NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

Proposed Single Technology Appraisal (STA)

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

Provisional matrix of consultees and commentators

Consultees	Commentators (no right to submit or appeal)
<u>Company</u>	General
Sanofi (cabazitaxel)	 Allied Health Professionals Federation Board of Community Health Councils in
Patient/carer groupsAfiya TrustBlack Health AgencyBob Champion Cancer TrustCancer Black CareCancer EqualityEqualities National CouncilEverymanHAWCHelen Rollason Cancer CharityIndependent Cancer Patient's VoiceMacmillan Cancer SupportMaggie's CentresMarie Curie Cancer CareMuslim Council of BritainOrchidProstate Cancer UKProstate Help AssociationSouth Asian Health FoundationSpecialised Healthcare AllianceTackle Prostate CancerTenovus	 Board of Community Health Councils in Wales British National Formulary Care Quality Commission 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 Alliance NHS Confederation Scottish Medicines Consortium Possible comparator companies Astellas Pharma (enzalutamide) Bayer (radium-223 dichloride) Hospira (mitoxantrone) Janssen (abiraterone) Wockhardt (mitoxantrone)
 <u>Professional groups</u> Association of Cancer Physicians British Association of Urological Nurses British Association of Urological Surgeons British Geriatrics Society British Institute of Radiology British Prostate Group British Orthopaedic Oncology Society British Psychosocial Oncology Society 	 <u>Relevant research groups</u> Cochrane Prostate Diseases and Urologic Cancers Group Institute of Cancer Research MRC Clinical Trials Unit National Cancer Research Institute National Cancer Research Network National Institute for Health Research Ovarian and Prostate Cancer Research Trust Pro Cancer Research Fund

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

Consultees	Commentators (no right to submit or appeal)
 British Society of Urogenital Radiology British Uro-Oncology Group Cancer Network Pharmacists Forum 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 Surgeons Royal College of Surgeons 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
Others 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.