Cataracts Guideline Committee – development

Date: 12/01/2017

Location: Dee 2, NICE Manchester

Minutes: Final



Committee members present:		
Mike Burdon (Chair) (MB)	Present for all	
Kamal Bishai (KB)	Present for all	
Arthur Brill (AB)	Present for all	
Emily Lam (EL)	Present for all	
Geoff Roberson (GRo)	Present for all	
Paul Rosen (PR)	Present for all	
Gillian Rudduck (GRu)	Present for all	
Nick Wilson-Holt (NWH)	Present until item 6.	
Jennifer Yip (JY)	Present for all	

In attendance:				
Chris Gibbons (CG)	ICG – Health Economist	Present for all		
Andrew Gyton (AG)	NICE - Commissioning Manager	Present for all		
Jane Lynn (JL)	NICE - Business Analyst	Present for all		
Adam O'Keefe (AO)	ICG - Project Manager	Present for all		
Sarah Palombella (SP)	NICE - Senior Medical Editor	Present for all		
Joshua Pink (JP)	NICE - Technical Advisor	Present for all		
Stephen Robinson (SR)	NICE - Technical Analyst	Present for all		
Gabriel Rogers (GR)	NICE - Technical Advisor (HE)	Present for all		

Observing:		
Rosie Lovett	NICE – Science Policy and Research Programme	Present for all

Apologies:		
Janet Marsden (JM)	Committee member	
Yvonne Needham (YN)	Committee member	
Keith Allman (KA)	Co-opted member	
Michael Glowala (MG)	Co-opted member	
Ruth O'Dea (RO)	Co-opted member	
Mary Russell (MR)	Co-opted member	
Sue Ellerby (SE)	ICG – Consultant Clinical Adviser	
Gareth Franklin (GF)	NICE – Medicines Advisor	
Aimely Lee (AL)	ICG – Technical Analyst	
Wes Hubbard (WH)	NICE – Information Specialist	
Sue Spiers (SS)	ICG – Associate Director	

1. Welcome and objectives for the meeting

The Chair welcomed the Committee members and attendees to the thirteenth meeting on Cataracts.

Apologies were noted, as recorded above.

The Chair asked each attendee to declare any new conflicts. The following conflict was declared in relation to RQ27:

PR had previously declared consultancy work for Thea Pharmaceuticals.
Thea produce Mydrane, a combination treatment for people who have
demonstrated pupil dilation preoperatively. However, since this was not an
intervention under consideration, the Chair declared that PR was eligible to
participate in the meeting.

No new conflicts were declared. It was agreed that all committee members were eligible to attend the committee meeting and contribute to the discussions and drafting of any recommendations.

The minutes were reviewed from GComm 12 and agreed to be an accurate record, subject to one change to the attendee list.

The Chair provided a brief overview and objectives of the day.

2. Review question 27: What is the effectiveness of interventions to increase pupil size to improve visual outcomes and reduce complications during

phacoemulsification cataract surgery?

MB provided a brief clinical introduction to the topic for the benefit of committee members and attendees.

SR provided a recap of the review protocols and presented the evidence for review question 27 for the committee's consideration. There was no health economics evidence available for this question.

The committee considered the evidence presented and drafted one recommendation.

3. Presentation of draft economic model

CG and GR presented the committee with an update on development of the proposed economic model for the guideline and sought the views of the committee on the work they had done on updating the parameters and on some new data that has been incorporated into the model. GR then provided the committee with a live demonstration of the model and discussed with them the desired outputs.

4.

Review Question 34: What should the postoperative assessment include?

Review Question 35: Who and in what setting should carry out the postoperative assessment?

Review Question 36: What issues should be considered when organising postoperative care?

Review Question 37: What is the appropriate time to assess outcomes in the postoperative period?

Review Question 38: If the postoperative assessment and care are undertaken outside of the hospital, how should outcomes between surgical units and these providers be effectively communicated?

SR provided a recap of the review protocols and presented the evidence for review questions 34-38 for the committee's consideration. There was no health economics evidence available for these questions.

The committee considered the evidence presented and drafted three recommendations. The committee then discussed what information on postoperative care and assessment should be included in the patient information section of the guideline and drafted two recommendations for that chapter.

5. Resource Impact Assessment

JL introduced herself as the Resource Impact Assessment lead on the guideline and provided a brief overview of the role of the team and how this differs from the role of the health economists. JL advised the committee that they will be required to identify any draft recommendations which are likely to result in substantial cost to the NHS. JL also requested the committee identify any recommendations for which barriers to implementation may exist so that these can be supported by NICE's Implementation Support team.

6. Role of Editorial Lead

SP introduced herself to the committee and explained her role as the editorial lead on the guideline. SP briefed the committee on the different formats of the published guideline, which includes the web viewer, app and the NICE pathway, explaining that the editorial team will require the committee's input in formulating the pathway, including for some members to attend an editorial meeting.

7. Research recommendations prioritisation

The committee reviewed the research recommendations drafted to date and agreed which five should be recommended to the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) as priorities for research. These will be finalised at the next meeting.

8. Next steps

The Chair thanked the group for their contributions and confirmed the next meeting will be held in Manchester.

Date of next meeting: Monday 27th and Tuesday 28th February 2017

Location of next meeting: NICE Offices, Manchester