

**HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL: NICE Health Technology  
Appraisal - Appraisal Consultation Document (ACD)**

**On  
Routine anti-D prophylaxis for rhesus negative pregnant  
women(Review of TA 41)**

**TO: NICE**

**FROM: NHS Quality  
Improvement Scotland**

1. Whether you consider that all the relevant evidence has been taken into account.

*I consider that most of the relevant evidence has been considered. I do consider that the new technologies involving non invasive pre natal diagnosis (NIPD) should be carefully considered when the results of ongoing studies are published*

2. Whether you consider that the summaries of clinical and cost effectiveness are reasonable interpretations of the evidence..

*Cost effectiveness calculations assume that the implementation is cost neutral to the maternity service delivering the recommendations. This is incorrect as Maternity services have to make special arrangement eg set up dedicated anti-D clinics in order to deliver RAADP.*

3. Whether you consider that the provisional recommendations of the Appraisal Committee are sound and constitute a suitable basis for the preparation of guidance to the NHS.

*The provisional recommendations are sound*

  
Reviewer 1.

1. Whether you consider that all the relevant evidence has been taken into account.

Yes.

2. Whether you consider that the summaries of clinical and cost effectiveness are reasonable interpretations of the evidence..

*Yes. Acknowledging that I have no experience of cost-effectiveness modelling the figures quoted in 4.2.4 seem lower than one would expect both for minor and major developmental problems. I think that it is correct to highlight in 4.3.3 the reasons why this underestimate might be the case.*

3. Whether you consider that the provisional recommendations of the Appraisal Committee are sound and constitute a suitable basis for the preparation of guidance to the NHS.

Yes

*The research recommendations are also appropriate and important*

Reviewer 2.

1. Whether you consider that all the relevant evidence has been taken into account.

*The limited evidence base seemed to have been considered – the majority from the previous appraisal.*

2. Whether you consider that the summaries of clinical and cost effectiveness are reasonable interpretations of the evidence.

*The Committee had not received any economic models, considered there were problems with some of the costs in the model developed, combined multigravidae women with primigravidae women, unlike the previous appraisal. However the discussion as reported highlighted some reasons for the cost and combination groups and therefore it was possible to trace the argument.*

3. Whether you consider that the provisional recommendations of the Appraisal Committee are sound and constitute a suitable basis for the preparation of guidance to the NHS.

*My concern is that there appears to be much uncertainty regarding cost and possibly benefit, but with the evidence presented and the inclusion of the final statement about choice (not currently included in the recommendation), the recommendations could be the basis for guidance.*

Reviewer 4

4. Whether you consider that all the relevant evidence has been taken into account.

*Yes. The methodology and evidence base used is appropriate and comprehensive for the purpose.*

5. Whether you consider that the summaries of clinical and cost effectiveness are reasonable interpretations of the evidence..

Yes.

6. Whether you consider that the provisional recommendations of the Appraisal Committee are sound and constitute a suitable basis for the preparation of guidance to the NHS.

Yes.

1 April 2008