NICE National Institute for Health and Care Excellence

Surveillance proposal consultation document

2018 surveillance of sedation in under 19s: using sedation for diagnostic and therapeutic procedures (NICE guideline CG112)

Proposed surveillance decision

We propose to not update the NICE guideline on sedation in under 19s: using sedation for diagnostic and therapeutic procedures.

Reasons for the proposal to not update the guideline

No new evidence was identified which suggested NICE guideline CG112 should be updated. No ongoing studies were identified, so it is unlikely that new evidence will be available in the near future.

Overview of 2018 surveillance methods

NICE's surveillance team checked whether recommendations in sedation in under 19s: using sedation for diagnostic and therapeutic procedures (NICE guideline CG112) remain up to date.

The 2018 surveillance followed the static list review process, consisting of:

- A search for new or updated Cochrane reviews.
- A search for ongoing research.
- Consideration of evidence from previous surveillance.
- Examining related NICE guidance and quality standards and NIHR signals.
- Feedback from topic experts via a questionnaire.
- Consulting on the decision with stakeholders (this document).

After consultation on the decision we will consider the comments received and make any necessary changes to the decision. We will then publish the final surveillance report containing the decision, the summary of the evidence used to reach the decision, and responses to comments received in consultation.

For further details about the process and the possible update decisions that are available, see ensuring that published guidelines are current and accurate in developing NICE guidelines: the manual.

Evidence considered in surveillance

Cochrane reviews

We searched for new Cochrane reviews related to the whole guideline. We found 3 relevant Cochrane reviews published between January 2012 and June 2018.

One review (Conway et al 2016) includes analysis suggesting that oral midazolam produces less effective sedation than chloral hydrate for children undergoing non-invasive diagnostic procedures. However, the findings were influenced by 1 study which was in lumber puncture and as such the review does not provide clear evidence of an impact on the guideline. A second review (Fong et al 2017) which compared chloral hydrate against several other methods of sedation for neurodiagnostic procedures in children is not directly relevant to the general population that is covered by the guideline. The third review (Lourenço-Matharu et al 2012) which covers sedation of children undergoing dental treatment provides evidence in support of the guideline recommendation 1.9.

Previous surveillance

We also considered studies identified in an evidence update in 2012. The 2012 evidence update included 13 studies in the following areas:

1.6 Painless imaging. The evidence from the following studies supports the recommendations:

- Evidence suggests that a single dose of propofol may be suitable for magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) procedures lasting up to 30 minutes (Cho et al. 2010).
- Continuous propofol infusion may be better than intermittent dosing for longer procedures (Hassan et al 2011).
- Oral chloral hydrate may be effective for sedation during auditory brainstem response testing (Avlonitou et al 2011).

1.8 Painful procedures.

- Evidence suggests that propofol is suitable for procedural sedation in children and young people ((Lamond 2010); (Mallory et al 2011)). Evidence from these studies supports the suitability of propofol for sedation in children.
- Propofol and ketamine may be suitable as a specialist sedation regimen in children and young people ((Andolfatto & Willman 2010); (David & Shipp 2011); (Shah et al 2011)). NICE CG112 does not make specific recommendations about specialist techniques for procedural sedation, a specialist could choose to use ketamine with propofol, so this

evidence does not contradict current guidance; however this combination remains a technique for specialist use only.

- Limited evidence suggests that midazolam may be more effective given by buccal aerosol than given orally or by intranasal aerosol (Klein et al 2011). Further evidence would be needed to determine the optimum method of administration of midazolam.
- Limited evidence suggests that nitrous oxide may be preferable to midazolam in sedation in children and young people in whom establishing an intravenous line is expected to be difficult (Ekbom et al 2011). Further studies comparing midazolam with nitrous oxide may be useful to determine the preferred first-line drug for procedural sedation in children and young people.

1.9 Dental procedures.

- Limited evidence suggests that ketamine may be associated with a higher rate of successful dental procedures than midazolam (Bahetwar et al 2010). Using ketamine for dental sedation is an advanced technique, which is likely to be used only by specialist teams, so this study is unlikely to affect a future update to NICE CG112.
- Limited evidence suggests that midazolam plus fentanyl may result in a higher rate of successful dental procedures than midazolam alone (Pandey et al 2010). This evidence is unlikely to affect a future update to NICE CG112, because the combination of midazolam and fentanyl would be considered a specialist sedation technique, which is not covered in NICE CG112.
- Limited evidence suggests that adding sevoflurane to nitrous oxide does not improve the rate of successful dental procedures (Soldani et al 2010).

1.10 Endoscopy.

- Limited evidence suggests that propofol plus remifentanil may be associated with shorter time to waking and using lower doses of propofol, but may be associated with more respiratory events compared with propofol plus fentanyl (Hirsh et al 2010). Further studies are needed to establish the safety of remifentanil with propofol for procedural sedation in children, thus this limited evidence is unlikely to affect an update to the guidance.

Overall, the evidence from the evidence update in 2012 did not have an impact on the recommendations and we found no new evidence in these areas to suggest an update.

The surveillance review in 2014 did not identify any new studies.

Ongoing research

We checked for relevant ongoing research. No relevant studies were identified.

Intelligence gathered during surveillance

Views of topic experts

We considered the views of topic experts, including those who helped to develop the guideline. For this surveillance review, topic experts completed a questionnaire about developments in evidence, policy and services related to NICE guideline CG112.

We sent questionnaires to 12 topic experts and received 3 responses. The topic experts either:

- participated in the guideline committee who developed the guideline
- were recruited to the NICE Centre for Guidelines Expert Advisers Panel to represent their specialty.

The 3 experts indicated that recommendations in this guideline do not need to be updated.

One expert highlighted that sedation is a continuum, and it is not always possible to predict how an individual patient will respond. Hence, practitioners intending to produce a given level of sedation should be competent and able to rescue patients whose level of sedation becomes deeper than initially intended. The expert felt that the American Society of Anesthesiologists (ASA) classification of levels of sedation should be acknowledged in the guideline. We have checked the full guideline and the glossary clarifies that depression of consciousness is a continuum. It also acknowledges the level of sedation varies over time due to two main factors: the change in the concentration of the sedation drug within the patient and the variation in the stimulation that opposes sedation. In line with the ASA definitions, three levels of sedation are also mentioned in the recommendations: minimal, moderate and deep sedation. Furthermore, the guideline includes recommendations on personnel training which outlines requirements of competency for sedation practice. We do not plan to make changes based on the feedback received.

Views of stakeholders

Stakeholders are consulted on all surveillance decisions except if the whole guideline will be updated and replaced. Because this surveillance decision is to not update the guideline, we are consulting on the decision.

See ensuring that published guidelines are current and accurate in developing NICE guidelines: the manual for more details on our consultation processes.

Equalities

No equalities issues were identified during the surveillance process.

Editorial amendments

During surveillance of the guideline we identified the following points in the guideline that should be amended:

- Footnote 6 will be updated to refer to the present time point and to update the link to the British national formulary for children. The text will state: At the time of the surveillance review (August 2018), no drugs have a UK marketing authorisation specifically for sedation in all ages of infants, children and young people under 19. The prescriber should follow relevant professional guidance, taking full responsibility for the decision, and using a drug's summary of product characteristics and the British national formulary for children. Informed consent should be obtained and documented. See the General Medical Council's Good practice in prescribing and managing medicines and devices for further information.
- The 'patient-centred care' section of the guideline will be replaced with the following 'informed decisions' box:

> People have the right to be involved in discussions and make informed decisions about their care, as described in your care.
>
> Making decisions using NICE guidelines explains how we use words to show the strength (or certainty) of our recommendations, and has information about professional guidelines, standards and laws (including on consent and mental capacity), and safeguarding.

Overall decision

After considering all evidence and other intelligence and the impact on current recommendations, we decided that no update is necessary.