98 mmol/L of chloride which matches serum exactly and is considered isotonic. Sodium chloride 0.45% only contains 77 mmol/L of sodium and sodium chloride 0.9% contains 154 mmol/L chloride, hence the reasons for hyponatraemia and hyperchloraemia when using these types of fluids. The audit results match what is reported in other controlled trials of fluid choices in that an isotonic fluid should be used as the chosen fluid when hydrating paediatric patients. A further audit in July 2018 would be beneficial to check that patients are continuing to benefit from the introduction of this fluid and not experiencing iatrogenic metabolic disturbances, but also look at other electrolytes such as potassium and to see if adherence to the guidelines has improved.

REFERENCES

1. NICE (2015) Intravenous fluid therapy in children and young people in hospital. NICE guideline 29.
2. Allen, C. Goldman, R. *et al.* A randomised trial of Plasma-Lyte A and 0.9% sodium chloride in acute paediatric gastroenteritis. *BMC Paediatrics* 2016;**16**:117.

P039

CONSIDERATION OF GUANFACINE FOR ADDITION TO THE ADHD PATHWAY FOLLOWING REVIEW OF EFFECTIVENESS

Liz Webb. Cardiff and Vale UHB

10.1136/archdischild-2019-nppc.49

Background Intuniv (guanfacine hydrochloride) is indicated for the treatment of attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) in children and adolescents 6-17 years old for whom stimulants are not suitable, not tolerated or have been shown to be ineffective. In June 2016 the decision by All Wales Medicines Strategy Group (AWMSG) was that cost effectiveness had not been proven making it difficult to add the drug to our local prescribing formulary. Initially Individual Patient Funding Requests (IPFR) were submitted but this was not a sustainable approach. Following discussion at Women and Children's Clinical Board Medicines Management Group it was agreed that a Non Formulary request could be used if each was approved by the Community Child Health Clinical Director and Directorate Pharmacist and both stimulants and atomoxetine had been tried unless contraindicated. This would allow us to gain much needed experience of using the drug and allow us to evaluate where it should sit within the treatment pathway.

Aim To review the effectiveness of guanfacine in all children and young people for whom an IPFR or Non Formulary Form had been approved over 12 months May 2017 – April 2018

Methods Children and young people were identified from the IPFR and Non Formulary forms. The forms provided information on reasons for considering guanfacine, clinician and patient identifiers, other data, date, reason and age at initiation was collected from medical notes and electronic clinical system (PARIS). The maintenance dose, any side effects and assessment of effect as well as reason and date stopped, if relevant were recorded.

Results 22 children and young people were reviewed consisting of 6 IPFR's and 16 non formulary forms. 100% of patients had previously taken stimulants and atomoxetine. 5 patients never started guanfacine.

17 patient's notes were reviewed. Average age at initiation was 13 (range 8-17).

9 (53%) patients have continued on guanfacine and the average maintenance dose was 3 mg daily (range 1–4 mg). 6 (35%) had a good response, 1 (6%) had some benefit, 2 (12%) limited benefit but better than no medication.

8 (47%) patients stopped treatment. 4 (24%) stopped due to increased challenging behaviour/anger/character changes, 1 (6%) borderline BP and dizziness, 1 (6%) no response, 1 (6%) substance misuse and non-compliance, 1 (6%) vomiting, 76% were requested by CAMHS clinicians, 24% requested by community paediatricians.

Conclusion Guanfacine is an effective alternative treatment for some ADHD patients with a different mode of action and different side effect profile. A small number of patients would benefit from its inclusion in the Formulary. The children and young people on guanfacine had already had stimulants and atomoxetine unless contraindicated; historically the alternative for them has been non pharmacological interventions. Half of the patients on guanfacine received benefit. An Implementation Planning Document (IPD) has been submitted to the Clinical Board requesting addition to the formulary as a Hospital Only (HO) medicine and inclusion in the ADHD pathway. AWMSG are not due to review guanfacine.

P040

MONITORING DEFIBROTIDE USAGE IN PAEDIATRIC PATIENTS UNDERGOING HSCT WITH KNOWN RISK FACTORS FOR DEVELOPING VOD/SOS

Michelle Beirne, Eileen Butler, Michael Fitzpatrick. Our Lady's Children's Hospital Crumlin Dublin

10.1136/archdischild-2019-nppc.50

Aim Defibrotide is licensed for the treatment of hepatic venous occlusive disease (VOD) following haematopoietic stem cell transplant (HSCT). Up to April 2015 defibrotide was used as prophylaxis against VOD in our HSCT patients who were considered at high-risk for developing VOD. This practice was discontinued due to the lack of evidence of efficacy and increasing costs of the drug. The aims of this audit were to identify patients undergoing HSCT who had one or more risk factors for the development of VOD, to measure the incidence of VOD in this patient cohort after the discontinuation of prophylactic defibrotide and calculate the cost savings associated with the discontinuation of prophylaxis.

Methods All patients who underwent HSCT between Oct 2015 and Dec 2016 were included. Patient's medical records were reviewed and risk factors for VOD were identified. Risk factors for developing VOD post HSCT in our patient cohort were defined following a literature review of peer-reviewed papers identifying paediatric specific risk factors.^{1 2} These were namely: patients aged ≤ 2 years, patients receiving a second transplant, conditioning with IV busulfan $\pm$ cyclophosphamide, and previous treatment with gemtuzumab or zoledronic acid. The theoretical dose of defibrotide for patients with known risk factors was calculated based on their weight at start of conditioning and the duration of treatment was based on the number of days conditioning the patient received plus 30 days following the date of transplant. The cost of a theoretical course of defibrotide for these patients was calculated to determine cost savings.

Results Of the 27 patients included in the study, 16 (59%) had one or more risk factors. The most common risk factor identified was conditioning with busulfan in patients ≤ 2 years