REPORT FROM CLINICAL PANEL

Title: **F06X04**
Plasma-derived C1-esterase inhibitor for Prophylactic treatment of hereditary angioedema (HAE) types I and II

CRG: Immunology and Allergy
NPOC: Blood and Infection
Lead: Claire Foreman

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 eligible population(s) defined in the policy are the same or similar to the population(s) for which there is evidence of effectiveness considered in the evidence review.	
<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.	
<u>Outcomes - benefits</u>		
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 subgroups presented 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 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 were satisfied that document addressed the issues raised following the Clinical Panel meeting on 2nd December. Specifically:

- 'Clinically significant attacks' have been defined
- Starting and stopping criteria are included
- The policy is clear on the use of the licenced drug
- The proposed dosage regimen has been confirmed.

The policy proposition for routine commissioning was supported.

FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION ONLY

Report approved by:

David Black
Chair
04 January 2016