

National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence

CG49: Faecal incontinence
Guideline Review Consultation Comments Table
1-14 November 2010

Stakeholder	Agree?	Comments	Comments on areas excluded from original scope	Comments on equality issues
GDG member	Yes			
GDG member	Yes	<p>1. Page 4, question2: Heymen et al (Dis Colon Rectum 2009) suggests that biofeedback has a specific advantage over pelvic floor exercises in treatment of faecal incontinence.</p> <p>2. Page 5, question 1: I agree that it is appropriate to include the data on posterior tibial nerve stimulation but not change the recommendation at this time.</p>		
NHS Devon	Yes			

PLEASE NOTE: Comments received in the course of consultations carried out by the Institute are published in the interests of openness and transparency, and to promote understanding of how recommendations are developed. The comments are published as a record of the submissions that the Institute has received, and are not endorsed by the Institute, its officers or advisory committees.

Stakeholder	Agree?	Comments	Comments on areas excluded from original scope	Comments on equality issues
GDG member		<p>There are two areas that I feel merit further discussion.</p> <p>The first is obstetric sphincter injury where management needs leave a great deal to be desired.</p> <p>It has become a medico-legal minefield.</p> <p>The second is the management of incontinence secondary to rectal prolapse.</p> <p>These were not covered in any detail and I believe more work by GDG is merited.</p>		
Department of Health	Yes	No comments to make		
ConvaTec Limited	No	<p>The revision does not take in consideration the Faecal Management Systems.</p> <p>Not taking in consideration Faecal Management Systems as part of the tools available today to manage acute faecal incontinence in hospitalised patients would imply the creation of a substandard quality of care for certain groups of patients</p>	<p>Newer systems for the management of acute faecal incontinence need to be considered by this revision. It is important that healthcare practitioners know about the benefits that such systems provide. No RCTs are available at this point, but a good number of articles and publications deal with the subject, some of them are:</p> <p>-An article by Padmanabhan, who reported in 2007 (Padmanabhan A., et al. Clinical evaluation of a flexible fecal incontinence management system. AJCC. July 2007; 16(4): 384-393) the results of a clinical evaluation about safety of a Faecal Management</p>	<p>We might face here a problem of equality, or I would say inequality, related to patients that fulfil all the criteria to be managed with Faecal Management Systems and are not. Quality of Life, quality of care and ethical concerns need to be considered when not recommending the utilisation of a device that has brought benefits to almost a million of patients worldwide.</p>

PLEASE NOTE: Comments received in the course of consultations carried out by the Institute are published in the interests of openness and transparency, and to promote understanding of how recommendations are developed. The comments are published as a record of the submissions that the Institute has received, and are not endorsed by the Institute, its officers or advisory committees.

Stakeholder	Agree?	Comments	Comments on areas excluded from original scope	Comments on equality issues
			<p>System used in 42 patients suffering from acute faecal incontinence in critical care settings.</p> <p>- Also in 2007, the Rapid Review Panel set by the Department of Health As part of the Healthcare Associated Infections (HCAI) Technology Innovation Programme, granted recommendation 1 to Faecal Management Systems and implemented showcase review across 8 hospitals in the UK. The results were published in 2009. "Staff and patient opinions were favourable, and use of the product led to a significant reduction in the number of times bedding etc had to be changed and to fewer skin problems compared with standard ways of managing faecal incontinence." Faecal Management systems have also a great potential to prevent cross contamination and infections. These reports can be found at http://www.clean-safe-care.nhs.uk</p> <p>Many other articles, mainly case reports have been published in different scientific peer reviewed</p>	

PLEASE NOTE: Comments received in the course of consultations carried out by the Institute are published in the interests of openness and transparency, and to promote understanding of how recommendations are developed. The comments are published as a record of the submissions that the Institute has received, and are not endorsed by the Institute, its officers or advisory committees.

Stakeholder	Agree?	Comments	Comments on areas excluded from original scope	Comments on equality issues
			journals.	
British Society of Gastroenterology (BGS)/Royal College of Physicians (RCP)	Yes	<p>The BGS and RCP are grateful for the opportunity to respond. Overall, we agree with the update but would like to make the comments below.</p> <p>Page 4, question 2: Heymen et al (Dis Colon Rectum 2009) suggests that biofeedback has a specific advantage over pelvic floor exercises in treatment of faecal incontinence.</p> <p>Page 5, question 1: We agree that it is appropriate to include the data on posterior tibial nerve stimulation but not to change the recommendation at this time.</p>		
Royal College of Nursing	Yes	We would like this to cover children and young people	We would like this to cover children and young people. Also if the guideline is to be reviewed it is important to note that integrated continence services are not in place and many people are excluded from access to a specialist nurse because they are in a care/nursing home. The national audit backs this view.	

PLEASE NOTE: Comments received in the course of consultations carried out by the Institute are published in the interests of openness and transparency, and to promote understanding of how recommendations are developed. The comments are published as a record of the submissions that the Institute has received, and are not endorsed by the Institute, its officers or advisory committees.

Stakeholder	Agree?	Comments	Comments on areas excluded from original scope	Comments on equality issues
Uroplasty BV	N/A	<p>The consultation date 1-14 November was not passed when the study below was published last Friday November 12th , thus should be added to the list of reference in the document.</p> <p>It concerns: B. Govaert, D. Pares, S. Delgado-Aros, F. La Torre, W. G. van Gemert and C. G. Baeten. A prospective multicentre study to investigate percutaneous tibial nerve stimulation for the treatment of faecal incontinence. Colorectal Disease 2010; 12(12) Dec, 1236–1241.</p>		

PLEASE NOTE: Comments received in the course of consultations carried out by the Institute are published in the interests of openness and transparency, and to promote understanding of how recommendations are developed. The comments are published as a record of the submissions that the Institute has received, and are not endorsed by the Institute, its officers or advisory committees.

These organisations were approached but did not respond:

3M Health Care Limited
Abbott Laboratories Limited
Adults Strategy and Commissioning Unit
Age UK
Airedale Acute Trust
Albyn Medical Ltd
All Wales Tissue Viability Nurse Forum
American Medical Systems UK
Association for Continence Advice
Association for Spina Bifida & Hydrocephalus (ASBAH)
Association of Chartered Physiotherapists in Women's Health
Association of Child Psychotherapists
Association of Coloproctology of Great Britain and Ireland
Association of the British Pharmaceuticals Industry (ABPI)
Barnet PCT
Barnsley PCT
Biosil Ltd
Bladder and Bowel Foundation, The (B&BF)
Boehringer Ingelheim Ltd
Boehringer Ingelheim Ltd
Bradford & Airedale PCT
British Association for Counselling and Psychotherapy
British Association of Paediatric Surgeons
British Association of Stroke Physicians (BASP)
British Dietetic Association
British Geriatrics Society
British National Formulary (BNF)
British Psychological Society, The
BUPA
Calderdale PCT
Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (Addenbrookes)
Care Quality Commission (CQC)
Carmarthenshire Acute Trust
Central Area of North Wales NHS Trust
Central London Community Healthcare
Central Surrey Health Ltd
Chartered Physiotherapists Promoting Continence (CPPC)
Chartered Society of Physiotherapy (CSP)
Chartered Society of Physiotherapy (CSP)
College of Occupational Therapists
Connecting for Health
Continence Advisory Service
Crohn's and Colitis UK (NACC)
Cumbria and Lancashire Cardiac and Stroke Network
David Lewis Centre, The

PLEASE NOTE: Comments received in the course of consultations carried out by the Institute are published in the interests of openness and transparency, and to promote understanding of how recommendations are developed. The comments are published as a record of the submissions that the Institute has received, and are not endorsed by the Institute, its officers or advisory committees.

Ferring Pharmaceuticals Ltd
Fylde Primary Care Trust
Greater Manchester West Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust
Gut Trust, The
Hampshire Partnership NHS Foundation Trust
Help the Hospices
Hertfordshire Partnership NHS Trust
Humber NHS Foundation Trust
IA (Ileostomy & Internal Pouch Support Group)
Institute of biomedical Science
King's College Hospital NHS Foundation Trust
Liverpool PCT
Maidstone and Tunbridge Wells NHS Trust
Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency (MHRA)
Medtronic International Trading Sarl
Midlands Centre for Spinal Injuries
Milton Keynes PCT
National Patient Safety Agency (NPSA)
National Public Health Service for Wales
National Spinal Injuries Centre
National Youth Advocacy Service
Newcastle PCT
Newcastle Upon Tyne Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust
NHS Clinical Knowledge Summaries Service (SCHIN)
NHS Direct
NHS Grampian
NHS Quality Improvement Scotland
NHS Sheffield
Norfolk Suffolk and Cambridgeshire Local Specialised Commissioning Group
Norgine Ltd
North Eastern Derbyshire PCT
North Tees and Hartlepool Acute Trust
North Tyneside Primary Care Trust
Northwick Park and St Mark's Hospitals NHS Trust
Nutrition Society
Oldham Primary Care Trust
Pancreatic Cancer UK
Parkinson's Disease Society
Pembrokeshire and Derwen NHS Trust
PERIGON Healthcare Ltd
Peterborough & Stamford NHS Hospitals Trust
Plymouth Hospitals NHS Trust
PromoCon
Q-Med (UK) Ltd
Reckitt Benckiser Healthcare (UK) Ltd
Royal College of General Practitioners Wales

PLEASE NOTE: Comments received in the course of consultations carried out by the Institute are published in the interests of openness and transparency, and to promote understanding of how recommendations are developed. The comments are published as a record of the submissions that the Institute has received, and are not endorsed by the Institute, its officers or advisory committees.

Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists
Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health
Royal College of Physicians Edinburgh
Royal College of Psychiatrists
Royal College of Radiologists
Royal National Hospital For Rheumatic Diseases
Royal Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain
Sandwell & West Birmingham Hospitals NHS Trust
Sandwell & West Birmingham Hospitals NHS Trust
Scottish Intercollegiate Guidelines Network (SIGN)
Sheffield Children's NHS Foundation Trust
Sheffield PCT
Society and College of Radiographers
South Essex Partnership NHS Foundation Trust
Spinal Injuries Association
Staffordshire Moorlands PCT
Stockport PCT
Tameside and Glossop Acute Trust
Taunton and Somerset NHS Trust
The British Psychological Society
The Neurological Alliance
The Robert Jones & Agnes Hunt Orthopaedic & District
Hospital NHS Trust
The Royal College of Surgeons Edinburgh
The Royal Society of Medicine
Tissue Viability Nurses Association
UK Specialised Services Public Health Network
University College London Hospitals (UCLH) Acute Trust
University Hospital Aintree
University of North Durham
Uroplasty Ltd
Vygon (UK) Ltd
Welsh Assembly Government
Western Cheshire Primary Care Trust
Whipps Cross University Hospital NHS Trust
Wirral Hospital Acute Trust
York NHS Foundation Trust

PLEASE NOTE: Comments received in the course of consultations carried out by the Institute are published in the interests of openness and transparency, and to promote understanding of how recommendations are developed. The comments are published as a record of the submissions that the Institute has received, and are not endorsed by the Institute, its officers or advisory committees.