



National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence

MidCity Place
71 High Holborn
London
WC1V 6NA

Tel: 0845 003 7780
Fax: 0845 003 7784

Email: nice@nice.org.uk
www.nice.org.uk

[REDACTED]

Wyeth Pharmaceuticals

11 June 2009

Dear [REDACTED]

Final Appraisal Determination: Bevacizumab (first line) sorafenib (first and second line) sunitinib (second line) and temsirolimus (first line) for the treatment of advanced and/or metastatic renal cell carcinoma

Thank you for your response to the initial scrutiny of your appeal lodged against this FAD. This letter represents the final decision on initial scrutiny.

1.1 Inconsistent use of economic models in decision making

On reflection, I agree that the decision to use your model and not the assessment group model may be taken forward as an appeal point. You will have appreciated that the mere use of your model per se cannot be unfair and you will need to develop your arguments as to why the approach to economic modelling in this case has been unfair.

1.3 Failure to consider clinical need

I am afraid I am still not minded to agree this is a valid appeal ground. The sections of the methods guide you refer to seem to me to deal with positive recommendations. It still seems to me that it is not possible that the appraisal committee were unaware of the clinical need of these patients, and I do not agree that it is necessary for them to have spelt this out in the FAD.

Conclusion

This is the final decision on initial scrutiny. The valid appeal points are Ground one: 1.1, 1.2, Ground 2, 2.1.

Yours sincerely



Appeals Committee Chair

National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence