pathways that are distinct from end-of-life care or voluntary assisted dying. Ultimately, the discussion paper aims to support efforts to develop and implement guidance on the use of palliative care for eating disorders, emphasising compassion, person-centredness, quality of life, autonomy and dignity throughout the illness journey.

Methods The development of the discussion paper involved a literature review and consultations with people with lived experience, their families and supports and professionals across national and international eating disorder and palliative care sectors. The literature review explored key lived experience, clinical and research perspectives and priorities and identified gaps, challenges and facilitators to implementing palliative care for longstanding eating disorders. The consultations, which spanned from 2017 to the present, explored the applicability and need for palliative care for those affected by longstanding eating disorders.

Results The discussion paper advocates for the development of guidelines for the provision of palliative care for longstanding eating disorders. Drawing on the findings from the literature review and consultations, the paper outlines a list of fundamental principles to inform these guidelines: leading with lived experience, person-centred care planning, interdisciplinary collaboration, workforce competence, ethical practice, supportive care networks, robust research and evaluation and public awareness.

Conclusion A transformative shift in care pathways for longstanding eating disorders is needed, including the integration of palliative care, to address the multifaceted and complex needs of this group. The discussion paper calls for guidelines addressing the recommended principles to be developed through critical and courageous dialogue and action across the eating disorder and palliative care sectors and with people with lived experience. People with longstanding eating disorders, their families, supports and communities deserve access to compassionate and holistic care pathways that reshape care experiences and address a long-neglected aspect of palliative care.

P-13 GENOMIC VARIATION IN SYMPTOM EXPRESSION IN MEN WITH CASTRATE RESISTANT PROSTATE CANCER

[1,2,3]Phillip Good*, [1,2]Karyn Foster, [4]Ristan Greer, [5]Niara Oliveira, [6]Petra Vayne-Bossert, [2]Adam Ewing, [2]Janet Hardy. *[1]Mater Health, Brisbane, Australia; [2]Mater Research Institute-University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia; [3]St Vincent's Private Hospital, Brisbane, Australia; [4]Torus Research, Brisbane, Australia; [5]University of Queensland, School of Clinical Medicine, Mater Clinical Unit, Brisbane, Australia; [6]Geneva University Hospitals, Hôpital de Bellerive, Geneva, Switzerland*

10.1136/spcare-2024-ANZSPM.61

Background Men with castrate resistant prostate cancer (CRPC) suffer from symptoms related to both their disease and its treatment with marked variation between individuals with respect to symptom expression despite similar tumour burdens. This may be related to genetic variation.

Objective This study aimed to determine whether genetic variation in cytokine expression can predict severity of symptoms in men with CRPC and investigate whether symptom severity was related to tumour burden.

Methods A prospective, longitudinal consecutive patient cohort study across two Queensland sites. Patient characteristics including tumour burden and current treatment were collected at baseline. Symptom severity was assessed using the Edmonton Symptom Assessment Scale (ESAS-R) 3–4 weekly for up to 6 assessments, with blood taken for genetic analysis once during the study. Cytokine gene variants of each participant were assessed using a panel of SNPs most reported to be associated with symptom variation in the literature. Analysis was performed using R software and the package SNPassoc (R Core team, 2021; Gonzalez JR. et al, 2007).

Results Twenty-eight of 67 (42%) of participants had a low, and 39/67 (58%) a high tumour burden. Tumour burden remained constant throughout the study period for all participants. Twenty-six of 67 (39%) participants were classified as having low ESAS-R severity and 67 (61%) as high ESAS-R severity. Symptom severity was not related to tumour burden or patient characteristics. One hundred and forty-four SNPs from 63 participants were analysed, of which results were available for 142 SNPs. Fifteen SNPs were significantly associated with symptom severity. In multivariable analysis, SNP rs2069772 in IL2 ($p = 0.001$), rs1554606 in IL6 ($p=0.003$), rs2227306 in IL8 ($p=0.008$) and rs2069718 in IFNG ($p=0.001$) were highly predictive of symptom severity.

Discussion Although multiple factors can influence symptom severity, genetic variation may well play a part. The early identification of men likely to develop severe symptoms during the course of their prostate cancer could theoretically enable symptoms to be managed more aggressively from an early stage. Our findings also add to the expanding data bases that document the associations of genetic polymorphism with both disease and symptom expression.

P-14 DRUG INTERACTIONS IN PEOPLE ON CANNABIDIOL – IS THERE CAUSE FOR CONCERN?

[1]Georgia Downs, [4]Ristan Greer, [2]Geraldine Moses, [1,2]Taylan Gurgenci, [1,2,3]Phillip Good*, [1]Janet Hardy. *[1]Mater Research Institute-University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia; [2]Mater Health, Brisbane, Australia; [3]St Vincent's Private Hospital, Brisbane, Australia; [4]Torus Research, Brisbane, Australia*

10.1136/spcare-2024-ANZSPM.62

Background There is potential for a wide array of cannabidiol (CBD) drug-drug interactions (DDIs) through modulation of hepatic cytochrome P450 enzymes and various other membrane proteins. Potential DDIs with CBD have been described, but few clinical interaction data exist outside of medications prescribed for epilepsy. Polypharmacy in cancer and palliative care patients increases the likelihood of DDIs. It is therefore important to consider possible drug interactions when prescribing medicinal cannabis.

Objective To look for evidence of drug-drug interactions between concomitant medications and CBD oil in participants with advanced cancer recruited to a placebo-controlled trial of medicinal cannabis for symptom control.

Methods Participants were those recruited to a randomised controlled trial of synthetic CBD versus placebo (MedCan-1, ACTRN 12618001220257, J Clin Oncol 2023;41(7);1444–1452). All participants provided a list of concomitant medications taken in conjunction with trial medications and were advised to continue them throughout the study. Adverse events were recorded throughout the trial. Surrogate measures were used to identify possible drug interactions: 1) the maximum mL of oil self-selected by patients in CBD or placebo groups in relation to specific drug groups or individual agents (on the basis that co-administration of other drugs might limit the dose of CBD tolerated), 2) the occurrence of any new or