APPENDIX 7B
Analysis of sense check and feedback phase for London Choosing Wisely draft policy for:
Varicose veins
Results - sense check of draft London policy

- The **draft London policy for varicose veins** was circulated to key stakeholders with a request to share the online feedback form with their own networks and interested parties.

- The **sense check was open for a 4 week period** (13 August – 10 September), extended from 2 weeks to accommodate the summer period.

- Despite reminders to provide feedback, **only 1 response was received** – there were 3 online responses but only 1 completed the online feedback form, i.e. 2 individuals exited the survey without any response to questions 4-11.

- The **completed response is from BMA London exec chair who is a primary care clinician in NEL**.

- The key point in the response was to **remove the word “and” in relation to the criterion that includes “severe daily symptoms”, and oedema**.

- This response was reviewed by the Chair, and it was **agreed to retain the existing wording in the policy** given:
  
  o The response represents a single view, whilst the criteria in the policy have been discussed and agreed upon by all members of the Task and Finish Group, and there was consensus in the Group on this.

  o Task and Finish Group members agreed that as well as daily symptoms, they would want to see evidence of the oedema.

- Given the low response rate to the varicose veins policy sense check, it will be **highlighted to CCGs that they may want to do further engagement on this policy**.

-
Summary – sense check and feedback phase

As part of the development of each draft policy a sense check and feedback phase has been introduced to ensure that the draft policy is easy to follow and use, and ensure that patients will receive the most effective clinically appropriate treatment available to them.

Stakeholders (listed below) were invited to comment on the draft policy via an online feedback form. Specifically, the online feedback form was aimed to receive comments on how easy the draft policy was to follow and on the clarity of the language used.

The link to the online feedback form was sent to the following audience groups with a request to share the online feedback form with their own networks and interested parties (for example, key CCG colleagues, primary and secondary care colleagues, local patient groups, professional associations, and referral management centres):

- London’s STP clinical leads
- Members of the London Choosing Wisely Programme Board (which includes London’s STP PoLCE leads)
- London Choosing Wisely Task and Finish Group members or contributors who had developed the draft policy
- London Choosing Wisely Steering Group patient representatives
- London’s Healthwatch networks and patient-facing organisations
- Relevant royal colleges and professional associations (including the BMA’s London executive)
Summary - questions

The following is an extract of the London Choosing Wisely feedback and sense check phase online form questions for varicose Veins:

**Section 1: About you**

1. In what capacity are you responding to this survey?
   - A patient or patient organisation/group
   - A primary care clinician
   - A secondary care clinician
   - A referral management centre
   - A commissioner
   - Professional clinical association/body
   - Other (please state)

2. Which part of London do you work (clinician) or live (public/patient):
   - East London
   - North London
   - North West London
   - South East London
   - South West London

3. Please provide your e-mail address so that we can keep you informed about the development of London Choosing Wisely policies:
Section 2: Feedback questions on the draft policy

Please rate the following [Qs 4 – 9] on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is the lowest and 5 is the highest:

1) Strongly disagree
2) Somewhat disagree
3) Neither agree nor disagree
4) Somewhat agree
5) Strongly agree
6) Unable to rate (N/A)

Note: through the online feedback form there is an options comment box for all questions asking for the reason for that rating.

4. The draft policy is clear and unambiguous.

5. The draft policy is easy to follow and supports dialogue between the patient and clinician about decisions including treatment or referral.

6. It is clear which conditions this draft policy applies to.

7. The draft policy is clear on when treatments or referral should be offered to patients.

8. The draft policy reflects the commissioning codes you are currently using.

9. The draft policy can be easily implemented as part of your local compliance process.

10. It is clear how the draft London Choosing Wisely policy compares with local policies currently in place across London.

11. [Comment box]. Please use the following comment box to add any additional observations you may have about the policy – for example, you may wish to comment on how easy it is to follow or the clarity of the language used.
Summary – overall response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>sense check phase opened</th>
<th>sense check phase closed</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Varicose Veins</td>
<td>13 August 2018</td>
<td>9am Monday, 10 September 2018</td>
<td>1 response (completed online)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Task and Finish Group members should note:

- **This online feedback reflects only one response to the sense check** – there were 3 online responses but only 1 completed the online feedback form, i.e. 2 individuals exited the survey without any response to questions 4-11.

- To note, the one completed response is from BMA London exec chair who is a primary care clinician in NEL.

- There were no additional responses received.

- The sense check and feedback phase of the programme was launched for an extended period to allow for the August holiday period.

- The average score across questions 4 – 10 was: 3.71.

- The following data is extracted directly from the online form.
Q4 The draft policy is clear and unambiguous.

Answered: 1   Skipped: 2

![Bar chart showing the response to the statement]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT DISAGREE</th>
<th>NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT AGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>UNABLE TO RATE (N/A)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>WEIGHTED AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(no label)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q5 The draft policy is easy to follow and supports dialogue between the patient and clinician about decisions including treatment or referral.

Answered: 1  Skipped: 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT DISAGREE</th>
<th>NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT AGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>UNABLE TO RATE (N/A)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>WEIGHTED AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(no label)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q6 It is clear which conditions this draft policy applies to.

Answered: 1  Skipped: 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT DISAGREE</th>
<th>NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT AGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>UNABLE TO RATE (N/A)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>WEIGHTED AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(no label)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q7 The draft policy is clear on when treatments or referral should be offered to patients.

Answered: 1  Skipped: 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT DISAGREE</th>
<th>NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT AGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>UNABLE TO RATE (N/A)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>WEIGHTED AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(no label)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q8 The draft policy reflects the commissioning codes you are currently using.

Answered: 1    Skipped: 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT DISAGREE</th>
<th>NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT AGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>UNABLE TO RATE (N/A)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>WEIGHTED AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(no label)</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q9 The draft policy can be easily implemented as part of your local compliance process.
Q10 It is clear how the draft London Choosing Wisely policy compares with local policies currently in place across London.

Answered: 1  Skipped: 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>REASON FOR RATING:</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>It does not match the local policy</td>
<td>8/14/2018 10:25 AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q11 Please use the following comment box to add any additional observations you may have about the policy – for example, you may wish to comment on how easy it is to follow or the clarity of the language used:

Answered: 1  Skipped: 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>If &quot;and&quot; was removed from &quot;severe daily symptoms&quot; and &quot;oedema&quot; I would support this but not otherwise</td>
<td>8/14/2018 10:25 AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>