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Background Restorative proctocolectomy is considered the procedure of choice in patients with UC refractory to medical therapy. Inflammation of the pouch is a common complication and in some cases fails to respond to antibiotics, the mainstay of treatment. In such cases, corticosteroid, immunomodulatory or biologic treatments are an option. However, our understanding of the effectiveness of IFX for both chronic pouchitis and Crohn’s-like inflammation are based on small studies.

Methods This was an observational, retrospective, multi-centre study to assess the effectiveness IFX for inflammatory disorders related to the pouch. The primary outcome was the development IFX failure defined by primary non-response or secondary loss of response to IFX.

Results 38 patients were included. 20/38 (53%) who were initiated on IFX for inflammatory disorders of the pouch had IFX failure, 4/38 (11%) had primary non-response, and 16/38 (42%) had secondary loss of response with a median follow-up of 265 days (range 82–2119). Of those that had IFX failure 10/20 (50%) avoided an ileostomy by switching to an alternative biologic. In total, 28/38 (74%) avoided an ileostomy, of these, 17/38 (45%) continued on their IFX after a median follow-up of 311 days (42–3968), 5/38 (13%) were changed to Adalimumab after a median follow-up of 498 days (1–1544), 4/38 (11%) were changed to Vedolizumab after a median follow-up of 569 (251–1138), 1 achieved histological remission and stopped all treatments at 251 days and 1 was maintained on methotrexate and multiple antibiotics after 3968 days.

Conclusions After initial IFX therapy over half will fail first line IFX, of those that fail half can avoid an ileostomy by switching to an alternative biologic. Patients should be counselled about a high incidence of failure and alternatives should be considered.
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Background Restorative proctocolectomy is performed in patients with UC refractory to medical therapy, UC related neoplasia, and in some patients with familial adenomatous polyposis. Incontinence can occur in up to 12%–31% of patients with an ileoanal pouch. Incontinence and evacuatory disorders associated with the ileoanal pouch can be particularly problematic and difficult to treat using conventional therapies.

Biofeedback therapy is a behavioural treatment which is non-invasive and offers a non-surgical approach as an alternative or adjunct for patients with functional bowel disorders. The theoretical basis for biofeedback is ‘learning through reinforcement’ or ‘operant conditioning’.

Methods This was a retrospective single centre study. All patients attending for biofeedback at our institution between Jan 2012 and Oct 2017 were identified to include all those that attended for a pouch related problems. We recorded patient reported subjective improvements following biofeedback. The validated International Consultation on Incontinence Questionnaire was used to assess improvement in incontinent symptoms, and the evacuatory disorder questionnaire was used to assess improvement in evacuatory disorders.

Results n=26. Based on patients’ feedback at next clinical encounter following biofeedback, nine reported much improvement, 11 reported some improvement and six reported no improvement. In the group treated for incontinence, quality of life improved significantly from a median pre-treatment score of 80 to a post-treatment score of 41 (p=0.01) (table 1). Biofeedback reduced pain, bloating, straining and laxative use in patients with evacuatory disorders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Pre-biofeedback score (median, range)</th>
<th>Post-biofeedback score (median, range)</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bowel pattern</td>
<td>62 (49–62)</td>
<td>46 (39–62)</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowel control</td>
<td>82 (33–102)</td>
<td>53 (11–76)</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-scored</td>
<td>22 (17–35)</td>
<td>29 (12–29)</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of life</td>
<td>80 (62–98)</td>
<td>41 (30–55)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abstract IDDF2018-ABS-0057 Figure 1  Kaplan-Meier graph showing 10-year cumulative incidence of ileostomy free survival.

Abstract IDDF2018-ABS-0057 Table 1  Incontinence disorder using objective scoring system (n=5) ICQb Scores.