

Sent by email

████████████████████

Registrar
Royal College of Physicians

25 June 2014

Dear ██████████

Final Appraisal Determination: Enzalutamide for metastatic hormone-relapsed prostate cancer previously treated with a docetaxel-containing regimen

Thank you for your letter dated 17 June 2014. This letter represents my final decision on initial scrutiny.

1.1 Inclusion of paragraph 1.2 of the FAD is not fair

I have carefully considered the points that you raise.

The Committee explains at paragraph 4.23 of the FAD that it has not been presented with sufficient evidence to inform a decision on the clinical effectiveness of the sequential use of enzalutamide after abiraterone. This conclusion informs the statement at paragraph 1.2 of the FAD that the guidance does not cover the use of enzalutamide for treating metastatic hormone-relapsed prostate cancer previously treated with abiraterone. Given the Committee's conclusion on this point was specific to abiraterone, I do not think it can be said that the Committee has acted unfairly in "singling out" abiraterone at paragraph 1.2 as you suggest.

So far as the impact of the guidance is concerned, I reiterate the point I made in my previous letter: that the logical conclusion of your argument is that the Committee should recommend a treatment about which it had insufficient evidence to make a recommendation. I do not

think that that would be appropriate, or that the Committee can be said to have acted unfairly by not taking the course of action you suggest.

My view remains that this is not a valid ground of appeal. This is the final decision on initial scrutiny.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Maggie Helliwell
Vice Chair of NICE
National Institute for Health and Care Excellence