

FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION ONLY



REPORT FROM CLINICAL PANEL

Title: **E03X07**
The use of temperature-controlled laminar airflow devices for children with persistent allergic asthma

CRG: Paediatric Medicine
NPOC: Women and Children
Lead: Rachel Lundy

Date: 21 October 2015

The Panel were presented a policy proposal to not routinely commission

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?	-	Not applicable

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>The only consistent benefit shown within the evidence was in patient reported quality of life in children of less than 12 years.</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>No harms identified</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>-</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>-</p>	<p>Not applicable.</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?	-	Not applicable.
--	---	-----------------

Overall conclusions of the panel

The panel would suggest some greater clarity is provided within the policy that it is intended for all children, and for a clearer definition of severe and persistent asthma.

The policy reflects the findings of the clinical evidence review and should progress with the recommended amendments as a not routinely commissioned policy.

Report approved by:

Jeremy Glyde
Head of Strategic Change Management (Specialised Services)
4th January 2015