

Agenda External Advisory Group: November 2nd 5pm – 6pm.

Present: Stuart Logan (Chair) (SL), Exeter University
 Jane Coad (JC), Coventry University
 Jenny Ingram (JI), University of Bristol.
 Kamal Patel (KP), Paediatrician, Brighton
 Alison Wearden (AW), University of Manchester
 Mary-Jane Willows (MJ W), CEO AYME

Also Present: Esther Crawley (PI) (EC)

<p>Introductions and Welcome Everybody introduced themselves. EC outlined the study.</p>	
<p>Review of study documentation SL invited comments on the study documentation. SL said the aims and objectives were clear and it was good to see documentation on the web. This comment was endorsed by other members of the meeting.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There was a general discussion about what would happen if either the Lightning Practitioner or the child/family felt that a LP course was not appropriate after discussion. It was agreed that understanding about drop outs was part of the study. 2. There was a discussion that the PIS wasn't clear on the qualifications or registration of the practitioners. EC agreed and suggested that an amendment was put forward to ethics to add further information on the PIS about this. 3. AW asked whether groups would be feasible given the wide geographical area. EC replied that there were concerns about this but that was why a feasibility study was so important. 4. AW asked why the Chalder trial was not included in the reference list. EC replied that it was published after initial submission to Ethics. 5. JC suggested that the teenager PIS was clearer to read than the adult PIS and could be used for both. 	<p>EC to draft amendment for PIS</p>
<p>Information requests EC informed the External Advisory Group that it was likely that FOI requests would be received</p>	
<p>Minutes EC suggested that the minutes were put on to the website. This was agreed.</p>	<p>EC: Minutes to go on web</p>
<p>AOB</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SL asked how the study was going to date. EC replied that recruitment was going well, parents and teenagers appeared to be enthusiastic and there was a higher recruitment rate than envisioned. 2. EC informed the group that she needed to respond to complaints made to NRES about the study. She suggested that she drafted a response, discussed this with co-applicants and sent the response to the External Advisory Group before submission. This was agreed. 	<p>EC to draft response for NRES, show co-applicants and then send to External Advisory Group before submission.</p>
<p>Date of Next meeting – due in 6 months time</p>	<p>EC to doodle date</p>