

## REPORT FROM CLINICAL PANEL

Title: **A03X04 Cinacalcet for complex primary hyperparathyroidism**

CRG: Specialised Endocrinology

NPOC: Internal Medicine

Lead: Ursula People

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?	There is a difference between the population subgroups defined in the policy and the populations considered by the evidence review.	The panel noted that there was limited evidence available for patients with severe hyperparathyroidism, with most studies covering patients with moderate hyperparathyroidism, but felt the policy proposition to be appropriate considering the patient pathway.
<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	See note above on patients with severe hyperparathyroidism

## FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION ONLY

	and/or subgroups presented in the policy.	
<u>Outcomes – harms</u>		
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.	
<u>The intervention</u>		
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.	
<u>The comparator</u>		
1. Is the comparator in the policy the same as that in the evidence review?	Not applicable.	There was no comparator.
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?	Not applicable.	There was no comparator.

### Overall conclusions of the panel

The policy reflects the findings of the clinical evidence review and should progress.

The panel noted that there was a lack of clarity within the policy proposition regarding which elements of the pathway were specialised commissioning and that this should be updated prior to stakeholder testing.

Report approved by:

J Palmer  
 Chair  
 29 December 2015