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**Introduction**

The increasing incidence and prevalence of inflammatory bowel disease (IBD) has fuelled the need for innovative models of care. We aimed to compare effectiveness of e-health interventions with standard care in management of IBD.

**Methods**

We searched Medline, Embase, PubMed, CINAHL, Psyclnfo. Clinical trials registry and Cochrane databases for randomized controlled trials published in the English language until November 2020, comparing e-Health interventions to standard care for patients with IBD. Primary outcomes included difference in disease activity and patients in clinical remission at the end of follow up. Secondary outcomes included differences in quality of life (QoL), IBD-related knowledge & rate ratios (RR) for endoscopic procedures, total healthcare encounters, corticosteroid use, clinic visits and IBD related hospitalization or surgery. RevMan 5.4 was used for data analysis.

**Results**

Nine studies (n=1841; 991 e-Health & 850-controls) were identified. There was no statistically significant difference between the mean disease activity scores for ulcerative colitis (UC) standard mean difference (SMD) 0.22, 95% confidence interval (CI): 0.04-0.48) and Crohn’s disease (CD)(SMD 0.02, 95% CI: -0.18-0.22) in the e-Health and standard care groups and no statistically significant difference in patients in clinical remission at the end of follow up between both groups (OR: 1.05, 95% CI: 0.76-1.45). Higher QoL (SMD 0.19, 95% CI: 0.05-0.34) and IBD knowledge (SMD 0.25, 95% CI: 0.12-0.37) scores were noted in the e-Health group compared to standard care. E-Health group had less clinic visits (RR 0.85, 95% CI: 0.78-0.93) while there were no statistically significant differences noted in the RR for endoscopic procedures, total healthcare encounters, corticosteroid use, and IBD-related hospitalization or surgery between both groups.

**Conclusions**

E-Health interventions are comparable with standard care for impact on disease activity, remission, endoscopy utilization, total healthcare encounters, corticosteroid use, and IBD-related hospitalization or surgery. However, e-Health group had better outcomes with QoL, IBD related knowledge & fewer clinic visits.
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**Introduction**

Liver biopsy carries significant risks, including bleeding and death. It is routinely undertaken to confirm imaging evidence of hepatic metastases. However, establishing a cancer diagnosis beyond doubt is of limited benefit if a patient is not suitable for oncological therapy. We have therefore examined outcomes in patients undergoing liver biopsy for metastatic cancer.

**Methods**

Hospital Episode statistics were examined to identify patients undergoing percutaneous liver biopsy between 2010 and 2019 and diagnosed with metastatic cancer. Multivariable logistic regression examined risk factors for mortality at 14 and 30 days and receiving chemotherapy.

**Results**

30992 patients underwent liver biopsy for metastatic cancer (median age of 67 (IQR 59-74) years, 52% female). 28% underwent biopsy during an emergency inpatient stay and 9% died within 14 days and 27.6% within 30 days of their biopsy. In contrast, only 2.2% of patients having an outpatient biopsy died within 14 days and 8.6% within 30 days.

Increased 30 day mortality was associated with: inpatient biopsy (odds ratio 3.37 (95%CI 3.15-3.61)) and increasing comorbidity (Charlson score 1-4: 1.21 (1.11-1.32)). Lower 30 day mortality was associated with all ages under 70 (for 18-29 yr olds: 3.79 (2.67-5.39)) and increasing comorbidity (Charlson score 1-4: 1.21 (1.11-1.32)). Lower 30 day mortality was associated with all ages under 70 (for 18-29 yr olds: 3.79 (2.67-5.39)) and increasing comorbidity (Charlson score 1-4: 1.21 (1.11-1.32)).

14,244 (46%) patients received chemotherapy within 6 months of liver biopsy; 53% of those undergoing outpatient biopsy but only 33% of those biopsied as an inpatient. 18% of patients received only one dose of chemotherapy and 18% died within 14 days of chemotherapy. Receiving chemotherapy was negatively associated with biopsy as an inpatient (0.45 (0.42-0.47)) and increasing comorbidity (Charlson score 1-4 0.85 (0.80-0.91)). All ages under 70 (for 18-29 yr olds: 3.79 (2.67-5.39)) and female sex (1.06 (1.01-1.11)) were associated with receiving chemotherapy. Medium and high volume providers of biopsies were also associated with receiving chemotherapy compared to the lowest volume providers (1.13 (1.04-1.22) and 1.51 (1.39-1.64), respectively).

**Conclusions**

Mortality is high following liver biopsy to confirm metastatic cancer in patients admitted as an emergency. Only a third of such patients go on to receive chemotherapy. Clinicians should carefully consider the benefit of invasive procedures.