identified at CTAP. In two of these cases ileal-colonoscopy collaborated TI inflammation and in the third case capsule enteroscopy confirmed TI inflammation. In all three the final diagnosis was Crohn's disease. Overall MRE identified one (1.25%) patient with possible CD that was missed at CTAP and ileo-colonoscopy.

Conclusion In this study the diagnostic yield of MRE in patients previously investigated with ileo-colonoscopy and CTAP was low. This suggests that MRE has a limited diagnostic role in this specific situation and should be reserved for those patients where clinical suspicion remains high despite negative CTAP and ileo-colonoscopy or to further define complex disease.

Disclosure of Interest None Declared.

PWE-114 THE IBD-CONTROL QUESTIONNAIRE: MULTI-CENTRE VALIDATION PLUS EVALUATION IN ROUTINE CARE

¹T Gledhill*, ²E Brown, ³B Collins, ⁴S Subramanian, ³A Bassi, ¹K Bodger. ¹Department of Gastroenterology, Institute of Translational Medicine, University of Liverpool, UK; ²Department of Gastroenterology, Aintree University Hospital, Liverpool, UK; ³Department of Gastroenterology, Whiston Hospital, Prescot; ⁴Department of Gastroenterology, Royal Liverpool Hospital, Liverpool, UK

10.1136/gutjnl-2014-307263.374

Introduction Routine capture of reliable, patient-centred health status measures for IBD has not become part of standard practice. The IBD-Control questionnaire is a short (13 item), generic patient-reported outcome measure which we developed to support routine care.¹

Methods To further define performance in varied settings, we undertook: (A) A prospective study at an inner city teaching hospital and a DGH, to show reproducibility of psychometric properties. Clinic patients completed IBD-Control and the local IBD team recorded activity index, global physician assessment and treatment. (B) A prospective endoscopic study, with IBD-Control prior to endoscopy and Mayo score of mucosa. IBD teams were blinded to questionnaires. (C) A service evaluation in our unit, auditing implementation of IBD-Control to support a new virtual (telephone) clinic – a case study on integrating PROMs into routine care.

Results 113 IBD-Control questionnaires returned to date. Patients:

Age, mean [sd]: 50 [16] yrs; Female: 54%; UC: 73%; Disease duration, mean [sd]: 7.5 [7.7] yrs. Global Physician Assessment: Inactive 48.3%; Mild 41.3%; Moderate 10.3%; Severe 0%. Summary scores, mean [sd]: IBD-Control-8 (range: 0–16): 11.7 [5.2]; IBD-Control-VAS (range: 0–100): 73.5 [76.1]. Psychometric properties: *Completion rate*: 93–94% per item; Strong correlation between the 2 summary scores: IBD-Control-8 vs IBD-Control-VAS, $r = 0.83$; *Validity* of summary scores,