Audit of the Expected HPB Faster Diagnosis Pathway Data A Johnston & K Mann **Liverpool University Hospitals Foundation Trust**

Introduction

- Version 1 of the HPB Faster Diagnosis Pathway was published on 6/9/22 and it due to be rolled out as national guidance in the coming weeks
- The 21-day pathway for *suspected* pancreatic, extrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma and gallbladder cancer was used as a standard to audit current practice of the Mersey and North Wales supra-regional MDT
- The aim is to highlight the standards that will prove difficult to achieve set by the pathway and help find solutions in the anticipation of national rollout

Methods

- Data was retrospectively collected via the Somerset Cancer Registry of weekly MDTs between 18/1–15/3/23
- Inclusion criteria was documentation of MDT diagnosis OR high suspicion pancreatic, extrahepatic of cholangiocarcinoma & gallbladder cancers
- Median timed data was collated from the electronic systems of PACS, PENS, EPRO and the Somerset registry

Results

21-day jaundice, pancreatic, extrahepatic cholangio, gall bladder

Day 0	By Day 5	By Day 8	By Day 10	By Day 16	By Day 21	
Primary care	Local Diagnostic Centre			/ Specialist Diagnostic Centre		
Urgent referral based on <u>NG12</u> NICE guidelines ¹ Including minimum dataset	Straight to test: Contrast CT ³ with hot reporting (72hrs), Bloods, including tumour	Clinical assessment of CT results by suitably experienced HPB clinician ⁶ and commence endoscopic retrograde		Contrast MRI ⁴ or MRCP ¹⁰ Fluorodeoxyglucose PET-CT or selective Laparoscopy /	Confirmation of treatment plan and Ongoing Personalised Care and	
2	markers and commence Pancreatic Enzyme Replacement Therapy (PERT) if ^{3, 15} required ^{3, 15} Outpatient appointment if not suitable for straight to CT ⁵	cholangiopancreatography (ERCP), brushings and stent if clinically indicated. Or fast track treatment referral for resectable patient, if required ⁷ Booking of Contrast MRI, MRCP, Fluorodeoxyglucose PET-CT, or Laparoscopy / Laparoscopic Ultrasound, if required ⁷		Laparoscopic Ultrasound when resection planned ¹¹ Endoscopic Retrograde	Plan discussion with patient ^{13, 14} Access to a HPB specialist dietitian Referral to prehabilitation programme, if	
Secondary care Emergency presentation and referrals from radiology ¹				Cholangiopancreatography (ERCP) (or other biliary drainage procedure) or Endoscopic Ultrasound guided FNA Biopsy ¹²		
Patient information Provided in primary care ¹	Patient information Provided in clinic / OPA ⁵	Cancer ruled out and communicat has been excluded. Note there are Referred to other secondary care se Cancer likely / diagnosed; Outpat Record FDS if patient is informed the specialist MDT input, Discuss treate Personalised Care and Support Plat management, identify physical, psy prehabilitation, occupational, nutritie	significant 'overlap' for up ervice or discharge ⁸ OR tient Clinic and commun ney have cancer. Discussi ment options, subject to st an discussion with patient chological and nutritional	nication to patient; on with HPB specialist, CNS and taging testing being reported; HPB CNS to discuss symptom care needs as well as refer for any	indicated Clinical trial enrolment considered	

Figure 1: Comparing timed days from the pathway vs median no. of days of current practice

Day 0-5: Urgent referral for CT (1° or 2° care)



Timed points of the pathway

Discussion

 Unclear if local MDT meets day 10 target. Unable to audit this target without local information

NA Regional MDT referral form has no specific date documented of first point of referral **Day 5-8:** *Date of CT to date of report* 5 days Recommends 72hr 'Hot reporting' for high suspicion **Day 8-10:** *CT report to MDT discussion* 13 days Day 8-16: CT to MRCP or ERCP Low frequency Few patients had further tests recommended **Day 16-21**: Further investigations to confirmed treatment plan Not possible Very difficult to assess. Lack of documented dates of MDT outcomes enacted outside of tertiary centre

Figure 2: A pie chart showing the number of patients recommended the following MDT outcomes



25% patients present acutely when should present to primary care, misrepresenting positive target

- Common presentation comes from investigations such as CT colon/U/S, as opposed to GP booking CT scans, patients do not start on the pathway.
- GP to CT report is crucial and referrals do not comment on whether patients first present to primary or secondary care. Significant resources required to improve reporting from GPs
- Treatment plan occurred within the target demonstrating the robust functioning of the tertiary centre

Key areas to improve Accurate data recording from referring trusts and outcome delivery Hot CT reporting and onwards referral