

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** 19 September 2012 12:59  
**To:**  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:** Re: Initial scrutiny letter: Bone metastases treatment in cancer (solid tumours) - denosumab

Dear

Thank you for your email and I would also like to thank [redacted] for her telephone call and concern.

[redacted], this is a subject that is very close to my heart.

I have been discussing this with my colleagues and we have come to the understanding that NICE was correct in the ruling that has been given, as the rules apply. Our reasons for this are as follows:

Denosumab has been compared with bisphosphonates for treatment in bone disease from metastatic cancer. As there is no recommended treatment pathway for prostate cancer which includes treatment for bone health, there was nothing to compare and as such the decision reached was the only one possible, under the current rules and in that sense, not unfair. In view of this the Prostate Cancer Support Federation would like to withdraw its appeal.

I would like to add as a finishing note, that according to my oncologist, denosumab works equally well with both breast and prostate cancers, there are no differences in outcomes.

I do realise that this is not the remit of this committee, but hormone treatment for prostate cancer causes osteoporosis and skeletal related events. The fact that there is no recommended treatment pathway for bone health is not only morally wrong, but condemns men to bone breakages and great pain when it could be so easily avoided. This is something which hugely impacts on quality of life ought to be corrected very quickly.

Regards

Prostate Cancer Support Federation  
Charity No. 1123373