

Date: 19th February 2015

Minutes: Final

Guideline Development Group Meeting 3 Parkinson's Disease

Place: NICE Offices, Level 1a, City Tower, Piccadilly Plaza, Manchester, M1 4BT

Present: Paul Cooper (Chair)
Alistair Church (AC)
Beverly Sheaf (BS) – co-opted expert
Fiona Lindop (FL)
Graham Lennox (GL)
Ivan Benett (IB)
Jane Little (JL)
Janine Barnes (JB)
Lynne Osborne (LO) (attended via telephone for afternoon session)
Matthew Sullivan (MS)
Richard Grunewald (RG)
Robin Fackrell (RF)

Apologies: Debbie Davies (DD)
Paul Shotbolt (PS)
Richard Walker (RW)

In attendance:

NICE Staff:

Laura Downey (LD)
Stephen Duffield (SD)
Stephanie Mills (SM)
Steven Ward (SWard)
Gabriel Rogers (GR)
Hugh McGuire (HM)
Louise Shires (LS)
Jenny Kendrick (JK)

Observers:

Swapna Mistry	NICE Project Manager	
Lynne Kincaid	NICE Medical Writer	
David Jarrom	NCC – Cancer	
Vicky Gillis	NICE Technical Analyst	

1. PC welcomed the group to the third meeting of this guideline development group (GDG). Apologies were received from DD, PS, RW and LO would join the group in the afternoon via teleconference to hear the presentation on the evidence for palliative care. RF and GL declared specific personal, non-financial interests which did not affect their participation in the meeting. RG declared a potential non-specific personal financial interest. This did not affect his participation in the meeting. No further conflicts of interest above what had been made known to the NICE team were declared by any other person present.

The GDG looked over the minutes of the previous meeting and agreed they were an accurate representation of the meeting in December 2015. One amendment was noted which was to ensure one member of the NICE team, LD, was added to the list of those present at the previous meeting.

PC explained that the meeting on the day would include looking at some of the evidence on nutrition, the evidence for palliative care and agreeing further review protocols.

2. SD presented the findings of the part of the review for nutrition. The purpose of the questions, the framework for the review and the outcomes which were searched for were explained to the committee. A re-cap of the GRADE criteria for the quality assessment of evidence was given in view that the methodological rigour of some of the evidence was questionable and therefore downgrading of the evidence was necessary.

There was some considerable debate around the evidence for certain interventions for nutritional support of people with Parkinson's disease. Subject to a few amendments, the evidence statements for the review were agreed and the group went on to make recommendations.

3. Following lunch, LD presented the evidence review on palliative care. The committee were reminded that a NICE guideline on *Care of the dying adult* is in development, and that the Parkinson's disease guideline must be conscious not to duplicate any recommendations. The evidence base underpinning this question was smaller and qualitative. Although the evidence was of mixed quality and more difficult to interpret, the committee felt some salient points emerged. The group went on to make recommendations.
4. SWard and GR had a session to discuss health economics with the committee and to ascertain the true extent of the priority for health economic modelling which had been identified at an earlier meeting.
5. LD checked that the committee agreed on the main points of their discussions which had been recorded in a written form to explain how they moved from evidence to recommendations for the questions on nutrition and palliative care.
6. The committee signed off review protocols for a number of upcoming reviews. The group were told that a set amount of development time had now been agreed for the guideline. LD discussed with the group areas of the guideline where changes to some of the review questions may improve the focus of the question. The committee agreed this would be valuable for areas around psychosis and hallucinations. However, the committee did not think changes to the questions on non-motor features of Parkinson's disease would be appropriate. The team also discussed with the group the best ways to answer questions around duodopa and deep brain stimulation.

Date, time and venue of the next meeting

Next meeting – 27th April 2015 at the NICE offices in Manchester from 10am – 5pm.

- **Review question 14:** a) *What is the comparative effectiveness of speech and language therapy compared with usual care to improve speech and communication?*
- **Review question 14:** b) *What is the comparative effectiveness of speech and language therapy compared with usual care to improve swallowing function?*
- **Review question 22:** *What are the specific information needs of women of childbearing age with Parkinson's disease?*
- **Ratify review protocols**