

4.0.03 DOC Cmte minutes

Prostate Cancer Committee meeting

Date: 28/11/2017

Location: NICE – Manchester

Minutes: Final



Committee members present:

Waqar Shah (WS) (Chair)	(Present for notes 1 – 9)
Abi Ademoyero (AA)	(Present for notes 1 – 9)
Guy Chetiyawardana (GC)	(Present for notes 1 – 9)
Charles Frost (CF)	(Present for notes 1 – 9)
John Graham (JG)	(Present for notes 1 – 9)
Peter Jenkins (PJ)	(Present for notes 2 – 9)
Sanjeev Madaan (SM)	(Present for notes 1 – 9)
Jon Oxley (JO)	(Present for notes 1 – partway through item 6)
Jonathan Richenberg (JR)	(Present for notes 1 – 9)
Mark Robinson (MR)	(Present for notes 1 – 9)
Karen Stalbow (KS)	(Present for notes 1 – 9)

In attendance:

Jean Bennie (JB)	GUT - Technical Analyst	(Present for notes 1 – 9)
Chris Carmona (CC)	GUT - Senior Technical Analyst	(Present for notes 1 – 9)
Rupert Franklin (RF)	NICE – Senior Guidelines Commissioning Manager	(Present for notes 1 – 9)
Les Hayes (LH)	NICE - Business Analyst	(Present for item 4)
Jenny Kendrick (JK)	NICE – Information Specialist	(Present for notes 1 – 9)
Adam O’Keefe (AO)	GUT – Project Manager	(Present for notes 1 – 9)
Gabriel Rogers (GR)	NICE – Technical Adviser (HE)	(Present for notes 1 – 9)
Sue Spiers (SS)	GUT – Associate Director	(Present for notes 1 – 9)

Apologies:

Pauline Bagnall (PB)	Committee member
Sadaf Haque (SH)	Committee member
Howard Kynaston (HK)	Committee member
Brian McGlynn (BM)	Committee member

4.0.03 DOC Cmte minutes

Observer:	
Alice Biggane (AB)	(Present for notes 1 – 9)

1. Introductions and guideline committee working

The Chair welcomed the Committee members and attendees to the second meeting on Prostate cancer. The Committee members and attendees introduced themselves. The Chair informed the Committee of apologies received, as listed above.

The Chair outlined the objectives of the meeting, which included:

- An outline of AB's research project
- Role of the Information Specialist and Business Analyst
- Development of a number of review protocols
- Discussion around potential expert witnesses
- Further discussion around identifying priorities for health economic analysis
- Presentation of clinical and Health economic evidence supporting review question 7.

Minutes of the previous meeting were agreed with one minor amendment.

The Chair asked all attendees to verbally declare any interests. No new interests were declared. Having reviewed the registry of previous declarations, the Chair declared that JO would leave the meeting before the evidence presentation on Review Question 7 due to a previously declared conflict but all other attendees could fully participate in the meeting.

2. Observer's outline of research

The Chair then introduced AB, who delivered a presentation which outlined the methods and objectives of her research project for the benefit of the Committee. The Chair then invited the Committee to ask any questions before thanking AB for her presentation.

3. Information Specialist introduction

The Chair introduced JK, who gave a presentation on the role of the Information Specialist in guideline scoping and development. The Chair thanked JK for her

4.0.03 DOC Cmte minutes

presentation.

4. Resource Impact Assessment

The Chair introduced LH who provided further detail of the role the Resource Impact Team plays in guideline development and how the Business Analyst supports the committee with areas of substantial resource impact. LH then answered the committee's questions. The Chair thanked LH for his presentation.

5. Discussion on Expert Witnesses

CC led a discussion on the process around and possibility of, inviting expert witnesses to present evidence to the Committee. The Committee felt this could be beneficial to them as this would enable it to consider evidence it would not have otherwise had access to. CC advised that the NICE team would review suggestions made by the Committee and contact potential expert witnesses.

6. Remaining review protocols

The Chair reintroduced JB, who worked with the committee to finalise the following review questions and consider/agree review protocols for these review questions:

Review question 6 'What is the most clinically- and cost-effective scheduling of docetaxel added to standard treatment for the treatment of hormone-sensitive metastatic prostate cancer?'

Review question 8 'What is the most clinically- and cost-effective follow-up protocol for people who have a raised PSA, negative MRI and/ or negative biopsy?'

Review question 9: 'What is the most clinically- and cost-effective follow-up protocol for people with prostate cancer who have had radical treatment, with specific regard to: duration of follow-up, frequency of follow-up appointments, the type of examination or blood tests, the respective roles of primary and secondary care in follow-up?'

The Chair asked for volunteers from the committee to be allocated as contact persons to the following remaining review questions. Review questions were allocated as follows:

Review Question 1	Pauline Bagnall
Review Question 6	Peter Jenkins
Review Question 8	TBC
Review Question 9	Sanjeev Madaan

4.0.03 DOC Cmte minutes

JB noted that the Review Protocols would be circulated to the Committee for review following the meeting.
7. Health economics: priority setting
The Chair reintroduced GR, who sought the committee's views on which Review Question held most economic uncertainty and would benefit most from original Health Economic modelling.
8. Review Question 7: What is the clinical and cost- effectiveness of the use of bisphosphonates in people with hormone- relapsed metastatic prostate cancer?
<p>JB provided the Committee with an outline of the methods of analysis used, a recap of GRADE (Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation) Criteria and an explanation of the different categories of evidence statements summarising the identified evidence.</p> <p>JB then recapped the search protocol and presented the clinical evidence supporting Review Question 7 for the committee's consideration. GR then presented the health economic evidence identified for this question.</p> <p>The committee discussed the evidence presented and drafted 3 recommendations and one research recommendation.</p>
9. Next steps
The Chair confirmed the venue, date and time of the next meeting, as detailed below and thanked the Committee and others present for their contribution to the meeting before closing the meeting.

Date of next meeting: 09/01/2018

Location of next meeting: NICE - London