

4.0.3 DOC Cmte minutes

Cataract Guideline Committee – development

Date: 08/07/2015

Location: NICE offices, Manchester

Minutes: Final

NICE National Institute for
Health and Care Excellence

Committee members present:		
Mike Burdon (Chair)		(Present for notes 1–9)
Kate Kotschy (KK)		(Present for notes 1–9)
Arthur Brill (AB)		(Present for notes 1–9)
Paul Rosen(PR)		(Present for notes 1–9)
Nick Wilson-Holt (NWH)		(Present for notes 1-9)
Gillian Rudduck (GRud)		(Present for notes 1-9)
Geoff Roberson (GRob)		(Present for notes 1-9)
Yvonne Needham (YN)		(Present for notes 1-9)
Janet Marsden (JM)		(Present for notes 1-9)
Kamal Bishai (KB)		(Present for notes 1-9)
Jennifer Yip (JY)		(Present for notes 1-9)
Michael Glowala (MG)		(Present for notes 1-9)

In attendance:		
Caroline Keir (CK)	NICE – Guideline Commissioning Manager	(Present for notes 1-5)
Jessica Fielding (JF)	NICE – Public Involvement Advisor	(Present for notes 1-3)
Wes Hubbard (WH)	NICE – Information Specialist	(Present for notes 1-9)
Sharlene Ting (ST)	ICG – Technical Analyst	(Present for notes 1-9)
Sue Spiers (SSp)	ICG – Associate Director	(Present for notes 1-5)
Chris Gibbons (CG)	ICG – Health Economist	(Present for notes 1-9)
Holly Irwin (HI)	ICG – Project Manager	(Present for notes 1-9)
Gabriel Rogers (GR)	ICG – Technical Advisor (HE)	(Present for notes 1-9)

4.0.3 DOC Cmte minutes

Observers:	
Vicky Gillis	ICG – Technical Analyst (present for notes 1-9)
Jennifer Evans	Cochrane Eyes & Vision Group (present for notes 1-7)
Eileen Taylor	NICE – Quality Standards (present for notes 1-5)

Apologies:	
Sarah Stephenson (SSt)	NICE – Guideline Commissioning Manager
Erin Whittingham (EW)	NICE – Public Involvement Advisor

1. Welcome and objectives for the meeting

The Chair welcomed the Committee members and attendees to the first meeting on Cataracts. The Committee members and attendees introduced themselves.

No members of the public asked to observe the meeting.

The Chair informed the Committee that apologies had been received. These are noted above.

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

- Introductions; committee & NICE staff
- Role of chair, committee, Guideline Commissioning Manager, Public Involvement Programme and Project Manager
- Introduction to literature searching, health economics and developing review protocols, evidence reviews and drafting recommendations
- Initial discussion around identifying priorities for health economic analysis
- Development of a number of review protocols

2. Introductions & Guideline Committee working

The Chair gave a presentation which was an introduction to guideline committee working including the role of Chair and the committee, and an overview of the process of guideline development.

3. Developing NICE clinical guidelines

The Chair introduced JF, who gave a presentation on the Public Involvement Programme and the role and value of lay committee members. JF delivered this

4.0.3 DOC Cmte minutes

presentation on behalf of her colleague EW, who was unable to attend the committee meeting that day. The Chair thanked JF for her presentation.

The Chair then introduced CK, who delivered a presentation which outlined the role of the NICE Guideline Commissioning Manager, explaining that SSt would be supporting the committee in this role. CK also provided a context for the development of clinical guidelines within NICE as a wider organisation. The Chair thanked CK for her presentation.

The Chair introduced HI, who presented an outline of her role and also reiterated some of the key points relating to declarations of interest and claiming expenses. The Chair thanked HI for her presentation.

4. Declarations of interest

The Chair confirmed that, for the purpose of managing conflicts of interest, the matter under discussion was starting to draft protocols for a number of review questions.

The Chair asked everyone to verbally declare any conflicts of interest that have arisen since declarations made at appointment.

- MB – Presented at a neuro-ophthalmology study day in Belfast March 2015. Travel expenses paid directly by the sponsor of the event, Allergan – non-specific, personal-financial (although in-line with NICE expense limits).
- GRob – Works for the Association of Optometrists, who are part of a consortium called the Optical Confederation. The Optical Confederation is a registered stakeholder and will be responding to consultation. However GRob confirmed that he will not be directly involved in the consultation response – specific non-personal and non-financial
- YN – Attended a round table event on innovative technologies (ophthalmic) on 2nd June. Travel and accommodation expenses funded by ALCON – specific, personal-financial (although in-line with NICE expense limits).
- KK – Works part time for RNIB, who receive a small proportion of their funding from pharmacological companies – non-specific and non-personal financial
- AB – Undertakes some work as an inspector for the CQC – non-specific and non-financial
- PR – lead for a Limited Liability Partnership (LLP) of eye surgeons in Oxford, which has never traded/been active and also one of many named Directors at Consultant Eye Surgeons Partnership (CESP). PR does not receive any direct personal remuneration from either organisation and does not undertake any

4.0.3 DOC Cmte minutes

work for CESP. PR stated his intention to resign from being a Director in CESP – non-specific, non-financial personal interest

The Chair and a senior member of the Developer's team noted that the interests declared did not prevent the attendees from fully participating in the meeting.

5. Guideline development presentations

The Chair introduced ST who provided a summary of the scope for the Cataract Guideline and explained that the scope has now been finalised after a process of public consultation. The Chair thanked ST for her presentation.

The Chair re-introduced ST and also introduced WH and CG. Together they delivered a presentation which gave an introduction to; formulating review protocols, literature searching; answering review questions (including drafting recommendations) and health economics. The Chair thanked them for their presentation.

6. Health economics – priority setting

The Chair introduced CG who facilitated consideration by the committee of priority areas for new health economic modelling in relation to the review questions. A number of areas were identified and prioritised by the committee. CG explained that further consideration would be given to agreeing an area for new modelling over the next few guideline committee meetings. The Chair thanked CG for his presentation.

7. Review protocol development

The Chair introduced ST, who worked with the committee to finalise a number of review questions and consider/agree review protocols for these review questions. It was explained that the Cochrane Eyes and Vision (CEV) group may be working with NICE to undertake the reviews for a number of relevant review questions, based on protocols agreed by the committee. They would then share this information with the NICE technical team who would review and present the evidence to the committee.

The committee considered review question 9 'What is the effectiveness of laser phacoemulsification compared with ultrasound phacoemulsification'. The committee made some suggestions to refine the wording of the question and also agreed the review protocol to guide literature searching and appraisal of evidence.

The committee also considered review question 15 'What is the effectiveness of multifocal intraocular lens compared to standard monofocal'. The discussion was helpful in considering how this review question may relate to other review questions and also how the review of evidence may be undertaken. It was agreed that additional consideration would be given to this by the NICE team and fed back at the

4.0.3 DOC Cmte minutes

next committee meeting.

The committee considered review question 5 'What is the effectiveness of different techniques for undertaking biometry'. The group finalised the review questions and agreed the associated review protocol.

The Chair asked for volunteers from the committee to be allocated to each review question. The primary purpose of this was to provide a point of contact for the technical team. It was recognised that, due to the focus of many of the review questions, it might not be necessary or appropriate for all committee members to have any or the same number of questions allocated to them. Review questions were allocated as follows:

RQ1	KK & AB	RQ13	TBC	RQ25	TBC
RQ2	KK & AB	RQ14	TBC	RQ26	TBC
RQ3	GRob & JM & JY	RQ15	TBC	RQ27	NWH
RQ4	GRob & JM & JY	RQ16	TBC	RQ28	MG
RQ5	GRud	RQ17	TBC	RQ29	MG
RQ6	NWH	RQ18	NWH	RQ30	MB
RQ7	TBC	RQ19	PR	RQ31	PR
RQ8	MB	RQ20	JM	RQ32	KB
RQ9	PR	RQ21	PR	RQ33	GRob & JY
RQ10	YN	RQ22	MB	RQ34	Grob & JY
RQ11	TBC	RQ23	YN & JM		
RQ12	TBC	RQ24	TBC		

8. Next steps

The Chair introduced HI who confirmed the venue, date and time of the next meeting and also distributed an evaluation form for committee members to complete to provide feedback on the introductory information that they had been provided with by NICE.

The Chair thanked the committee and others present for their contribution to the

4.0.3 DOC Cmte minutes

meeting.
9. Any other business
None

Date of next meeting: Wednesday 2nd September, 10.00-5.00pm

Location of next meeting: Red Room 1, City Tower (across the foyer from the NICE offices), Manchester