group III then group I then group II after treatment and 3 months later but there was no significant difference between the three groups after 6 months follow up.

Table 1 Pre- and post-treatment clinical measurement of the patient groups

	Baseline				After treatment				After 3 months				After 6 months			
	G I	G II	G III	G IV	G I	G II	G III	G IV	G I	G II	G III	G IV	G I	G II	G III	G IV
VAS	8.54 ±1.42	8.75 ±1.07	8.27 ±1.82	7.94 ±3.98	5.24 ±2.41	5.95 ±1.8	4.65 ±2.06	7.27 ±1.82	5.61 ±2.74	6.1 ±1.95	5.05 ±1.76	7.63 ±2.06	5.94 ±2.34	6.16 ±2.35	5.75 ±2.08	7.79 ±1.92
WOMAC (Total)	68.95 ±13.87	67.95 ±15.07	69.58 ±13.8	66.7 ±18.4	43.75 ±17.6	49.14 ±18.5	40.0 ±15.28	66.14 ±27.3	43.35 ±15.9	48.84 ±16.8	40.09 ±15.83	64.3 ±19.26	45.7 ±19.34	50.12 ±20.8	43.0 ±16.48	69.42 ±17.53
50 meters walking time(s)	77.95 ±40.4	68.9 ±47.32	79.26 ±30.7	84.35 ±40.56	64.35 ±35.4	66.57 ±35.8	60.5 ±37.47	81.95 ±23.5	68.0 ±33.84	68.17 ±25.2	61.25 ±19.4	79.95 ±25.5	64.8 ±19.4	65.52 ±20.8	62.5 ±16.7	80.04 ±23.6
Lequesne index	14.2 ±3.56	13.66 ±2.5	14.61 ±4.2	13.3 ±5.21	10.2 ±4.5	10.2 ±5.51	10.0 ±5.52	13.1 ±3.53	10.58 ±3.65	10.31 ±3.81	10.07 ±4.31	13.6 ±5.6	10.3 ±4.53	10.29 ±5.51	10.13 ±2.5	14.1 ±2.95
-HAD anxiety subscore	9.05 ±4.65	8.50 ±3.84	8.8 ±4.6	9.0 ±4.65	7.4 ±4.0	6.5 ±2.83	6.5 ±2.7	8.8 ±3.7	7.4 ±3.6	6.4 ±2.5	6.3 ±3.2	9.2 ±4.0	7.6 ±4.0	8.8 ±3.5	6.5 ±3.6	8.9 ±4.0
-HAD depression subscore	7.60 ±5.95	7.20 ±4.82	7.4 ±5.07	7.3 ±4.6	6.6 ±4.5	6.6 ±4.25	5.9 ±4.0	7.0 ±4.5	6.7 ±4.7	6.3 ±4.9	5.5 ±3.6	7.0 ±4.0	6.6 ±4.3	6.5 ±2.6	6.0 ±3.7	7.3 ±3.2

Conclusions: Perineural Injection Therapy is an effective new modality in management of pain, physical function, ambulation activity, disability and psychological status in moderate and severe knee osteoarthritis.

REFERENCES:

1. Tuhina Neogi. The Epidemiology and Impact of Pain in Osteoarthritis. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage* 2013;21(9):1145–1153.
2. Lyftogt J. Subcutaneous prolotherapy treatment of refractory knee, shoulder, and lateral elbow pain. *Australasian Musculoskeletal Medicine* 2007;12(2):110–112.

Disclosure of Interest: None declared

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2018-eular.1071

FRI0688

FAST ACCESS TO ASSESSMENT SUPPORT AND TREATMENT (FAAST): INNOVATION TO IMPROVE SERVICE

R. Laxminarayan¹, A. Dean², L. Bembridge², S. Redfern², H. Nutland², M. Nisar¹.

¹Rheumatology, ²Physiotherapy, Queen's Hospital, Burton on Trent, United Kingdom

Background: Physiotherapy is integral to rheumatology MDT. Early physiotherapy interventions optimise education, self-management and enhance outcomes. Delay in first physiotherapy assessment leads to non engagement, altered clinical features and adverse outcomes¹. Our physiotherapy service provided appointment based assessments. Each new patient appointment was for 60 minutes. We had an average of 43 day wait to see routine patients. Non attendance rate was high, patients did not value the benefits of physiotherapy and therapist was not able to provide input in patient management.

To improve service, a new system of Fast Access to Assessment, Support and Treatment (FAAST) was introduced in April 2017, allowing patients same day access to physiotherapy on the day of referral.

Objectives: 1. To assess the impact of FAAST on non-attendance rate and subsequent visits.

2. To analyse the type of interventions, time spent on assessment and benefits on resource utilisation.

Methods: Patients completed a body chart to document their symptoms and a baseline Burton-Patient Reported Outcome Measure (B-PROM)^{2,3}. These informations allowed the therapist to assess patients' priorities. Physiotherapist and patient then decided upon the appropriate and possible intervention on the day and subsequent visits. Follow up appointments were made based on clinical need and patient's convenience. We collected data prospectively on type of intervention, time spent on assessment, attendance to subsequent sessions and compared to the data from conventional physiotherapy clinics.

Results: FAAST project started in April 2017. This ran parallel to the conventional clinic. Now it is the main portal of referral to physiotherapy. We present data from April 2017 to November 2017. 495 out of 952 patients referred in this period were assessed in the FAAST clinic.

1. Average wait time in conventional clinic was 43 days for routine and 19 days for urgent. In FAAST clinic, every patient was assessed by the physiotherapist on the day of referral eliminating waiting time. Average time to second review after FAAST clinic was 23 days.

2. Type of assessment was decided on the first visit to FAAST clinic. About 70% patients were booked for one to one sessions and about 15% were booked into group sessions designed for specific disease conditions. FAAST assessment

helped to identify patients needed to be referred to other specialist therapy areas also.

3. Non-attendance rate for the first appointment in conventional clinic for preceding three year period was 13%. Every patient referred to FAAST clinic attended the first appointment and non-attendance at second appointment improved to 9.5%.

4. Average time spent by the therapist at first FAAST clinic was 29 minutes which equated to saving of 242 hours compared to conventional clinic. Pre FAAST era, 100 new patients were seen a month on an average. Since FAAST clinic started, this increased to 136 a month.

Conclusions: 1. FAAST clinic achieves its objective of reducing waiting times and non-attendance rate.

2. Average assessment time was flexible, saved time and helped to improve efficiency of the clinic.

3. Assessment and intervention on the day of assessment helped to target the therapy more effectively.

REFERENCES:

1. doi:10.1186/1471-2474-14-203
2. doi:10.1136/annrheumdis-2016-eular.5926
3. doi:10.1136/annrheumdis-2016-eular.4670

Disclosure of Interest: None declared

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2018-eular.4478

FRI0689

A CONSERVATIVE TREATMENT OPTION FOR CARPAL TUNNEL SYNDROME: EXTRACORPOREAL SHOCK WAVE THERAPY. PROSPECTIVE, RANDOMIZED, DOUBLE BLIND PLACEBO CONTROLLED STUDY

R. Kocak Ulucağöy¹, F. G. Yurdakul¹, H. Bodur¹. ¹Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Ankara Numune Training and Research Hospital, Ankara, Turkey

Background: Carpal tunnel syndrome (CTS) is the most common entrapment neuropathy that occurs as a result of median nerve compression at the wrist. Extracorporeal shock wave therapy (ESWT) is specified as a treatment with high amplitude acoustic waves that focus on a region of the body. While ESWT is frequently used to treat musculoskeletal disorders such as plantar fasciitis and tendinitis, in recent years ESWT has become a new treatment option in CTS. Positive results have been reported from limited number of studies which were assessed efficacy of ESWT in CTS treatment. On the other hand it is noteworthy that the number of patients in these studies is not high and there is no clear consensus on the concept of shock wave energy density and frequency due to lack of experience (1,2,3).

Objectives: To evaluate the efficacy of ESWT in CTS and compared to wrist splint treatment in this prospective, randomized double-blind, placebo-controlled trial.

Methods: One hundred eighty-nine patients with mild/moderate CTS were included. Patients were assigned to 4 different treatment groups (1-Splint, 2-Splint + ESWT, 3-ESWT, 4-Splint+ placebo ESWT) by using stratified randomization to ensure balance of the treatment groups respect to the various combinations of the prognostic variables in terms of in terms of age, gender, and severity of CTS. 168 patients completed the study at third month. ESWT was performed on the area included 2 cm proximal to the pisiform bone. It was applied with 1000 shots, 0.05 mJ/mm² intensity of energy and frequency of 5 Hz. (3 weeks, once a week). Wrist splint with suitable size and neutral position was suggested. Patients were evaluated at baseline, first and third month. Pain, finger pinch strength, Boston Carpal Tunnel Questionnaire (BCTQ), Leeds Neuropathic Symptom and Finding Assessment (LANSS) and electrophysiological examination were assessed.

Results: Demographics, clinical characteristics of the patients are shown in table 1. Significant pain and functionality improvement was found in all groups (p<0.05) at first and third months. The improvements in clinical and electrophysiological variables were compared between four groups In group 2, baseline- first month finger pinch increase was higher than groups 1 and 4, and the baseline- third month finger pinch increase was higher than group 4. In group 2, the increase in mMNCV was higher than group 1.