treatment or present following treatment overseas requesting further management. We frequently experience difficulties relating to the quality of information received regarding their management which makes follow up and ongoing treatment more challenging.

Methods Patients discussed in the multidisciplinary team meeting over a 3yr period who received treatment overseas were identified. The electronic patient record was reviewed for each patient to assess the quality of the information received regarding the clinical management (investigations, operative reports, chemotherapy and radiotherapy treatments). Pathology information received was assessed in terms of availability of reports meeting minimum dataset criteria or provision of pathological specimen blocks.

Results 15.1% of patients (n=129/850) discussed by the MDT sought treatment overseas between 4/2015 and 3/2018. Patients travelled to 28 different destinations. Most commonly U.S.A(15.7%), Philippines (15%), UK(10.5%) and Thailand (9.2%). 60% of patients provided no or poor pathology information. 19% had no formal and 29% had inadequate clinical information regarding treatment received. Only 32.6% (n=42) provided adequate clinical and pathological information.

Conclusions The quality of information provided for patients travelling between different countries frequently falls below a level that is required for confident decision making regarding future management. Development of a recommended minimum dataset report to be used for such patients would be of significant value and is perhaps something that would appropriately be managed by the IGCS.

EPV157/#364

PATIENTS SEEKING GYNAECOLOGIC ONCOLOGY TREATMENT OVERSEAS: DOES IT MAKE A DIFFERENCE?

¹MT Alsayed*, ¹S Brich, ²H Khalidi, ¹A Magzoub, ¹A Al-Ansari, ³S Alhyassat, ⁴H Almalik, ⁴S Chandramouli, ²JJO Herod. ¹Hamad Medical Corporation, Women Wellness and Research Center, DOHA, Qatar; ²Hamad Medical Corporation, Women Wellness and Research Center, Doha, Qatar; ³Hamad medical corporation, Pathology, Doha, Qatar; ⁴NCCCR, Oncology, Doha, Qatar

10.1136/ijgc-2021-IGCS.227

Objectives All gynecologic oncology patients in Qatar receive treatment recommendations according to guidelines developed after reviewing international best practice (e.g., NCCN; ESGO; BGCS guidelines) by our multidisciplinary team (MDT). However, despite a highly-regarded and highly-affordable or free national health service, many women travel overseas for treatment. We wished to investigate if the decision to travel resulted in any difference in treatment received, and whether that was of any benefit or harm to the patients.

Methods We performed a retrospective review of all patients discussed in the MDT meeting over a 3yr period to identify those who received treatment overseas. The treatment received was reviewed for each case and compared with our MDT plan.

Results Approximately 1 in 7 (15.1%) patients (n=129/850) discussed by the MDT sought treatment overseas between 4/2015 and 3/2018. Patients travelled to 28 different destinations, most commonly; U.S.A(15.7%); Philippines (15%); UK (10.5%) and Thailand(9.2%). 25% of patients received different treatment to that recommended by our MDT. One had been referred to an overseas centre due to the unusual nature

of her disease. Two patients opted for unrecognized and unproven treatment by alternative practitioners. Many patients were subjected to unnecessary investigations, surgery, chemotherapy or radiotherapy.

Conclusions Most women who travelled abroad received the same treatment to that recommended by the Qatar MDT. Commonly, where there was different treatment, we considered that treatment received was inappropriate according to our guidelines and international best practice. There was a tendency for patients to receive additional or unnecessary treatment after travelling.

EPV158/#447

THE IGCS PROJECT ECHO VIRTUAL TUMOR BOARD: REVIEW OF A PATHOLOGIST'S EXPERIENCE FROM THE FIRST 2 YEARS

E Olkhov-Mitsel, A Plotkin*. Sunnybrook Health Sciences, Laboratory Medicine and Molecular Diagnostics, Toronto, Canada

10.1136/ijgc-2021-IGCS.228

Objectives This project aimed to summarize the experience of a mentor pathologist in the IGCS ECHO project virtual tumor boards, which utilize case-based analysis of patients using videoconferencing technology to connect physicians in low resource settings with international mentors.

Methods All cases discussed by a single pathologist in the IGCS project ECHO virtual tumor board sessions from July 2019 to May 2021 were included. De-identified information was entered into a spreadsheet. Standard descriptive analysis was performed.

Results Since July 2019, 50 virtual tumor board sessions were attended by one mentor pathologist. One to three cases were presented each session. A local site pathologist was present in 60% of sessions. Pre-meeting case details and microscopic images were emailed to mentor for 94% of sessions and 64% of cases, respectively. Pathologic diagnosis was included for 91% of cases. Mentor pathologist significantly contributed to the discussion of 71 (86%) cases. Cases discussed were primarily cancers of the ovary (n=30), cervix (n=23) and endometrium (n=10). Cancers of the uterus (n=4), vulva (n=4), vagina (n=2), fallopian-tube (n=1), germ cell tumors (n=4), pregnancy-related malignancies (n=3), and tuberculosis (n=1) were also reviewed. Case discussions were focused on tumor morphology, grading and accurate classification, prognostic factors, differential diagnosis, immunohistochemistry, appropriate tumor sampling, and the value of cytology. Appropriate references were suggested for review.

Conclusions Participation of consultant pathologists in IGCS project ECHO virtual tumor boards significantly improves the quality of pathology data for clinical management and provides educational opportunities to physicians in low resource settings for better management of gynecological cancers.

EPV159/#479

ROLE OF PATHOLOGY CONSULTANT IN ADVANCEMENT OF DIAGNOSTIC ONCOLOGY IN UNDERSERVED COUNTRIES

¹A Plotkin*, ²F-I Lu. ¹Sunnybrook Health Sciences, Laboratory Medicine and Molecular Diagnostics, Toronto, Canada; ²SHSC, Laboratory Medicine, Toronto, Canada

10.1136/ijgc-2021-IGCS.229