NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

Review Proposal Project

NICE Technology Appraisal No. 218; Azacitidine for the treatment of myelodysplastic syndrome

Provisional matrix of consultees and commentators

Consultees	Commentators (no right to submit or
	appeal)
Manufacturers/sponsors Celgene (azacitidine) Patient/carer groups Afiya Trust African Caribbean Leukaemia Trust Anthony Nolan Aplastic Anaemia Trust Black Health Agency Cancer Black Care Cancer Equality Cancer52	 General Allied Health 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
 Cancer52 CML Support Group Equalities National Council Helen Rollason Cancer Charity Independent Cancer Patients Voice Leukaemia Cancer Society Leukaemia CARE Macmillan Cancer Support Maggie's Centres 	 Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency National Association of Primary Care National Pharmacy Association NHS Alliance NHS Commercial Medicines Unit NHS Confederation Scottish Medicines Consortium
 Marie Curie Cancer Care MDS UK Patient Support Group Muslim Council of Britain Muslim Health Network Rarer Cancers Foundation South Asian Health Foundation Specialised Healthcare Alliance Tenovus 	 Comparator manufacturers None Relevant research groups Cochrane Haematological Malignancies Group Elimination of Leukaemia Fund Health Research Authority Institute of Cancer Research
 Professional groups Association of Cancer Physicians British Committee for Standards in Haematology British Geriatrics Society British Psychosocial Oncology Society British Society for Haematology 	 Leukaemia & Lymphoma Research Leukaemia Busters MRC Clinical Trials Unit National Cancer Research Institute National Cancer Research Network National Institute for Health Research Research Institute for the Care of Older People

NICE Technology Appraisal No. 218; Azacitidine for the treatment of myelodysplastic syndrome Issue date: February 2014

- Cancer Network Pharmacists Forum
- Cancer Research UK
- Royal College of General Practitioners
- Royal College of Nursing
- Royal College of Pathologists
- Royal College of Physicians
- Royal Pharmaceutical Society
- Royal Society of Medicine
- UK Health Forum
- United Kingdom Clinical Pharmacy Association
- United Kingdom Oncology Nursing Society

Others 1

- Department of Health
- NHS Coventry and Rugby CCG
- NHS England
- NHS Leeds North CCG
- Welsh Government

Assessment Group

- Assessment Group tbc
- National Institute for Health Research Health Technology Assessment Programme

Associated Guideline Groups

 National Collaborating Centre for Cancer

Associated Public Health Groups

- Public Health England
- Public Health Wales NHS Trust

NICE is committed to promoting equality, eliminating unlawful discrimination and fostering good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. Please let us know if we have missed any important organisations from the lists in the matrix, and which organisations we should include that 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 Government and relevant NHS organisations in England.

The manufacturer/sponsor of the technology are invited to prepare a submission dossier, can respond to consultations, nominate clinical specialists and has the right to appeal against the Final Appraisal Determination (FAD). All non-manufacturer/sponsor consultees are invited to prepare a submission dossier respond to consultations on the draft scope, the Assessment Report and the Appraisal Consultation Document. They can nominate clinical specialists and/or patient experts and have the right to appeal against the Final Appraisal Determination (FAD).

Commentators

Organisations that engage in the appraisal process but are not asked to prepare a submission dossier. Commentators are able to respond to consultations and they receive the FAD for information only, without right of appeal. These organisations are: manufacturers of comparator technologies; Healthcare 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 Alliance and NHS Commercial Medicines Unit, 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 group

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 manufacturer/sponsor and non-manufacturer/sponsor submission dossier to the Institute.