NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

Review Proposal Project

NICE Technology Appraisal No.336; Empagliflozin for treating type 2 diabetes

Matrix of consultees and commentators

Consultees	Commentators (no right to submit or appeal)
 Company(ies) Boehringer Ingelheim Limited and Eli Lilly (Empagliflozin) Patient/carer groups BEMDA: Black and Ethnic Minority Diabetes Association Black Health Agency Diabetes Research and Wellness Foundation Diabetes UK InDependent Diabetes Trust Muslim Council of Britain Network of Sikh Organisations South Asian Health Foundation 	General commentators Allied Health Professionals Federation Board of Community Health Councils in Wales British National Formulary Care Quality Commission Department of Health, Social Services and Public Safety for Northern Ireland Diabetes UK Cymru Healthcare Improvement Scotland Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency National Association of Primary Care National Pharmacy Association NHS Alliance
 Specialised Healthcare Alliance Professional groups Association for the Study of Obesity Association of British Clinical Diabetologists British Geriatrics Society Primary Care Diabetes Society Royal College of General Practitioners Royal College of Nursing Royal College of Pathologists Royal College of Physicians Royal Pharmaceutical Society Royal Society of Medicine 	 NHS Confederation Scottish Medicines Consortium Welsh Health Specialised Services Committee All Wales Therapeutics and Toxicology Centre Comparators Janssen (canagliflozin) Actavis UK (gliclazide, pioglitazone, tolbutamide) Accord Healthcare (glimepiride, gliclazide, pioglitazone) Arrow Generics (metformin, pioglitazone)
 Society for Endocrinology TREND UK UK Clinical Pharmacy Association UK Health Forum British Association of Endocrine and Thyroid Surgeons Others	 AstraZeneca (dapagliflozin, exenatide metformin, saxagliptin) Aurobindo Pharma (glibenclamide, gliclazide, metformin) Boehringer Ingelheim (linagliptin, metformin) Bristol laboratories (gliclazide, metformin)

NICE Technology Appraisal No.336; Empagliflozin for treating type 2 diabetes Issue date: May 2018. © NICE 2018. All rights reserved. Subject to Notice of rights.

- Department of Health
- NHS Chorley and South Ribble CCG
- NHS England
- NHS North Manchester CCG
- Welsh Government

- Eli Lilly UK (insulin)
- Merck Serano (metformin)
- Merck Sharp and Dohme (sitagliptin)
- Novartis (metformin, vildagliptin)
- Novo Nordisk (insulin, liraglutide)
- Pfizer (glipizide)
- Sanofi (glimperimide, insulin)
- Sandoz (pioglitazone)
- Servier Laboratories (gliclazide)
- Takeda (metformin, pioglitazone)
- Teva UK (metformin, pioglitazone)
- Wockhardt UK (glibenclamide, gliclazide, insulin, metformin)
- Zentiva (glimepiride, metformin, pioglitazone)

Relevant research groups

- Cochrane Metabolic & Endocrine Disorders Group
- Cochrane Metabolic & Endocrine Disorders Group
- MRC Clinical Trials Unit
- National Institute for Health Research

Associated Public Health Groups

- Public Health England
- Public Health Wales

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

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 prepare a submission dossier, can respond to consultations, nominate clinical experts and has the right to appeal against the Final Appraisal Document (FAD).

All non- company 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 or patient experts and have the right to appeal against the Final Appraisal Document (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: companies that market comparator technologies; Healthcare Improvement Scotland; 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 the British National Formulary. All non-company organisations can nominate clinical or patient experts to present their personal views to the Appraisal Committee.