

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence

IP260/2 – Radiofrequency ablation of the soft palate for snoring

Consultation Comments table

IPAC date: 14 November 2013

Com. no.	Consultee name and organisation	Sec. no.	Comments	Response
1	Consultee 1 British Thoracic Society (Health professional organisation)	1	The British Thoracic Society does not support the provisional recommendations given the lack of evidence. The procedure should only be carried out as part of a research trial until more evidence on safety and efficacy is available. This guidance should highlight the importance of considering the diagnosis of OSA before submitting a patient to airway surgery.	Please respond to all comments Thank you for your comment. The Committee considered this comment but decided not to change the guidance.
2	Consultee 2 Royal College of Physicians	1	The Royal College of Physicians (RCP) is grateful for the opportunity to comment on this consultation. We wish to endorse the comments submitted by the British Thoracic Society (BTS)	Thank you for your comment. The Committee considered this comment but decided not to change the guidance.
3	Consultee 3 NHS Professional	1	I do not agree. The evidence from a high quality randomised controlled trial does not exist. This area is littered with surgical approaches to snoring that fall by the wayside when tested properly. Therefore I do not think the evidence for efficacy is adequate.	Thank you for your comment. The Committee considered this comment but decided not to change the guidance.

Com. no.	Consultee name and organisation	Sec. no.	Comments	Response
				Please respond to all comments
4	Consultee 3 NHS Professional	2	Snoring must never be confused with sleep apnoea. The reference to OSA here is spurious. UPPP and related operations have failed to survive proper RCTs	Thank you for your comment. Thank you for your comment. The guidance has been changed.
5	Consultee 1 British Thoracic Society	3	The only trial undertaken for this procedure was small, used subjective outcomes, and, given the side effects, the patients and their partners would not have been blinded. Thus this trial does not provide evidence to support its use outside properly constructed trials.	Thank you for your comment. The Committee considered evidence from several studies in their deliberations.
6	Consultee 3 NHS Professional	3	The populations in whom this might just work are undefined. All snorers are not the same.	Thank you for your comment. Section 1.3 of the guidance notes the importance of patient selection.
7	Consultee 3 NHS Professional	4	This level of evidence is appalling. Reported snoring is not good enough, it has to be measured. There was no change in ESS yet it is implied it did improve.	Thank you for your comment. Section 4.2 of the guidance notes this change in ESS was not significant. The overview provides more details about individual studies.
8	Consultee 3 NHS Professional	5	It is clear that patients would know if they had real or placebo treatment, making subjective outcome criteria even more inappropriate.	Thank you for your comment. The Committee considered this comment but decided not to change the guidance.

"Comments received in the course of consultations carried out by NICE 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 NICE has received, and are not endorsed by NICE, its officers or advisory committees."