were collected until patients received at least 3 treatment cycles. Chi square and Fisher’s exact tests were used to analyze any association among variables.

Results: The most common symptoms were vaginal dryness (41.1%) followed by decreased libido (39.3%). In the subgroup analysis, the most common symptom among 64 pre-menopause women was irregular menstruation (84.1%). Vaginal dryness occurred more in cases with anthracycline-based regimen (p=0.036) and with anxiety (p=0.019), compared to their counterparts. Decreased libido presented more in cases with younger age (p=0.037) and positive ER status (p=0.009). Irregular menstruation, dyspareunia, delayed orgasm, and anorgasmia did not correlate with any of the determinant factors.

Conclusions: Reproductive system disorders occurred very frequently in the local BC patients after receiving chemotherapy. Influencing factors included anthracycline-based regimen, anxiety, age, and estrogen receptor status.

Disclosure: All authors have declared no conflicts of interest.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annonc.2020.10.346

353P Survey for geriatric assessment in practising oncologists in India

V. Talreja

Medical Department, Tata Memorial Hospital, Mumbai, India

Background: To date, there is limited information on Indian oncologists’ views and experiences of geriatric oncology. This study aimed to explore the views of Indian oncologists regarding the perception of, and barriers to the incorporation of geriatric screening tools, GA and collaboration with geriatricians in routine clinical practice.

Methods: This was an anonymized cross-sectional survey. The online survey, based on a literature review and expert opinion, comprised 12 questions covering: (i) respondent characteristics, clinical practice environment and patient population; (ii) challenges and treatment decision-making factors in the management of older patients with cancer; and (iii) benefits of and barriers to the implementation of GA or geriatrician review in cancer care for older patients. Qualitative variables were reported as numbers (N) and percentages. Statistical analyses were performed using χ² or Fisher’s exact test. Results were considered statistically significant with p < 0.05.

Statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS software (version 20).

Results: Between March 2019 and June 2019, 100 answers were collected. Only 74 centres (48%) had a geriatrics department and a mere 21 (14%) medical oncology departments had a person dedicated to GO. The vast majority (n = 98; 88%) had the perception that the number of elderly patients with cancer seen in clinical practice had increased. Eighteen (12%) oncologists had specific protocols and geriatric scales were used at 55 (31%) centres. Almost all (91%) claimed not to apply special management practices for the implementation of GA or geriatrician review in cancer care for older patients. Qualitative variables were reported as numbers (N) and percentages. Statistical analyses were performed using χ² or Fisher’s exact test. Results were considered statistically significant with p < 0.05.

Conclusions: From the nationwide survey, we conclude that there is currently no dedicated practice in GO afforded certain potential advantages. Finally, 99% of the oncologists were used at 55 (31%) centres. Almost all (91%) claimed not to apply special management practices for the implementation of GA or geriatrician review in cancer care for older patients. Qualitative variables were reported as numbers (N) and percentages. Statistical analyses were performed using χ² or Fisher’s exact test. Results were considered statistically significant with p < 0.05.
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Background: In Malaysia, up to 68% of cancer patients uses CAM, with CAM disclosure at only 7.6%. Perception of doctors’ poor knowledge on CAM, and non-belief in its practice are some reasons cited for non-disclosure. This may lead to various complications.

Methods: This cross-sectional study was carried out in 2 university hospitals in Malaysia from 1st July to 23rd December 2016. All doctors and nurses of Oncology Departments were included. Subjects were briefed on the study before questionnaires were distributed and returned anonymously once completed. The questionnaire was adopted with local adaptations, from a study done in Japan on perceptions and attitudes on CAM. A pilot study was done and the final validated version consists of 2 sections. Section A consists of questions on socio-demographic characteristics of respondent. Section B consisted of questions to assess the respondent’s knowledge, perception and attitude on CAM. Each question was given a point scale. Based on total points obtained, respondents were classified into good or poor knowledge, positive or negative perception and attitude towards CAM.

Results: Total of 60 nurses and 26 doctors responded, with 16 male and 70 female. Generally, all respondents have poor knowledge on CAM. Two thirds (67.4%) were not aware of the existence of the National Policy on CAM in Malaysia. Most have very little or no knowledge on the CAM modalities listed. The respondents have negative perception on CAM, with 83.7% feel the lack of evidence in its effectiveness. Most (72%) think that there is a definite or possible interaction between CAM products and anticancer drugs. All have negative attitude on CAM except 8.1% of respondents encouraging the use of CAM. Majority do not encourage the use of CAM products in both early (79.1%) and advanced (64%) stage.

Conclusions: Oncology-related healthcare providers have poor knowledge, with negative perception and attitude towards CAM.
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