

FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION ONLY



REPORT FROM CLINICAL PANEL

Title: **B14X10 Penile Prosthesis surgery for end stage erectile dysfunction**

CRG: Specialised urology

NPOC: Cancer

Lead: Nicola McCulloch

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>		

FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION ONLY

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?	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

FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION ONLY

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

The panel noted that the previous query regarding the role of psychosexual counselling had been addressed.

Report approved by:

J Palmer

Chair

29 December 2015