

# FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION ONLY



## REPORT FROM CLINICAL PANEL

Title: **A05X03/01**  
**Obesity surgery for children with severe complex obesity**

CRG:

NPOC: Internal Medicine

Lead: Ursula Peaple

Date: 2 December 2015

The Panel were presented a policy proposal for routine commissioning

<b>Question</b>	<b>Conclusion of the panel</b>	<b>If there is a difference between the evidence review and the policy please give a commentary</b>
<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.	

## FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION ONLY

<p><u>Outcomes - benefits</u></p> <p>3. Are the clinical benefits demonstrated in the evidence review consistent with the eligible population and/or subgroups presented in the policy?</p>	<p>The clinical benefits demonstrated in the evidence review support the eligible population and/or subgroups presented in the policy.</p>	
<p><u>Outcomes – harms</u></p> <p>4. Are the clinical harms demonstrated in the evidence review reflected in the eligible population and/or subgroups presented in the policy?</p>	<p>The clinical harms demonstrated in the evidence review are reflected in the eligible population and/or subgroups presented in the policy.</p>	
<p><u>The intervention</u></p> <p>5. Is the intervention described in the policy the same or similar as the intervention for which evidence is presented in the evidence review?</p>	<p>The intervention described in the policy the same or similar as in the evidence review.</p>	
<p><u>The comparator</u></p> <p>1. Is the comparator in the policy the same as that in the evidence review?</p>	<p>The comparator in the policy is the same as that in the evidence review.</p>	

## FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION ONLY

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

The clinical panel noted that additional work was required to ensure a clear definition of 'children' for the policy.

They requested that the Policy Working Group clarify the nature of the Tier 3 service required and specify the minimum length of time patients should undergo Tier 3, by patient sub-group where appropriate.

It was noted that the policy proposition included a number of elements that would be more suitable for a service specification and work was needed to develop a service specification alongside the policy and agree how content sat between the two. The commissioning teams should also seek to align timelines for consultation on these two documents if possible.

The thresholds proposed in the audit requirements should be supported by an evidence base.

Report approved by:

Jeremy Glyde  
Clinical Effectiveness Team  
16<sup>th</sup> December 2015