NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

Single Technology Appraisal (STA)

Cabazitaxel for hormone-relapsed metastatic prostate cancer previously treated with a docetaxel-containing regimen (review of TA255) [ID889]

Consultees	Commentators (no right to submit or
	appeal)
Company	General
Sanofi (cabazitaxel)	 Allied Health Professionals Federation Board of Community Health Councils in
Patient/carer groups	Wales
Black Health Agency	British National Formulary
Bob Champion Cancer Trust	Care Quality Commission
Cancer Black Care	Department of Health, Social Services
Cancer Equality	and Public Safety for Northern Ireland
 Equalities National Council 	Healthcare Improvement Scotland
Everyman	Medicines and Healthcare products
HAWC	Regulatory Agency
Helen Rollason Cancer Charity	National Association of Primary Care
Independent Cancer Patient's Voice	National Pharmacy Association
Macmillan Cancer Support	NHS Alliance
Maggie's Centres	NHS Commercial Medicines Unit
Marie Curie Cancer Care	NHS Confederation
Muslim Council of Britain	Scottish Medicines Consortium
Orchid	Possible comparator companies
Prostate Cancer UK	 Possible comparator companies Accord (mitoxantrone)
Prostate Help Association South Asian Health Foundation	 Astellas Pharma (enzalutamide)
South Asian Health Foundation	 Bayer (radium-223 dichloride)
Specialised Healthcare AllianceTackle Prostate Cancer	 Bayer (nutation 220 distribute) Baxter (mitoxantrone)
 Tackie Prostate Cancel Tenovus 	 Hospira (mitoxantrone)
	 Janssen (abiraterone)
Professional groups	······································
Association of Cancer Physicians	Relevant research groups
British Association of Urological	 Cochrane Prostate Diseases and
Nurses	Urologic Cancers Group
British Association of Urological	Institute of Cancer Research
Surgeons	MRC Clinical Trials Unit
British Geriatrics Society	National Cancer Research Institute
British Institute of Radiology	National Cancer Research Network
British Prostate Group	National Institute for Health Research
British Psychosocial Oncology Society	Ovarian and Prostate Cancer Research
British Society of Urogenital Radiology	Trust
British Uro-Oncology Group	Pro Cancer Research Fund

Final matrix of consultees and commentators

Final matrix for the proposed technology appraisal of cabazitaxel for hormone-relapsed metastatic prostate cancer previously treated with a docetaxel-containing regimen (review of TA255) [ID889] Issue date: July 2015

Consultees	Commentators (no right to submit or appeal)
 Cancer Research UK Pelican Cancer Foundation Prostate Cancer Advisory Group 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 UK Clinical Pharmacy Association UK Health Forum UK Oncology Nursing Society Urology Foundation 	 Prostate Cancer Research Centre <u>Evidence Review Group</u> School of Health and Related Research (ScHARR) National Institute for Health Research Health Technology Assessment Programme <u>Associated Guideline groups</u> National Collaborating Centre for Cancer <u>Associated Public Health groups</u> Public Health England Public Health Wales
<u>Others</u> Department of Health NHS England NHS North East Essex CCG NHS Wigan Borough CCG Welsh Government 	

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 company that markets the technology; national professional organisations; national patient organisations; the Department of Health and the Welsh Government and relevant NHS organisations in England.

The company that markets the technology is invited to make an evidence submission, respond to consultations, nominate clinical specialists and has the right to appeal against the Final Appraisal Determination (FAD).

All non-company consultees are invited to submit a statement¹, respond to consultations, nominate clinical specialists or patient experts and have the right to appeal against the Final Appraisal Determination (FAD).

Commentators

Organisations that engage in the appraisal process but that are not asked to prepare an evidence submission or statement, are able to respond to consultations and they receive the FAD for information only, without right of appeal. These organisations are: companies that market 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-company commentators are invited to nominate clinical specialists or patient experts.

Evidence Review Group (ERG)

An independent academic group commissioned by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Health Technology Assessment Programme (HTA Programme) to assist the Appraisal Committee in reviewing the company evidence submission to the Institute.

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