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

URN: A13X06
Title: Tocilizumab for adults with large cell vasculitis (Takayasu Arteritis)

CRG: Specialised Rheumatology
NPOC: Internal Medicine
Lead: Ursula Peaple

Date: 02 February 2016

The Panel were re-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?	No population subgroups defined in evidence review or policy proposition	

<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	
<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?	No comparators used	

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?	No comparator	

Overall conclusions of the panel

The panel noted the small patient numbers for Takayasu Arteritis and that this limited the strength of evidence that would be available to support the use of Tocilizumab in this patient group.

In light of this, they supported the feedback from stakeholders that Takayasu Arteritis should be considered separately from GCA, and supported routine commissioning for this patient group.

Report approved by:

James Palmer
Clinical Panel Chair
02 February 2015