



ROYAL COLLEGE OF
PHYSICIANS AND
SURGEONS OF GLASGOW

CONSULTATION:	Consultation on Skin cancer draft quality standard
ORIGINATING SOURCE:	National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE)
CONTRIBUTORS:	Professor Hazel Scott, Honorary Secretary, RCPSG Mr Andrew Malyon, Consultant Plastic Surgeon
SUBMITTED:	24 March 2016

Consultation on draft quality standard –deadline for comments 5pm on 24/03/16 email: QSconsultations@nice.org.uk

	<p>Please read the checklist for submitting comments at the end of this form. We cannot accept forms that are not filled in correctly.</p> <p>We would like to hear your views on these questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does this draft quality standard accurately reflect the key areas for quality improvement? If the systems and structures were available, do you think it would be possible to collect the data for the proposed quality measures? Do you have an example from practice of implementing the NICE guideline(s) that underpins this quality standard? If so, please submit your example to the NICE local practice collection on the NICE website. Examples of using NICE quality standards can also be submitted.
<p>Organisation name – stakeholder or respondent (if you are responding as an individual rather than a registered stakeholder please leave blank):</p>	<p>The Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Glasgow</p>
<p>Disclosure Please disclose any past or current, direct or indirect links to, or funding from, the tobacco industry.</p>	<p>none</p>
<p>Name of commentator person completing form:</p>	<p>Prof H R Scott, Honorary Secretary, in consultation with Fellows practicing in this field.</p>
<p>Supporting the quality standard - Would your organisation like to express an interest in formally supporting this quality standard?More information.</p>	<p>No</p>

Consultation on draft quality standard –deadline for comments **5pm** on 24/03/16 email: QSconsultations@nice.org.uk

Type		[office use only]	
Comment number	Section	Statement number	Comments
			<p>Insert each comment in a new row.</p> <p>Do not paste other tables into this table because your comments could get lost – type directly into this table.</p>
Example 1	Statement 1 (measure)		This statement may be hard to measure because...
1	statement 1		This might be hard to measure because of the different NHS structure in Scotland
2	statement 2		We are concerned that 'low risk' BCC and required 'link' to the local skin cancer MDT are not sufficiently defined by the statement itself and that the rest of the document may be overlooked. It would also be difficult to support this in areas of low population density.
3	statement 3		agree
4	statement 4		We have received mixed feelings from a combined plastic surgical / dermatological sample. We question the assumption that there is a consensus for requiring dermoscopy as the minimum standard. We understand that several clinicians do not use dermoscopy & do not find it helpful in diagnosis and that there is mixed evidence around improvements in sensitivity / specificity of diagnosis using dermoscopy against an experienced eye. We could support a statement encouraging dermoscopy, but are concerned about one requiring it as a minimum standard.
	statement 5		agree
	statement 6		agree
5	statement 7		We agree that the surgeon should be a member of a skin cancer MDT. We have concerns about the stated minimum number of procedures and also that the statement itself does not make it clear that neck dissections are not within this. We are concerned that the document format is large and the statements may be read without reference to the definitions of terms. We are surprised that such specification in terms of practice is presented within a section on definitions rather than in the main statement.
6	statement 8		agree

Please return to: QSconsultations@nice.org.uk

Consultation on draft quality standard –deadline for comments 5pm on 24/03/16 email: QSconsultations@nice.org.uk

Insert extra rows as needed

Checklist for submitting comments

- Use this comment form and submit it as a Word document (not a PDF).
- Complete the disclosure about links with, or funding from, the tobacco industry.
- Include section number of the text each comment is about eg. introduction; quality statement 1; quality statement 2 (measure).
- If commenting on a specific quality statement, please indicate the particular sub-section (for example, statement, measure or audience descriptor).
- Combine all comments from your organisation into 1 response. We cannot accept more than 1 response from each organisation.
- Do not paste other tables into this table – type directly into the table.
- Underline and highlight any confidential information or other material that you do not wish to be made public.
- Do not include medical information about yourself or another person from which you or the person could be identified.
- Spell out any abbreviations you use
- For copyright reasons, comment forms do not include attachments such as research articles, letters or leaflets (for copyright reasons). We return comments forms that have attachments without reading them. The stakeholder may resubmit the form without attachments, but it must be received by the deadline.

You can see any guidance and quality standards that we have produced on topics related to this quality standard by checking [NICE Pathways](#).

Note: We reserve the right to summarise and edit comments received during consultations, or not to publish them at all, if we consider the comments are too long, or publication would be unlawful or otherwise inappropriate.

Comments received during our consultations are published in the interests of openness and transparency, and to promote understanding of how recommendations are developed. The comments are published as a record of the comments we received, and are not endorsed by NICE, its officers or advisory Committees.