

access include: age, sex, ethnicity, socioeconomic position, accessibility of services, and diagnosis (Allsop, Ziegler, Mulvey, et al. *Palliat Med.* 2018; 32(8): 1322–1333). Access to community specialist palliative care (CSPC) services may reflect this.

**Aims** To identify, 1) patterns in the populations accessing CSPC services, and 2) underserved populations.

**Methods** A retrospective evaluation of all referrals made to three CSPC services in one calendar year. Time in days calculated for: referral to discharge/death, and discharge to death in the cases discharged before death. Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) deciles (a surrogate for socioeconomic position) and straight-line distances between patients' residence and hospice were obtained. Access to palliative care was considered in terms of patients receiving a referral, and the duration under care in time from referral to death (days).

**Results** 2579 referrals (47% female, median age 76, 59% White British). Cancer was the modal diagnosis (72%). The modal IMD decile was 10 (least deprived), and median 7. Most referrals lived 5–10km from hospice. The median time from referral to discharge or death was 20 days, and from referral to death, 46 days. Younger age groups, cancer diagnoses, higher IMD decile and White British ethnicity had longer median referral to death times.

**Discussion** Fewer referrals were made for those with a non-cancer diagnosis, lower socioeconomic position, non-white British ethnicity, and residence further from the hospice. Those with non-cancer diagnoses, lower socioeconomic position, and older age groups, received fewer days of CSPC. CSPC remains aligned to the needs of less deprived, older, white British patients with cancer. Introducing palliative care referral to guidelines for management of terminal conditions and education on the benefits of early referral to SPC (Aldridge, Hasselaar, Garralda, et al. *Palliat Med.* 2015; 30(3): 224–239), and increased collaboration with underserved communities to design services aligned with their needs is required.

P-198

#### OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES FOR INVOLVING PEOPLE WITH LIVED EXPERIENCE OF INCLUSION HEALTH AS CO-RESEARCHERS IN PALLIATIVE AND END OF LIFE RESEARCH: A RAPID REVIEW AND THEMATIC SYNTHESIS

<sup>1</sup>Jodie Crooks, <sup>2</sup>Kate Flemming, <sup>3</sup>Caroline Shulman, <sup>1</sup>Briony Hudson. <sup>1</sup>Marie Curie, London, UK; <sup>2</sup>Department of Health Sciences, University of York, York, UK; <sup>3</sup>Pathway, London, UK

10.1136/spcare-2023-HUNC.218

**Background** Co-research promotes involvement of individuals with relevant lived experience as equal members of a research team. Recently, the importance of co-research within palliative and end of life care has been highlighted. However, few recommendations exist regarding best practice for involving people from inclusion health groups as co-researchers in palliative and end of life care research (i.e., people from socially excluded groups, who typically experience multiple disadvantages that contribute to poor health).

**Aim** To identify and synthesise qualitative literature outlining barriers and facilitators for involving people from four inclusion health groups (individuals with lived experience of: homelessness, substance use disorders, incarceration or

exchanging sex for money) in palliative and end of life care research.

**Methods** Rapid review with qualitative evidence synthesis. Three electronic databases were searched (2012 – 2022). Data was extracted from the perspectives of both academic researchers and lived experience co-researchers, including both first order-data (quotes from individuals with lived experience), and second order data (original authors' interpretations). Analysis followed thematic synthesis methodology.

**Results** Three eligible papers were identified. Two involved individuals with experience of incarceration, and one involved people with experience of homelessness. This corresponded to eighteen individuals with lived experience. Challenges for involvement included: facilitating appropriate reimbursement; overcoming stigma and reluctance to share power; protection vs. patronisation; how lived experience affects positionality (bias and scepticism); and the emotional burden of research. Benefits included: advanced level of insight, two-way learning opportunities and the relatability of lived experience co-researchers.

**Conclusions** There are few, good quality studies offering insight into barriers and facilitators for lived experience co-researcher involvement in palliative and end of life care research. Greater understanding of and recommendations for safe and impactful inclusion is needed to support and encourage researchers to involve people from inclusion health groups as co-researchers in palliative and end of life care research.

P-199

#### CO-DEVELOPING SKILLS IN WORKING WITH INTERPRETERS IN CONVERSATIONS ABOUT END OF LIFE

<sup>1</sup>Jaya Jaitly, <sup>2</sup>Linda Birt, <sup>3</sup>Christina Faull. <sup>1</sup>University Hospitals of Leicester, Leicester, UK; <sup>2</sup>University of Leicester, Leicester, UK; <sup>3</sup>LOROS Hospice, Leicester, UK

10.1136/spcare-2023-HUNC.219

**Background** Personalised communication is essential in effective palliative care (Silva, Genoff, Zaballa. *J Pain Symptom Manage.* 2016;51(3):569–80; Jaitly, Bronnert. *BMJ Support Palliat Care.* 2023;13:A52). However, language barriers coupled with diversity in cultural and faith backgrounds can make personalising information, dialogue and care planning complex. The lack of teaching around this subject in UK medical schools compounds the problem. The 2021 UK census shows that 8.9% of the population does not identify English as their primary language, making it a pressing concern for healthcare providers.

**Aims** This project aims to co-develop, pilot and evaluate learning resources for working with interpreters during end-of-life consultations. We report here on developing this work.

**Methods** Facilitated workshops drew on the experiences from a diverse range of stakeholders, who had delivered and/or received care, where the primary language was not shared. Discussion centred on real-life scenarios in advanced illness and end of life care involving complex discussions with interpreters.

**Results** The workshops highlighted that culture, as well as language, both played a significant role in communicating with non-English speaking patients. In an ideal situation, family and friends should not be expected to interpret consultations, especially in the emotional context of end-of-life discussions. The complexity of reality makes this challenging.