REPORT FROM CLINICAL PANEL

Title: **E04X01/01**
Use of Plerixafor for Stem Cell Mobilisation (Update to include paediatrics)

CRG: Children's Cancer CRG
NPOC: Women and Children
Lead: Anthony Prudhoe

Date: 16 December 2015

The Panel were presented a policy proposal for routine commissioning

Question	Conclusion of the panel	If there is a difference between the evidence review and the policy please give a commentary
<u>The population</u>		
1. What are the eligible and ineligible populations defined in the policy and are these consistent with populations for which evidence of effectiveness is presented in the evidence review?	The population(s) defined in the policy is the same or similar to the population(s) for which there is evidence of effectiveness considered in the evidence review.	The panel were satisfied that the populations were sufficiently similar to support the policy proposition. The panel advised that the criteria should be clear that the policy relates to children and young people with a paediatric type tumours (lymphoma and some paediatric solid malignant tumours).
<u>Population subgroups</u>		
2. Are any population subgroups defined in the policy and if so do they match the subgroups for which there is evidence presented in the evidence review?	The population subgroups defined in the policy are the same or similar as those for which there is evidence in the evidence review.	Subject to clarification of patient selection criteria within the policy proposition so that is made clear that children and young people with lymphoma, multiple myeloma and paediatric type solid tumours who meet the standard criteria are eligible.

Outcomes - benefits		
3. Are the clinical benefits demonstrated in the evidence review consistent with the eligible population and/or subgroups presented in the policy?	The clinical benefits demonstrated in the evidence review support the eligible population and/or subgroups presented in the policy.	
Outcomes – harms		
4. Are the clinical harms demonstrated in the evidence review reflected in the eligible population and/or subgroups presented in the policy?	The clinical harms demonstrated in the evidence review are reflected in the eligible population and/or populations in the policy.	
The intervention		
5. Is the intervention described in the policy the same or similar as the intervention for which evidence is presented in the evidence review?	The intervention described in the policy the same or similar as in the evidence review.	The panel requested that the policy provides clarity on dosage, which should be consistent with the license.
The comparator		
1. Is the comparator in the policy the same as that in the evidence review?	The comparator in the policy is the same as that in the evidence review.	
2. Are the comparators in the evidence review the most plausible comparators for patients in the English NHS and are they suitable for informing policy development?	The comparators in the evidence review include plausible comparators for patients in the English NHS and are suitable for informing policy development.	

Overall conclusions of the panel

The Clinical Panel supported the policy proposition for routine commissioning subject to minor amendments and clarifications, specifically the policy proposition should make it clear that it relates to the treatment of teenagers and young adults suffering from certain lymphomas, multiple myeloma and paediatric type solid tumours.

The Panel also requested that the PWG review the policy proposition document, which is an update to an existing policy to ensure that the amendments and additions are appropriately incorporated in a way which provides a single, coherent and clearly understandable document.

It was agreed that the revised document could be signed off through Chairs action as no significant amendments to the meaning of the policy proposition are required.

Report approved by:

David Black
Chair
04 January 2016