

Public Health Evidence Report Following Engagement Activity

This form is to be completed by the Policy Working Group's Public Health Lead if stakeholders identify potential new evidence during policy development engagement activities. The Public Health Lead will assess the evidence raised to against the Population, Intervention, Comparator and Outcome (PICO) criteria and will record the studies in the appropriate boxes in the 'Outcome for studies suggested during engagement activities' section of this form. In cases where newly identified evidence has a material impact please return the completed form to the Clinical Effectiveness Team (CET).

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| URN | 2006 |
| Policy title: | MR-guided laser interstitial thermal therapy for treatment of epileptogenic zones children and adults with refractory focal epilepsy |
| CRG: | Neurosciences |
| NPOC: | Trauma |
| Engagement activity | Stakeholder Engagement Report |
| Date | May 2022 |

| | |
|---|--|
| Description of comments during engagement (If studies have been suggested please provide a list of references) | <p><i>"We agree with the conclusion that there is enough evidence to make the treatment available at this time.</i></p> <p><i>Some additional studies published after the evidence review was completed are listed below"</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Barot et al. Surgical outcomes between temporal, extratemporal epilepsies and hypothalamic hamartoma: systematic review and meta-analysis of MRI-guided laser interstitial thermal therapy for drug-resistant epilepsy. <i>Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry</i> 2021;0:1–11. 2. Kang et al. Magnetic resonance-guided laser interstitial thermal therapy: Correlations with seizure outcome. <i>Epilepsia</i> (2021) 62:5 (1085-1091). 3. Zeller et al. Current applications and safety profile of laser interstitial thermal therapy in the pediatric population: a systematic review of the literature. <i>Journal of neurosurgery. Pediatrics</i> (2021) (1-8). |
|---|--|

4. Alomar et al. Neurocognitive Outcome after Laser Interstitial Ablation for Temporal Lobe Epilepsy, a Systematic Review and Meta Analysis. *Stereotactic and Functional Neurosurgery* 2021 99:SUPPL 1 (13-).

5. Awad, Kaiser et al. Laser ablation for corpus callosotomy: Systematic review and pooled analysis. *Seizure: European Journal of Epilepsy* 96 (2022) 137–141.

6. Wang R et al. A Systematic Review of Minimally Invasive Procedures for Mesial Temporal Lobe Epilepsy: Too Minimal, Too Fast? *Neurosurgery* 89:164–176, 2021.

7. Hines K et al. Costs Associated with Laser Interstitial Thermal Therapy Are Lower Than Anterior Temporal Lobectomy for Treatment of Temporal Lobe Epilepsy. *World Neurosurg.* (2022) 157:e215-e222

“We believe that there are four studies that should have been included in the evidence review.”

8. Cajigas I et al. Magnetic Resonance Guided Laser Interstitial Thermal Therapy for Mesial Temporal Epilepsy: A Case Series Analysis of Outcomes and Complications at 2-Year Follow-Up. *World Neurosurg.* (2019) 126:e1121-e1129

9. Waseem H et al. MRI-guided laser interstitial thermal therapy for treatment of medically refractory non-lesional mesial temporal lobe epilepsy: Outcomes, complications, and current limitations: A review. *Journal of Clinical Neuroscience* 38 (2017) 1–7.

10. Shimamoto S et al. Laser interstitial thermal therapy in drug-resistant epilepsy. *Curr Opin Neurology* (2019) 32: 237-245. DOI: 10.1097/WCO.0000000000000662.

11. Le S et al. Laser interstitial thermal therapy (LITT): Seizure outcomes for refractory mesial temporal lobe epilepsy. *Epilepsy & Behavior* 89 (2018) 37–41.

| | |
|---|---|
| Action taken by Public Health lead | Reviewed all 11 additional references against the 2 evidence reviews (2006a; 2006b), included and excluded studies, their PICO inclusion criteria, and the conclusions of the evidence reviews. |
|---|---|

Outcome for studies suggested during engagement activities

| | |
|--|--|
| 1. Evidence already identified during the evidence review | 8. Cajigas et al. (2019) 11. Le S et al. (2018) |
| 2. New evidence identified by stakeholders that does not fall within PICO and search methodology | 3. Zeller et al. (2021) 4. Alomar et al. (2021) 5. Awad & Kaiser. (2022) 7. Hines K et al. (2022) 9. Waseem H et al. (2017) 10. Shimamoto S et al. (2019) |
| 3. New evidence identified by stakeholders that falls within PICO and search methodology but does not materially affect the conclusions of the existing evidence review | 1. Barot et al. (2021) 2. Kang et al. (2021) 6. Wang R et al. (2021) |
| 4. New evidence identified by stakeholders that falls within PICO and search methodology, that does materially affect the conclusions of the existing evidence review. Updated evidence review to be undertaken (to be agreed with CET) | |

| | |
|---------------|-----------------------------|
| Completed by: | Consultant in Public Health |
| Date: | 26/05/2022 |

| | |
|---------------------------------|-----|
| Peer reviewed and supported by: | N/A |
| Date: | N/A |