

Abstract P45 Table 1 Summary of results

	Pre-intervention	Post-intervention
Endoscopies, n	53	37
Aim 1: Recycling		
Total waste, kg	68.4	41.7
Mean waste per procedure, kg	1.3	1.1
Infectious waste, kg (%)	68.4 (100)	36.1 (86.6)
Recycling waste, kg (%)	n/a	5.6 (13.4)
Aim 2: Patient Information Leaflets (PIL)		
Patients who received a PIL, n	19	18
Total PILs, n	24	21
Paper PILs, n (%)	24 (100)	13 (61.9)
Digital PILs, n (%)	n/a	8 (38.1)

Conclusions This quality improvement project was successful in trialling two simple measures to reduce the environmental impact of UHCW endoscopy. Although the aims of the project were achieved, cost and carbon savings were modest. This indicates the need to combine these initiatives within a suite of other environmental measures. Savings could be enhanced by increasing staff awareness of waste segregation and identifying other areas for QR code use. Offering paper leaflets as a choice for patient information will need to be maintained to ensure accessibility. Further work is needed to scale up the changes across the department.

P46

A RE-AUDIT ON THE INVESTIGATIONS AND FIRST LINE TREATMENT FOR PATIENTS REFERRED TO A SPECIALIST IRRITABLE BOWEL SYNDROME CLINIC

^{1,2}Mehejabeen Murshed*, ^{2,3}Chris Probert, ^{2,3}Thomas Edward Conley. ¹School of Medicine, University Of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK; ²Department of Gastroenterology, Liverpool University NHS Foundation Trust, Liverpool, UK; ³Institute of Systems, Molecular and Integrative Biology, University of Liverpool, UK

10.1136/gutjnl-2024-BSG.128

Introduction This two-cycle clinical audit evaluates the appropriateness of investigations and first-line treatments for patients referred to a specialist Irritable Bowel Syndrome (IBS) clinic. The audit aims to assess adherence to clinical guidelines, identify areas for improvement, and enhance the overall management of IBS patients, with a focus on reducing associated NHS costs.¹

Methods A retrospective review of online medical records was conducted for confirmed IBS patients referred to the specialist IBS clinic our Trust. The first audit (Jan-Dec 2022, 118 patients) assessed adherence to guidelines and deviations. Interventions, such as sending British Dietetic Association (BDA) guidance letters and minimizing repeated investigations post-clinic to reduce wastage, were implemented. A re-audit (Aug 2023-Jan 2024, 49 patients) was then performed to evaluate the impact of these changes.

Results The first cycle showed that 18% of patients was not tested pre-clinic for coeliac disease (CD) and only 1 of these was tested post-clinic. Pre-clinic, there were 7 patients (24%) in whom faecal calprotectin was indicated but not performed, and 5 others who were tested that who did not require testing. Conversely, only 3 patients out of 118 had colonoscopies all of which were justified. Dietary modifications, such as the

first line BDA advice, were prescribed to only 65% of patients.

The reaudit reported a 10% improvement in the number of patients who had no pre-clinic coeliac serology. 100% of patients with indications for faecal calprotectin were tested pre-clinic. Hence, there were no patients presenting to secondary care who required inflammatory bowel disease testing as opposed to 24% which were missed pre-intervention. No post-clinic colonoscopies were requested.

There was only a 2% improvement in the prescription of dietary modifications, such as the first line BDA advice with appropriate guidance from dietitians.

Conclusion This re-audit suggests that there are still IBS patients in primary care who are not routinely tested for coeliac disease. Whilst there is an improvement in the appropriate investigations and reduction in the unnecessary tests done in the specialist clinic, documentation of first line dietary advice remains patchy. Recommendations include a formal action plan to improve adherence to best practices in IBS management.

REFERENCE

1. British Society of Gastroenterology guidelines on the management of irritable bowel syndrome | *Gut* [Internet]. [cited 2024 Jan 26]. Available from: <https://gut.bmjjournals.org/content/70/7/1214>

P47

MANAGING IRON DEFICIENCY ANAEMIA (IDA): A DISTRICT GENERAL HOSPITAL EXPERIENCE

Rihazur Rahman*, Mohamed Elnagar, Pooja Jeyakumar, Siva Nagam, Riaz Dor. Queen's Hospital Burton, Burton-on-Trent, UK

10.1136/gutjnl-2024-BSG.129

Introduction IDA is a commonly encountered clinical entity. It may be precipitated by different causes including dietary deficiency and malabsorption but may be caused by a significant GI pathology in 1/3 of men and postmenopausal women. British Society of Gastroenterology (BSG) guidelines for IDA in adults recommends that gastrointestinal investigation should be considered on an urgent basis for IDA.

Methods A retrospective review of patients referred via 2-week wait pathways to our hospital with IDA. Review included demographics, comorbidities, primary care investigations and management in the secondary care settings.

Results 184 patients (89Female) referred with IDA between Sep2022 – Sep2023 were reviewed. On referral, 105/184 (57%) had no haematins done, only 31(17%) had coeliac screening, urine analysis wasn't done in 125 (68%) but 104 (57%) patients did have oral iron commenced. The average time between GP referral and clinic review was 15 days. After review in the clinic, 21/184 (11%) had extra blood tests. 95 (51%) had both OGD and colonoscopy, 37 (19%) had OGD alone of whom 2/37 had CT colonoscopy and 15 had full body CT. Colonoscopy was the only investigation offered to 42/184 (23%) whilst 4 (2%) had imaging alone. Endoscopic investigations were performed in 36 without ferritin checked to confirm IDA. Cancer was found in 17/184 (9%), non-cancer GI pathology was identified in 91 others (49%) and no cause was found in 75 (40%). Of these 75, 65 were discharged whilst 10 required further investigations. One patient was referred with an MCV>100 and raised ferritin who underwent endoscopy. Dietary history was documented for 3 patients only.