MEDLINE, EMBASE, Cochrane Library, Scopus, CINAHL, HTA and DARE, 3 websites and 7 trial registers were searched from 2008 to 2021. Study inclusion criteria were: malignant biliary obstruction; intervention as endoscopic RFA, either to fit a stent (primary RFA) or to clear a blocked stent (secondary RFA); primary outcomes were survival, quality of life or procedure-related adverse events. Risk of bias was assessed using the RoB 2.0 and ROBINS-I tools. Primary analysis was meta-analysis of the hazard ratio of mortality.

**Results** 68 studies (1742 patients) were identified but only 2 randomised trials, 1 retrospective case control study and 3 retrospective cohort studies reported a hazard ratio of death for primary RFA compared to stent-only control. The pooled hazard ratio of mortality for primary RFA compared to stent-only was 0.34 (95% confidence interval (CI) 0.21 to 0.55). There was moderate heterogeneity ($I^2 = 53\%$) however the studies were consistently in favour of primary RFA. There was insufficient evidence available to analyse effectiveness in secondary RFA. No evidence about the impact on quality of life was found. There was no evidence of increased risk of cholangitis (risk ratio 1.15, 95% CI 0.63 to 2.12) or pancreatitis (risk ratio 1.34, 95% CI 0.55 to 3.25), but there was an increase in cholecystitis (risk ratio 11.47, 95% CI 2.28 to 57.66). Inconsistencies in standard reporting and study design were noted e.g. adverse outcomes and lack of standardised comparator groups. RFA was estimated to cost £2,659 and produced 0.18 QALYs more than no RFA on average. With an ICER of £14,392/QALY, RFA was likely to be cost-effective at a threshold of £20,000/QALY. The source of the vast majority of decision uncertainty lay in the effect of RFA on stent patency.

**Conclusions** Primary RFA is associated with increased survival and appears cost-effective. The evidence for the impact of secondary RFA on survival and of quality of life is limited. There was no increase in the risk of post-ERCP cholangitis or pancreatitis but increased risk of cholecystitis. High quality RCTs to investigate primary and secondary RFA are needed with accurate documentation of quality of life, adverse event rates and survival.
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**Introduction** Updated guidance from the British Society of Gastroenterology (BSG) no longer recommends endoscopic surveillance after colorectal cancer resection or polypectomy in patients over 75 years. We aimed to evaluate the outcomes of surveillance in older adults in our local population, which is considered one of the most elderly in the country.

**Methods** A retrospective analysis of patient records was conducted for patients over 70 years, who had undergone colorectal cancer surgery with curative intent, between 2014 and 2016 at our district general hospital. We identified patients that had surveillance and those that did not. In the surveillance group, endoscopic findings were noted, including the presence of high-risk findings according to the BSG criteria, as well as complications following endoscopy. Parameters of interest for both groups were age, sex, ASA grade, Charlson comorbidity index (CCI), original tumour site, resection margin, TNM stage, CEA level, whether the patient received neoadjuvant or adjuvant therapy, overall survival and cause of death. Statistical analysis was performed using SPSS v27.

**Results** 207 patients were included in the study. 199 patients had major resection and 8 had endoscopic mucosal excision for their primary cancer. Median age was 77 years. Further demographics are shown in table 1. 108 patients had at least one surveillance endoscopy, of which 41 (38%) identified polyyps, including 11 (10%) with high risk findings. No major complications were reported. Overall survival was greater in the surveillance group at 38 months, compared to 21.5 months in the non-surveillance group ($p<0.01$). Mortality due to colorectal cancer was lower in the surveillance group (8 patients vs 29 patients) including mortality due to local recurrence (1 patient vs 7 patients). Parameters that were significantly lower in the surveillance group were age, ASA grade, CCI, M stage and CEA. There was no significant difference in sex, tumour site, resection margin, T stage, N stage and...