

**Date and Time:** *24 July 2013, 10.00 – 16.45*

**Minutes:** Final

**Guideline Development Group Meeting  
Neuropathic Pain**

**Place:** *NICE Offices  
Level 1a, City Tower, Piccadilly Plaza  
Manchester  
M1 4BT*

**Present:** Damien Longson (Chair)  
Issak Bhojani (IB)  
Paul Howard (PH)  
Vera Neumann (VN)  
Heather Wallace (HW)  
Brigitta Brandner (BB)  
Sailesh Sankar (SS)  
Annette Gibb (AG)  
Sam Chong (SC)

**Apologies:** Ammy Pui-Chi Lam (AL)  
Karen Cavanagh (KC)

**In attendance:**

NICE Staff:

Nicole Elliott (NE)  
Mike Heath (ME)  
Toni Tan (TT)  
Gabriel Rogers (GR)  
Heather Stegenga (HS)  
Steph Mills (SM)  
Asma Khalik (AK)  
Ben Doak (BD)  
James Mahon (JM)  
Paula Prior (PP)  
Susan Ellerby (SE)  
Katie Worrall (KW)  
Louise Bates (LB)

**Observers:**

1. DL welcomed the group to the post guideline consultation GDG meeting for neuropathic pain. Apologies were received from AL. The Chair asked all GDG members to declare any relevant conflicts of interest. All declared that they knew of no conflicts of interest in the development of this guideline above those that had already been declared. The minutes of the last meeting were agreed with no amendments to be made. DL informed the group that the main themes and comments from stakeholder consultation would be presented to the GDG and that based on their decisions today, the final guideline would be tweaked.
2. HS presented to the GDG the main themes and comments that had been received about the guideline and the recommendations that had gone out for consultation. The GDG started by considering the key principles of care and thinking about the most suitable order and wording of these. The GDG then moved on to consider the comments which had been received about the main pharmacological recommendations. The Chair asked the group to hold onto these thoughts till the afternoon of the meeting, once the health economic comments had been discussed and a small further bit of analysis from the economic model had been presented to the GDG.

The morning session was finished off by JM, who ran through the stakeholders queries about the health economics and potential responses to them.

3. Following lunch GR presented some small changes in the health economic analyses to the GDG. The GDG discussed this and whether it could impact on the recommendations which had been made. The GDG then continued to discuss and refine the recommendations.
4. After coffee the GDG had a final look at the recommendations and considered any outstanding issues. The Implementation team then presented to the GDG on the tools that would be produced alongside the guideline and asked for thoughts from the GDG on the potential cost impact and barriers to implementation of the new guideline.
5. SM gave the next steps following the meeting for updating and submitting the guideline and reassured the GDG that they would have another opportunity to see the guideline product prior to submission. SM thanked the GDG for all their hard work and DL echoed these sentiments.