

## NICE PUBLIC HEALTH GUIDANCE

### Overweight and Obese Adults: lifestyle weight management

#### 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting of the Programme Development Group

Tuesday 16<sup>th</sup> April 2013

The Royal College of Surgeons, London

#### Final Minutes

<b>Attendees:</b>	<p><b><i>PDG Members</i></b> Gill Fine (Chair), Lucy Aphramor, Barry Attwood, Matthew Broughton, Ruth Chambers, Jane DeVille-Almond, Ulla Griffiths, Vicky Hobart, Kate Jolly, Laura Maria Sanger, Carol Weir, Sarah West Sadler</p> <p><b><i>NICE Team</i></b> Jane Huntley, Adrienne Cullum, Caroline Mulvihill, Alastair Fischer, Victoria Axe</p> <p><b><i>Review Team</i></b> Paul Aveyard (University of Oxford), Jamie Hartmann-Boyce (University of Oxford), David Johns (University of Oxford), Graham Kelly (GK Research), Lise Ritat (UK Health Forum), Tim Marsh (UK Health Forum), Mark Suhrcke (UK Health Forum)</p>
<b>Apologies:</b>	<p><b><i>PDG Members</i></b> None</p>

<b>Author</b>	Victoria Axe
<b>File Ref</b>	Final minutes of PDG 2 16 <sup>th</sup> April 2013
<b>Version</b>	Final
<b>Audience</b>	<b>PDG members, NICE team, the public (via web publication)</b>

Item		Action
<b>1. Welcome and objectives for the meeting</b>	<p>The Chair welcomed the Programme Development Group (PDG) to the second meeting on Overweight and obese adults: lifestyle weight management.</p> <p>There were no apologies.</p> <p>The Chair informed the group that the objectives of the day would be: to discuss the next in the series of the evidence reviews; to hear the finding of the provider survey; to discuss the first stage of the economic modelling and agree the next steps for this work; to consider where there are gaps in the evidence so far and discuss options for expert testimony and to develop recommendations.</p> <p>It was noted that the new Department of Health best practice guidance for tier 2 services “Developing a specification for lifestyle weight management services” had been circulated to the group.</p>	
<b>2. Declarations of Interests</b>	<p>The Chair asked the PDG to give a verbal update of their interests and to keep their declarations updated throughout the guidance development.</p> <p>Kate Jolly declared that she is part of a research team which is using routine data to compare the outcomes of three commercially provided weight management programmes. The team will be seeking publication of this. They have also recently commented on the findings of a similar study: C.D. Madigan; S.A. Jebb; K. Jolly; P. Aveyard. Public health benefits of weight loss may be enhanced with multiple providers: a comment on Dixon et al. Journal of Public Health 2013; doi: 10.1093/pubmed/fdt023.</p> <p>There were no further interests to declare. The Chair and the Associate Director noted that the interests declared did not prevent the attendees at committee from fully participating in the meeting. The Chair reminded the group that all meetings and documents discussed are strictly confidential.</p>	
<b>3. Minutes of the last meeting</b>	<p>The minutes of the last meeting were noted and agreed to be an accurate record.</p>	
<b>4. Actions from the last meeting: Potential unintended effects</b>	<p>The NICE team had circulated a table on unintended or adverse effects and they reminded the PDG that this was not to be viewed as a review of the evidence.</p> <p>The PDG suggested further experts who could give testimony in this area. It was discussed that it might be best to invite a psychologist who could cover a range</p>	

	<p>of issues that the PDG had raised around unintended or adverse effects. It was noted that a psychologist may also be able to address issues around maintenance of change.</p> <p>Paul Aveyard arrived at 10.20am.</p> <p>The group suggested discussing future areas for research that could be added to the considerations.</p> <p>It was agreed that the group would return to defining tier 2 and tier 3 services evidence at a later time.</p>	
<b>5. Evidence review 1b and 1c: presentation of findings</b>	<p>The University of Oxford gave a presentation on the evidence from review 1b and 1c, focusing on studies which compare weight loss programmes and look at weight regain.</p>	
<b>6. Evidence review 1b and 1c: discussion</b>	<p>The Chair invited the PDG to ask questions in regard to the University of Oxford's presentation and a number of queries were discussed.</p> <p>It was noted that bariatric surgery will not be included in the remit of this guidance but would be included in an update of CG43 Obesity.</p> <p>The Chair noted that PDG member Kate Jolly had been involved in a number of the studies included in the review. The Chair did not consider this a conflict of interest for the PDG discussions.</p> <p>The PDG discussed the evidence statements further.</p> <p>The University of Oxford confirmed that the next review will look at people's perceptions of the programmes and what sort of systems of referral are in place. It will also look at the services themselves and how they are set up, how the programmes are commissioned and evaluated and how the training is organised.</p> <p><b>Action: University of Oxford team to amend the phrase "behaviour techniques" to "behavioural change techniques".</b></p> <p>The Chair thanked the University of Oxford team for their work.</p>	<b>The University of Oxford</b>
<b>7. Provider survey</b>	<p>Graham Kelly (GK) arrived at 12pm. GK presented the results from a survey of providers of adult weight management programmes.</p> <p>GK had previously noted in writing that he had no conflicts of interest to declare.</p>	

	<p>The Chair invited the PDG to ask GK questions in regard to his presentation.</p> <p>The Chair thanked GK for his work.</p> <p>GK and the University of Oxford team left the meeting at 1.30pm.</p>	
<b>8. Health economics report</b>	<p>Tim Marsh, Lise Ritat and Mark Suhrcke from UK Health Forum joined the meeting at 1pm.</p> <p>Tim Marsh had declared the following interests in writing prior to the meeting: his group is part of a MRC funded project MR/J000493/1 <i>A randomised controlled trial to test the clinical and cost-effectiveness of primary care referral to a commercial weight loss provider (Weightwatchers)</i>. His group's part of the project begins in 2015.</p> <p>Lise Ritat and Mark Suhrcke had previously noted that they had no conflicts of interest to declare</p> <p>The UK Health Forum team gave a presentation on the modelling for managing overweight and obesity among adults to date. They also discussed options for future modelling, including considerations around "productivity" costs of obesity. They also discussed data submitted to NICE by weight management providers as part of the call for evidence that could potentially be included in the modelling.</p> <p>The Chair invited the PDG to ask the UK Health Forum questions in regard to their presentations.</p> <p><b>Action: The UK Health Forum team to discuss the modelling further with NICE and the PDG economist. Following this the NICE Team to email the PDG a range of options for future modelling by the end of April. The PDG to respond with their favoured option(s) within a week of this email.</b></p> <p>The UK Health Forum team left the meeting at 2.45pm.</p>	<b>UK Health Forum and NICE Team</b>
<b>9. Drafting recommendations</b>	<p>Adrienne Cullum (AC) began a discussion on the draft recommendations. AC noted the areas which had been considered important at the last meeting which were as follows: the components of a weight programme; commissioning; referral in regard to exercise; improving outcomes; adherence; criteria for exclusion and inclusion; training; staff competencies and who should deliver; and raising awareness.</p> <p>AC asked the PDG to consider new areas for recommendations and also to build upon the previous</p>	

	<p>draft recommendations. The PDG were reminded that recommendations must be based on the evidence they have considered.</p> <p>A number of suggestions were made for future recommendations and considerations.</p>	
<b>10. Future planning</b>	<p>AC reminded the PDG of the areas they had previously suggested which might benefit from expert testimony.</p> <p>The PDG suggested some further areas and experts who could give testimony (in addition to earlier discussions around unintended effects). These included someone with expertise about working with BME or other specific subgroups; exercise referral criteria; provider competencies; health and wellbeing boards and comparisons with smoking (particularly in relation to re-referral).</p> <p>Jane DeVille-Almond left the meeting at 3.50pm.</p> <p><b>Action: The PDG to contact NICE if there are any further areas they feel need expert testimony. The PDG to also note what questions they would wish to ask the experts.</b></p>	<b>PDG</b>
<b>11. Any other business</b>	<p>The Chair informed the group that the two day meeting in July would not involve any evening activity and therefore the PDG could feel free to make their own arrangements once the meeting was over.</p> <p>It was noted that the next meeting would be held on 4<sup>th</sup> June 2013 at the NICE Offices in London.</p>	
<b>12. Close</b>	<p>The meeting ended at 4pm.</p>	