

## ABSTRACT SUBMISSION ACKNOWLEDGEMENT FOR WSM LONDON 2016

**Thank you for submitting your abstract for WSM London 2016.**

You can edit it at any time before the submission deadline by logging into the [profile area](#) and select **abstract submissions**.

The submission deadline is **23:59 on Monday 31 August**. Please check your abstract, references and the author details thoroughly prior to this date.

Submission of your abstract is subject to accepting the following terms of submission

- Your work has not been published elsewhere, e.g.as an abstract, letter or full paper in a journal or website (This does not preclude presentation at another meeting, so long as the abstract has not been published. If the work has been accepted by a journal in any form, it must not be published (in print or online) before this abstract is presented. Please seek advice from the AAGBI if uncertain. If the abstract has been presented at another meeting, it is not necessary to state this in the abstract, but it must be stated during oral presentation/included on the poster.
- That appropriate ethical approval has been obtained and that written informed consent has been obtained from research subjects, and written consent for publication from patients for case reports. (It is not necessary to state this in the abstract, but it must be stated during oral presentation/included on the poster).
- That any commercial interests or conflicts of interest regarding the abstract have been declared explicitly (please give details where necessary).
- That if the abstract is published in *Anaesthesia* in the form of a fully referenceable online supplement, minor changes may be made by the Editor and the copyright will rest with the AAGBI.

---

### Presenting Author Details

Title:	Dr
First Name:	Manojit
Surname:	Sinha
Institution/Organisation:	King
Job Title:	Advanced Pain Trainee
Contact telephone number	07588733750
Email:	drsinha13@hotmail.com
Please re-type your email address:	drsinha13@hotmail.com

### Presenting Author Details

Abstract Title:  
Do patients know what they have come in for? A re-audit of patients attending a chronic pain block list.

---

**Abstract text:**

In 2013, we audited patients' knowledge of the chronic pain procedure they were due to have when they attended the Day Surgery Unit (DSU) for the block. Thirty four percent of patients did not know what injection they were having done and 33% could not remember a single potential complication. Despite that the patients gave a 100% satisfaction rate with the doctor and subsequent explanation. We started sending patients copies of all letters sent to their GP, consented new patients in clinic and gave them a copy of this consent alongside the information leaflet to try and improve knowledge. We re-audited and also included a section on patients' expectations from the pain procedure.

## Methods

Patients were asked to complete a questionnaire on arrival in the DSU prior to consenting. The form included a list of pain procedures and complications for them to circle. We asked if this was their first procedure and if they remembered receiving/reading an information sheet. We also asked patients questions about their expectations from the procedure, including how long they thought it would last and what aspects of their life it might improve.

## Results

Seventy five patients completed the questionnaire. Twenty eight (37%) patients did not remember the name of the procedure they were having done, despite 12 of them stating they had read the information leaflet and were having a repeat procedure. Forty nine (65%) patients remembered receiving an information leaflet about it but from those, 10 patients admitted they had not read it. Fifty five (73%) patients stated they understood the risks involved but of this 47 (62%) only remembered one or less complications. Sixteen patients did not understand and 4 patients were unsure. Bruising was the most common risk ticked (28%), followed by infection (20%) and 21 patients (18%) did not remember any risks. Twenty five (36%) patients thought the injection would work for 6 months, 24 (35%) for at least 3 months. The majority of the patients (65) believed the injection would reduce their pain, 43 thought their activity would increase and 41 felt it would reduce their analgesic consumption. 39 expected to sleep better and 11 felt it would reduce their days off work.

Comparison of Audits	Previous Audit	Reaudit
Leaflets received	66%	65%
Read leaflet	59%	52%
Understanding of the risks involved	81%	73%
Commonest risk	Bruising	Bruising
Source of referral	Clinic 48% > Repeat injection 40% > Direct referral 12%	Repeat injection 47% > Clinic 44% > Direct referral 9%
Number of patients who got their procedure wrong	6.4%	6.6%
Don't remember don't know procedures	34%	37%

## Discussion

The results of the audit are disappointing as despite a significant change in practice a substantial number of patients still do not seem to have much knowledge about the pain procedure they are having done or the potential complications. Despite that they are still optimistic about a positive outcome expecting improved pain control, activity and sleep.

## Acknowledgements

Admission receptionist, Recovery Nurses, Pain Consultants

## References

None

---

## Abstract Authors

Sinha, Manojit<sup>1</sup>; Timberlake, Carolyne<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>King's College Hospital NHS Foundation Trust;

<sup>2</sup>Princess Royal University Hospital, King's College Hospital NHS Foundation Trust

Powered by [Shocklogic](#)