Methodology: Prospectively palliative in-patient hospice and community patients had medications deprescribed recorded and the rational. This was prospectively gaining a timeline of medication stops respective to date of death.

Results: Data collected from 13/3/18 to 30/06/18 with 647 medication stops of 197 differing medications. 56% (361) medication stops were due to approaching end-of-life, 15% (93) due to swallowing difficulties, 17% (109) due to rationalising medications.

The median number of days of palliative care deprescribing any medication before death is 4, with 25% being 1 day and 75% being 9 days before death. Groups were identified and individually measured, including statins (median 5 days), Beta-blockers (median 2), ACEi (median 5), anti-platelets (median 9), Warfarin/NOACS (median 5).

Conclusion/discussion: By describing deprescribing current practice we outline the short timespan between deprescribing and death for medications arguably of minimal patient benefit at this point in life. The rational for stopping correlates with this postulation, outlining we are stopping the vast majority of medications due to the dying phase rather than preemptively.

**134 COMMUNICATION WITH PALLIATIVE CARE PATIENTS ABOUT DRIVING AND OPIOIDS**

Emma Collins, Andrew Jones. Cwm Taf University Health Board

10.1136/bmjspcare-2019-ASP.158

Background: Recent changes in the law regarding liability and driving offences whilst on opioids, highlighted by the MHRA, reinforces the importance of communication about driving whilst taking medication and the law. A robust approach to communicating and documenting this information is required.

Methods: The audit standard was NICE CG140: ‘Opioids in palliative care: safe and effective prescribing of strong opioids for pain in palliative care of adults’. Patients seen in January 2015 in outpatients, day unit, inpatients and the community initiated on opioids or had dose titration, were reviewed. Cases were excluded if had an ECOG of 3–4. The data was analysed and presented at our clinical governance meeting. This triggered a redesign of our inpatient admission proforma. The method of documenting driving status on electronic patient records was changed and promoted. Driving safety leaflets were made available. The audit cycle was completed in June 2017.

Results: Pre-implementation, 33 cases were included in analysis. 9% of cases had their driving status documented. 0% had documentation of discussion of side effects and 9% documented that the patient was informed about the consequences of driving on opioids. On re-audit, 20 cases were analysed. Driving status was documented in 50% of cases, 30% showed discussion of side effects, and 30% documented consequences of driving on opioids.

Conclusions: It is the clinician’s responsibility to appropriately counsel patients on risks of driving whilst taking medications, to provide ‘medical defence’. Although conversations often occur, they are seldom documented and can therefore not be evidenced. Having written information to offer can provide evidence, but is no substitute for thorough conversation and eliciting comprehension. In our department, more needs to be done to educate the SPCT to ensure this is done routinely as part of the first assessment, and reviewed frequently, with changes to medications being a prompt.

**135 IS PATIENT-LED FOLLOW-UP (PLFU) AN ACCEPTABLE AND EFFECTIVE SERVICE FOR HOSPICE COMMUNITY PATIENTS? A CROSS SECTIONAL COHORT OF HOSPICE COMMUNITY PATIENTS ON PLFU (LITERATURE SEARCH)**

Rosemary Chester, Stephen Cox. Pilgrims Hospices

10.1136/bmjspcare-2019-ASP.158

Background: The current economic climate, increasing cancer survivorship, frailty and palliative care needs has led to a focus on resources. One method being evaluated is patient-led follow-up (PLFU) as a safe, more cost-effective alternative to traditional follow-up. Evidence shows that traditional appointments do not necessarily coincide with patient need or symptoms, and the volume of reviews limits the ability to respond to more urgent needs. Studies in rheumatology and breast cancer patients have demonstrated that nurse-led telephone helplines, education sessions, and open-access in ‘low-risk’ groups resulted in significant reductions in healthcare utilisation without compromising clinical or psychological wellbeing.
Furthermore, qualitative evidence suggests PLFU patients felt empowered. Within palliative medicine, focus has shifted towards Phase of Illness to determine follow-up frequency, with stable patients being moved towards PLFU.

**Methods** A cross-sectional cohort of PLFU patients is being followed for six months. Data being collected includes Phase, Karnofsky Performance Score (KPS), diagnosis, Integrated Palliative care Outcome Scale (IPOS) and outcome.

**Results** The project is ongoing but preliminary findings include identifying two cohorts frequently assigned to PLFU; nursing home patients, and breast cancer patients. Breast follow-up appears to be leading the way in PLFU, therefore patients transitioning from oncology follow-up to palliative care may be more amenable to a PLFU approach.

**Conclusions** The literature has demonstrated PLFU as a safe, cost-effective alternative to traditional follow-up and a way of ensuring a reactive service with resources to respond to crises whilst encouraging self-management and patient empowerment. Our study aims to demonstrate how PLFU translates to palliative care, and how we might identify those patients who would be candidates for this approach. It also aims to gain qualitative feedback from focus groups of both patients and relatives of deceased patients who can reflect on the transition to PLFU.

**EMPOWERING PATIENTS AND CARERS: A PROGRAMME WITHDRAWAL OF DIALYSIS; END OF LIFE TO ENCOURAGE ‘THINKING AHEAD’ IN THE SUPPORTIVE PHASE OF A PALLIATIVE CANCER DIAGNOSIS**

Kath Lambert, Charlotte Rock, Wendy Whitaker, Janet O'Brien, Harrogate and District NHS Foundation Trust

10.1136/bmjspcare-2019-ASP.159

**Background** The Harrogate and District Hospital Health and Wellbeing Project has successfully delivered education programmes to patients living with and beyond a cancer diagnosis. In 2018 the Palliative Care Team (PCT) was approached to develop a programme with focus on patients with a palliative diagnosis and their carers.

The aims of the programme include: to keep patients as well as possible for as long as possible; offer support to carers; provide information on local services; discuss advance care planning (ACP) and choices for future care.

**Methods** The programme is delivered by a range of professionals (e.g. PCT (Consultant and Clinical Nurse Specialist (CNS)), Psychologist, Welfare and Benefits Specialist, Carers Resource, Occupational Therapy). Referral is by Oncologist or Cancer CNS. Referral criteria includes: a palliative diagnosis for at least two months; palliative treatment or best supportive care and likely to be in the last year of life. Patients must be well enough to attend three two hour sessions over a six week period. Patients and their carer can either attend alone, together or the carer can attend alone. Maximum number of attendees is 12 per programme.

**Results** Three programmes have been delivered in 2018. Total number of attendees is 26. The patients had a range of diagnoses. Drop-out for those who have attended the first session is very low. The programme has evaluated extremely well. Sessions are reported to be informative and interesting. It has facilitated discussion of ACP in an environment with attendees supporting each other. Knowledge of local services and options for future care has resulted in informed decision making.

**Conclusions** The ‘Thinking ahead’ programme will continue in 2019 with an increase in number of sessions to meet increasing referrals. The model has the potential to be developed for patients with a non-malignant diagnosis.

**WITHDRAWAL OF DIALYSIS; END OF LIFE CONSIDERATIONS AND ADVANCED CARE PLANNING**

J Prentice, L Hetherington, M Findlay, T Collidge. NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde, Scottish Renal Palliative Collaborative Group, The Glasgow Renal and Transplant Unit, South Glasgow University Hospital, The Beatson West of Scotland Cancer Centre, The University of Glasgow

10.1136/bmjspcare-2019-ASP.160

**Background** Dialysis withdrawal is the commonest cause of death in patients with end stage renal disease aged >75. Factors contributing the withdrawal have been described but to what degree advanced care planning (ACP) is initiated in unknown. We sought to describe current practice within a large renal unit.

**Methods** We performed a retrospective analysis of patients who died following dialysis withdrawal from 2015–2017. Patient demographics, markers of health, triggers for withdrawal, admissions, timing and degree of ACP discussions were extracted.

**Results** 52 patients were included. Median age at death 76 (IQR 70, 81) years. Median duration of dialysis was 42 (IQR 10.5, 75) months with 30.8% dying within one year of commencement of dialysis. Median Charlson co-morbidity score was 8 (IQR 6, 9) with documentation of ‘frailty’ present in 52% of the cohort. 25% of the patients had an acute event triggering withdrawal. ACP was discussed with 34% of patients with 82% of patients achieving their preferred place of death where this was documented. Median length of last admission was 24 days (IQR 11, 43) compared with 11 days (IQR 0, 55) if the patient had an ACP (p-value 0.736).

**Conclusion** We are not good at initiating timely ACP in deteriorating dialysis patients despite identifying such patients. With an increasingly frail, multi-morbid population the need for these discussions will increase. Early ACP discussions with frail patients starting dialysis may inform later conversations and improve their quality of care. Encouragingly asking about preferred place of death improved the likelihood of achieving a death in the patients preferred location. Identification of poor prognostic markers such as dementia, introducing staff training in palliative care and adopting routine frailty scoring may guide timely conversations in anticipation of deterioration in vulnerable patient groups.

**THE INFLUENCE OF COMBINED ONCOLOGY AND PALLIATIVE CARE CLINICS (COPC) ON HOSPITAL ADMISSIONS**

Rachel Newman, Abbie Hewitt, Lucy Hines, Molly Jones, Shauna Green. University of Exeter Medical School, Royal Cornwall Hospitals NHS Trust, Cornwall Hospice Care

10.1136/bmjspcare-2019-ASP.161

**Background** Current evidence suggests early palliative care involvement (PCI) alongside oncology care improves quality of