NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

Review Proposal Project

NICE Technology Appraisal No. 215; Pazopanib for the first-line treatment of advanced and/or metastatic renal cell carcinoma

Provisional matrix of consultees and commentators

Consultees	Commentators (no right to submit or appeal)
Manufacturers/sponsors GlaxoSmithKline (pazopanib) Patient/carer groups Afiya Trust Black Health Agency British Kidney Patient Association Cancer52 Cancer Black Care Cancer Equality Equalities National Council Helen Rollason Cancer Charity Independent Cancer Patients Voice James Whale Fund for Kidney Cancer Kidney Alliance Kidney Cancer UK Kidney Research UK Macmillan Cancer Support Maggie's Centres Marie Curie Cancer Care Muslim Council of Britain Muslim Health Network National Kidney Federation	 General Allied Healthcare Professionals Federation Board of Community Health Councils in Wales British National Formulary Care Quality Commission Commissioning Support Appraisals Service Department of Health, Social Services and Public Safety for Northern Ireland Healthcare Improvement Scotland Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency National Association of Primary Care National Pharmacy Association NHS Commercial Medicines Unit NHS Confederation Scottish Medicines Consortium Welsh Kidney Patients Association Comparator manufacturer(s)
 Rarer Cancers Foundation South Asian Health Foundation Specialised Healthcare Alliance Tenovus 	 Merck Sharp & Dohme (interferon-alpha) Novartis (aldesleukin) Pfizer (sunitinib) Roche Products (interferon-alpha)
 Professional groups Association of Anaesthetists Association of Cancer Physicians Association of Renal Industries Association of Surgeons of Great 	 Relevant research groups Cochrane Prostate Diseases and Urologic Cancers Group Health Research Authority Institute of Cancer Research

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence

NICE Technology Appraisal No. 215; Pazopanib for the first line treatment of advanced and/or metastatic renal cell carcinoma Issue date: September 2013

Consultees Commentators (no right to submit or appeal) Britain and Ireland MRC Clinical Trials Unit British Association for Services to the National Cancer Research Institute Elderly National Cancer Research Network • British Association of Surgical National Institute for Health Research Oncology Pro Cancer Research Fund • British Association of Urological Research Institute for the Care of Older Nurses People British Association of Urological Surgeons Assessment group British Geriatrics Society Assessment Group tbc British Institute of Radiology National Institute for Health Research British Psychosocial Oncology Society Health Technology Assessment (BPOS) Programme British Renal Society British Society of Urogenital Radiology Associated Guideline Groups British Transplantation Society National Collaborating Centre for Cancer Cancer Network Pharmacists Forum Associated Public Health Groups Cancer Research UK Public Health England Renal Association Public Health Wales NHS Trust Royal College of Anaesthetists Royal College of General Practitioners Royal College of Nursing Royal College of Pathologists Royal College of Physicians Royal College of Radiologists Royal College of Surgeons Royal Pharmaceutical Society Royal Society of Medicine Society and College of Radiographers (SCoR) United Kingdom Clinical Pharmacy Association United Kingdom Oncology Nursing Society United Kingdom Renal Pharmacy Group Urology Foundation Others Department of Health

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence

NHS Newcastle North and East CCG

NHS England

NHS South Tyneside CCG

Welsh Government

NICE Technology Appraisal No. 215; Pazopanib for the first line treatment of advanced and/or metastatic renal cell carcinoma Issue date: September 2013

Consultees	Commentators (no right to submit or appeal)

NICE is committed to promoting equality and eliminating unlawful discrimination. Please let us know if we have missed any important organisations from the lists contained within the matrix and which organisations we should include who have a particular focus on relevant equality issues.

PTO FOR DEFINITIONS OF CONSULTEES AND COMMENTATORS

Definitions:

Consultees

Organisations that accept an invitation to participate in the appraisal; the manufacturer(s) or sponsor(s) of the technology; national professional organisations; national patient organisations; the Department of Health and the Welsh Assembly Government and relevant NHS organisations in England.

Consultees can participate in the consultation on the draft scope, the Assessment Report and the Appraisal Consultation Document, they are invited to prepare a submission dossier and all non-manufacturers/sponsors consultee organisations can nominate clinical specialists and patient experts to present their personal views to the Appraisal Committee. All consultees are given the opportunity to appeal against the Final Appraisal Determination (FAD).

Commentators

Organisations that engage in the appraisal process but that are not asked to prepare a submission dossier, and that receive the FAD for information only, without right of appeal. These organisations are: manufacturers of comparator technologies; NHS Quality Improvement Scotland; the relevant National Collaborating Centre (a group commissioned by the Institute to develop clinical guidelines); other related research groups where appropriate (for example, the Medical Research Council [MRC], National Cancer Research Institute); other groups (for example, the NHS Confederation, NHS Information Authority and NHS Purchasing and Supplies Agency, and the *British National Formulary*.

All non-manufacturers/sponsors commentator organisations can nominate clinical specialists and patient experts to present their personal views to the Appraisal Committee.

Assessment team

An independent academic group (commissioned by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Health Technology Assessment Programme (HTA Programme) to assist in the appraisal) prepares an Assessment Report on the health technology (a review of the clinical and cost effectiveness of the technology(ies) based on a systematic review of the literature and a review of manufacturer and sponsor submission to the Institute)

¹ Non manufacturer consultees are invited to submit statements relevant to the group they are representing.