score ($r=0.452$, $p<0.018$) and IL81 and WOMAC score ($r=0.441$, $p<0.021$). In responders, we found a moderate negative correlation between PDGF and VAS score ($r=-0.446$, $p<0.012$) and PDGF and WOMAC score ($r=-0.39$, $p<0.037$).

Conclusion Results indicated a unique intra-articular PRP injection offers a clinical improvement in patients with hip OA, with a correlation between growth factors and cell concentration and clinical results.

REFERENCES AND/OR ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

No conflict of interest.

4CPS-281

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE SATISFACTION OF CLIENTS WITH THE SERVICES OF AN OUTPATIENT PHARMACY IN A TERTIARY HOSPITAL

AC Viney*, CN García Matillas, S Núñez Bracamonte, E CONESA NICOLÁS, A Lloret Llorca, C Juez Santamaría, MC Mira Sirvent, IG Pérez Pérez, MS García Simón, MDM Sánchez Catalicio, MH García Lagunar. *Hospital General Universitario Santa Lucía de Cartagena, Servicio de Farmacia Hospitalaria, Cartagena, Spain*

10.1136/ejhp-harm-2019-eahpconf.430

Background Evaluation of patient satisfaction with outpatient pharmacy services (OPS) is important to help identify areas that require improvement and enhance positive changes in the service.

Purpose To analyse the evolution of patient satisfaction with the services of an outpatient pharmacy of a tertiary hospital, and compare the results with those of other OPS.

Material and methods A retrospective comparative study of the results of a satisfaction survey carried out on outpatients in 2015, 2016 and 2017 at a tertiary hospital, and a review of results reported by other OPS at the National Congress of Hospital Pharmacy.

The survey consisted of four parts:

- a. general questions (sex, age, frequency of visits).
- b. organisation.
 1. time;
 2. quality of the information given by the pharmacy technician;
 3. hospital staff correctly identified;
 4. privacy;
 5. satisfaction with the services of the pharmacy technicians.
- c. pharmacists.
 1. availability for consultation;
 2. satisfaction with the information given by the pharmacist;
 3. satisfaction with pharmacist care;
 4. time dedicated to the consultation;
- d. overall satisfaction.

Answers of b), c) and d) were scored as follows: 1=very bad, 2=bad, 3=normal, 4=good, 5=very good. There were several free text boxes to add observations. A mathematical adjustment was made for the transformation of the scale from 1–5 to 1–10.

Over the 3 years, improvements were made, such as an appointment calendar, staff identification cards and a parking area for patients.

Results One-hundred and eight, 104 and 84 surveys were completed in 2015, 2016 and 2017, respectively. Average scores for each question in 2015, 2016 and 2017 respectively were: b. 1) 6.84; 7.10; 6.67; b. 2) 8.31; 8.37; 8.19; b. 3) 7.80; 8.98; 8.32; b. 4) 7.17; 8.99; 5.57; b. 5) 9.11; 9.53;

8.84; c. 1) 7.70; 9.03; 8.51; c. 2) 8.00; 9.44; 8.91; c. 3) 8.58; 9.58; 9.17; c. 4) 7.45; 9.12; 8.42; and d) 8.29; 9.08; 8.67.

Observations were excessive waiting times, opening hours and location.

The results of six other OPS were reviewed.

Conclusion Satisfaction surveys are useful tools to gain knowledge about patients' preferences and needs, and implementing future actions to improve the service. A good maintained score was observed for the services and care given by pharmacy technicians and pharmacists. Waiting times obtained the worst score consecutively. The worst-rated aspects were waiting times and opening hours, coinciding with the results reviewed of other OPS.

REFERENCES AND/OR ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

No conflict of interest.

4CPS-282

ABSTRACT WITHDRAWN