REPORT FROM CLINICAL PANEL

Title: **A03X03**
Pasireotide: An injectable medical therapy for Cushing's Disease
CRG:
NPOC: Internal Medicine
Lead: Ursula Peaple

Date: 19 November 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.	
<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 is 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?	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 policy reflects the findings of the clinical evidence review and should progress.

The clinical panel requested the following amendments to the policy proposition:

Section 7. First sentence should read 'Pasireotide should be used, according to its licenced dose, for patients with Cushing's disease….'

Section 7. Correct formatting to ensure the whole section is legible

Section 8. Update pathway to reflect that medical therapy could continue whilst waiting for radiotherapy to take effect.

Report approved by:

Jeremy Glyde
Clinical Effectiveness Team
19th November 2015