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Abstract P309 Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Moviprep</th>
<th>Plenvu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of patients</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion who completed ingestion</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>95.4% P=0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean total BBPS score</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>6.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 1 segment with BBPS score ≥ 3</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results 479 patients were included. Median age was 66 (55–71) years. All patients had either face to face or telephone 'pre-assessment' by specialist screening practitioners. 73% of colonoscopies were performed on morning list.

Of the 7 patients unable to complete Plenvu, 43% for nausea and 28.5% vomited. For Moviprep (19 patients); 21% for nausea and 10.5% vomited. The remainder of the patients reported ‘just being unable’ to complete the agent.

Conclusions In our analysis, there was no significant difference between the efficacy of Plenvu and Moviprep in bowel cleansing. There was no significant difference in the patients ability to complete ingestion of Plenvu vs Moviprep despite the lower volume. This service evaluation does not support a switch to the more expensive cleansing agent.

P310 HIGH INCIDENCE OF MICROSCOPIC COLITIS IN PATIENTS WITH DIARRHOEA SUSPECTED OF HAVING COLORECTAL CANCER

T O’Connor*, KS Chapple. Sheffield Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Sheffield, UK

Introduction A persistent change in bowel habit to a looser stool may signify an underlying colorectal cancer and in the UK such patients are often investigated via the urgent ‘2 week wait’ suspected colorectal cancer exclusion pathway. Microscopic colitis (MC), a common cause of diarrhoea, is recognised to be under-diagnosed, partly because of poor adherence to British Society of Gastroenterology (BSG) guidance on the performance of colonic biopsies in high-risk patients. The incidence of MC in patients with diarrhoea referred on the ‘2 week wait’ pathway for exclusion of colorectal cancer as a cause of their symptoms is unknown.

Methods Consecutive ‘2 week wait’ patients who underwent a colonoscopy were investigated. Patients were excluded if diarrhoea was not the predominant symptom, if a cause for diarrhoea was diagnosed on colonoscopy or if colonoscopy was incomplete. The number of patients who underwent colonic biopsy, and whether or not this demonstrated the presence of MC was recorded. Similar data was obtained for a second cohort of patients referred for endoscopic investigation of a change in bowel habit outside of a cancer exclusion pathway.

Results Overall, 600 consecutive patients underwent colonoscopic investigation via the ‘2 week wait’ pathway [n=300], or an alternative non-‘2 week wait’ pathway [n=300]. 506 patients (‘2 week wait’ pathway [n=241] and non-‘2 week wait’ pathway [n=265]) were excluded from analysis (diarrhoea not the predominant symptom [n=477], obvious cause of diarrhoea seen during the procedure [n=23], or incomplete procedure [n=6]), leaving 94 patients (2 week wait pathway n=59, non-‘2 week wait’ pathway n=35).

Conclusions There is a high incidence of microscopic colitis (15%) in patients with diarrhoea referred under the ‘2 week wait’ suspected colorectal cancer pathway. Clinicians should have a high index of suspicion for microscopic colitis, regardless of the mode of referral.

P311 PATIENTS’ AND PHYSICIANS’ PERCEPTIONS OF FAECAL MICROBIOTA TRANSPLANTATION TO TREAT CLOSTRIDIUM DIFFICILE INFECTION

Kathryn Olsen*, Cigdem Cinar, Natasza Klas, Kiran Lehal, Robert Sarney, Nabil Quraishi. University Of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK

Introduction Faecal microbiota transplantation (FMT) is recommended as treatment for recurrent Clostridium difficile infection (CDI), with a 94% cure rate and excellent safety profile. However, only 28% of UK hospitals currently offer it. In this review, we attempt to identify the perceived barriers restricting the use of FMT.

Methods We searched Embase, MEDLINE, and PsychInfo for primary research. Articles were excluded if they were not primary research, were not about CDI, did not focus on perceptions of FMT, or they were conference abstracts only. Fourteen relevant articles were identified. These were appraised using appropriate critical appraisal tools.

Results Eight primary studies focussed on physicians’ perceptions and six focussed on patients’ perceptions. Most physicians were aware of or familiar with FMT, but fewer had referred patients for the procedure. The main barriers to referral identified by physicians were the absence of high-quality evidence-based clinical guidelines, poor patient acceptability, and lack of accessibility. Although every study indicated that patients found the nature of FMT unappealing, the majority of patients would undergo the procedure regardless. Patients’ main concerns with FMT were the use of nasogastric tube for the introduction of faecal matter, its safety, and its efficacy.

Conclusions Physicians’ concerns about patient acceptability should not be a factor influencing the recommendation of FMT for recurrent CDI. Patients are more concerned with safety and efficacy than the ‘ick factor’ of FMT. There is a need for physician education and training to overcome barriers concerning accessibility and the unappealing nature of FMT. Additionally, more research is needed to determine the best method of administration; with the identification of more