

#### 4.15 Pulmonary Rehabilitation outcomes analysis – Does class location or referral source impact patient outcomes?

Sarah Cunneen<sup>1</sup>, Sinéad Cleary<sup>1</sup>, Máire O'Doherty<sup>1</sup>, Aidan O'Brien<sup>2</sup>, Brian Casserly<sup>2</sup>, Jarlath Healy<sup>3</sup>  
<sup>1</sup>Respiratory CDM Team HSE Mid-West, Mid-West, Ireland. <sup>2</sup>University Hospital Limerick, Limerick, Ireland. <sup>3</sup>GP Lead, Toomevara Health Centre, Nenagh, Ireland

**Background:** Community pulmonary rehabilitation (PR) takes place in four venues across North Tipperary and East Limerick. Referrals are accepted from Respiratory Consultants (RC) and General Practitioners (GP). **Methods:** A retrospective service evaluation was undertaken to compare six PR groups (n=117) from 2023 and 2024. Two groups from site A (n=35), two from Site B (n=54) and two from Site C (n=28). The referral source in Site A was RC only, and in Sites B and C, GP referrals were also accepted. **Results:** Gender and age profiles were similar across all groups with an average age of 69 years. Overall patients attending Site A had the greatest improvement, most notably in their Incremental Shuttle Walk Test. They mobilised on average 107m further on post assessment, compared to Site B (63.2m) and Site C (59.44m). When analysis was undertaken within groups B and C, it was discovered that patients referred by GPs had a lower exercise capacity to begin with and subsequently showed the greatest improvement in their Incremental Shuttle Walk Test. **Conclusion:** Patients attending Site A had the best clinical outcomes following PR. Patients referred by GPs improved more than patients referred by RCs in sites B and C. **Disclosure:** The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.