

<b>Suicide prevention Committee meeting 4</b>		
<b>Date:</b>	15/06/17	
<b>Location:</b>	Prince Philip House, London	
<b>Minutes:</b>	Final	
<b>Committee members present:</b>		
Susan Jebb	Chair	Present for all
Jeff Round	Core member	Present for all
Toby Prevost	Core member	Present for all
Ian Basnett (+ carer)	Core member	Present until 4b (left at 1.45pm)
Andrew Chapman	Topic member	Present for all
Vikki Levick	Topic member	Present for all
Amy Beck	Topic member	Present for all
Ray Canham	Core member	Present for all
Jane Leaman	Core member	Present for all
David Mosse	Topic member	Present for all
Rebeca Martinez	Topic member	Present for all
Navneet Kapur	Topic member	Present for all
Chris Packham	Core member	Present for all
Chris Owen (arrived 10.40am)	Core member	Present for 4a onwards
Stephen Habgood	Topic member	Present for all
Rebeca Martinez	Topic member	Present for all

<b>In attendance:</b>		
Hugh Mcguire	Technical Adviser	Present for all
Ying Ying Wang	Technical Analyst	Present for all
Ben Doak	Guideline commissioning manager	Present for all
Patricia Mountain	Project Manager	Present for all
Ben Johnson	Health Economist	Present for all

<b>Observers</b>	
Sarah Boyce	Technical Analyst
Jess Fielding	Public Involvement Adviser

<b>Apologies PHAC members</b>	
Helene Raynsford	Topic member
Suzanne Jones	Core member
Dave Cherrington	Topic member
Raymond Jankowski	Core member
<b>Apologies</b>	
Helen Garnham	PHE Topic advisor
Sarah Willett	NICE Associate Director

<p><b>1. Welcome and objectives for the meeting</b></p> <p>The Chair welcomed the Committee members and attendees to the 4<sup>th</sup> meeting on NICE guideline <i>Preventing suicide in community and custodial settings</i>. The Committee members and attendees introduced themselves.</p> <p>The members of the public were also welcomed to the meeting. The members of the public had been briefed already, both verbally and in writing by the NICE team, and the Chair reminded them of the protocol for members of the public, i.e. their role is to observe and they may not speak or ask questions. Also, no filming or recording of the meeting is permitted.</p> <p>The Chair reminded all present that the PHAC is independent and advisory, and that its decisions and recommendations to NICE do not represent final NICE guidance; and they may be changed as a result of public consultation.</p> <p>The Chair welcomed the members of the public to the meeting.</p> <p>The Chair informed the Committee that apologies had been received. These are noted above.</p> <p>The Chair outlined the objectives of the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To consider and discuss evidence reviews of interventions that provide information, advice, education and training for staff and public to recognise and respond to someone who may be contemplating suicide</li> <li>• To recap public health evidence on restriction on access to means, present</li> </ul>
--

economic evidence on platform screening doors.

## **2. Confirmation of matter under discussion, and declarations of interest**

The Chair confirmed that, for the purpose of managing conflicts of interest, the matter under discussion was Suicide prevention in community and custodial settings’.

The Chair explained that verbal declarations of interest are a standing item on every agenda and are recorded in the minutes as a matter of public record.

The Chair asked the PHAC and attendees at the table, to declare any changes to the interests already declared, and any additional declarations

- Chris Packham. 2017 – 2018 Member of Death in custody group, which is a sub group of the NHS Health and Justice Clinical Reference Group - Personal non-financial specific

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.

## **3. Minutes of previous meeting**

The minutes were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting. All actions had been completed.

## **4. Evidence review RQ4/5**

Ying Ying Wang gave a presentation on Review questions 4 and 5 which are:

*RQ4 - Are information, advice, education or training interventions effective and cost effective at increasing the ability of staff and the public to recognise and respond to someone who may be contemplating suicide?*

*RQ5 - What are the most effective and cost effective non-clinical interventions to support people who are at risk of suicidal acts?*

Ying Ying Wang presented evidence, using Randomised Controlled Trials (RCTs), on review questions 4 and 5, what was agreed in protocol, search results and final reviews.

There was an opportunity for the PHAC to ask questions and discuss.

## **4b. Evidence review RQ4/5**

The PHAC discussed the evidence from RCTs within the presentation and cross referred to the draft review to pick out the stronger evidence.

The Chair asked the PHAC to agree a how the evidence could be best structured to facilitate the drafting of recommendations. The PHAC to identified studies that they assessed to be most useful.

**Action – NICE to create a data table which groups all studies according to topic area, and add summary text.**

**Action – NICE to add additional explanatory text to the table for the six studies identified by the PHAC.**

**Action – NICE to send the data table to the PHAC for comment before the next meeting.**

**Action – NICE to revise following PHAC comment and bring to the next meeting.**

The PHAC agreed that expert testimony would be beneficial to the evidence base and made suggestions of organisations.

**Action point – PHAC to contact NICE team with suggestions of named experts and their organisations**

**Action – NICE to review and bring the summary to the next meeting for PHAC agreement, with a view to inviting suggested experts to a subsequent meeting**

The PHAC agreed that potentially there was less evidence for custodial settings and that will be considered when they draft research recommendations.

#### **5. Health Economic update RQ 7 – Interventions to change or reduce access to the means of suicide**

At the previous meeting the evidence on restriction to access to means was presented to the PHAC, based on data from two systematic reviews. Following PHAC comment NICE revised the review.

Ying Ying Wang presented an update to the PHAC, which included a study which reported health economic data from Hong Kong on platform screen doors.

#### **6. Evidence Review RQ7**

The PHAC discussed the evidence and suggested potential further sources.

**Action – PHAC members to share with NICE sources of suicide data with economic metrics that can be shared with YHEC**

**Action – NICE to share with York Health Economics Consortium (YHEC)**

**Action – NICE to invite YHEC to the next meeting to update the PHAC on the**

**development of the economic model**

The NICE team had drafted potential draft recommendations, based on PHAC discussions.

The PHAC discussed these in plenary session. Revisions and additions were agreed. The Chair explained that there would be further opportunities for the PHAC to revise them.

**Action point: NICE to circulate draft to PHAC members for comment.**

**Action point – NICE to consider grouping recommendations that relate to custodial settings within the final guideline.**

**7. Look forward to the next meeting**

The Chair summarised the agreed decisions and actions from the meeting.

**Action – NICE to consider a specific PHAC meeting on custodial settings**

Hugh McGuire informed the committee of the next steps in the development of the guideline and plans for the next meeting.

**8. Any other business**

There was no other business for discussion

<b>Date of next meeting:</b>	Thursday 20 <sup>th</sup> July 2017
<b>Location of next meeting:</b>	TBC London