

SPECIALISED COMMISSIONING - CLINICAL EVIDENCE EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR CLINICAL COMMISSIONING POLICY PROPOSITION

URN: 1623 and 1696

TITLE: Cholic acid and chenodeoxycholic acid for inborn errors of bile acid synthesis/Cholic acid in combination with chenodeoxycholic acid for in born errors of bile synthesis

CRG: Metabolic Disorders

NPOC: Women & Children

Lead: Anthony Prudhoe

Date: 18/10/18

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|-------------------------------|--|
| This policy is being considered for: | For routine commissioning | X | Not for routine commissioning | |
| Is the population described in the policy similar to that in the evidence reviewed, including subgroups? | Yes. | | | |
| Is the intervention described in the policy similar to the intervention for which evidence is presented in the evidence review? | Yes. | | | |
| Are the comparators in the evidence reviewed plausible clinical alternatives within the NHS and are they suitable for informing policy development? | These disorders are rare and the research evidence is limited. The published research is limited to uncontrolled case series type studies. There are no studies that include a comparator arm. These drugs have been in use in the NHS for many years. There are very limited alternative treatments available with little evidence of effectiveness. | | | |
| Are the clinical benefits described in the evidence review likely to apply to the eligible population and/or subgroups in the policy? | These drugs have been used for many years. Whilst the research evidence is limited, Clinical Panel were satisfied that treatment with these drugs may result in a significant clinical benefit, slowing or halting disease progression. | | | |
| Are the clinical harms described in the evidence review likely to apply to the eligible and /or ineligible population and/or subgroups in the policy? | These can be usually be managed by adjustments in dose. | | | |
| The Panel should provide advice on matters relating to the | The policy proposition should proceed to stakeholder testing. | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| <p>evidence base and policy development and prioritisation. Advice may cover:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Balance between benefits and harms • Quality and uncertainty in the evidence base • Challenges in the clinical interpretation and applicability of policy in clinical practice • Challenges in ensuring policy is applied appropriately • Likely changes in the pathway of care and therapeutic advances that may result in the need for policy review. | | | |
| Overall conclusion | This is a proposition for routine commissioning and | Should proceed for routine commissioning | X |
| | | Should be reversed and proceed as not for routine commissioning | |
| | This is a proposition for not routine commissioning and | Should proceed for not routine commissioning | |
| | | Should be reconsidered by the PWG | |

Report approved by:

David Black
Deputy Medical Director, Specialised Services
14 November 2018