HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL: NICE Health Technology Appraisal Appraisal consultation document for cilostazol, naftidrofyryl oxalate, pentoxifylline and inositol nicotinate for peripheral arterial disease	
TO: NICE	**FROM: NHS Quality Improvement Scotland 23 February 2011**

Comment provided by:
[redacted]
22 February 2011

1. Do you consider that all the relevant evidence has been taken into account? *If not, what evidence do you consider has been omitted, and what are the implications of this omission on the results?*

I consider that all relevant evidence has been included

2. Do you consider that the summaries of clinical and cost effectiveness are reasonable interpretations of the evidence? *If not, in which areas do you consider that the summaries are not reasonable interpretations*?

The summaries states that the "committtee accepted the rationale for only including one trial of naftidrofuryl oxalate in the meta-analysis". This was my main objection to the meta-analysis. My other objection regarding the lack of quality of life evidence and the derivation of utility values has been addressed in 4.3.14

3. Are the provisional recommendations of the Appraisal Committee sound and do they constitute a suitable basis for the preparation of guidance to the NHS? *If not, why do you consider that the recommendations are not sound?*

The recommendations are reasonable

4. Are the patient pathways and treatment options described in the assessment applicable to NHSScotland? *If not, how do they differ in Scotland?*

yes

5. Would the provisional recommendations change the patient pathways and/or patient numbers in NHSScotland? *If so, please describe what these changes would be.*

No they are consistent with the SIGN guidelines on management of patients with PAD

6. Do you think there is any reason why this provisional guidance would not be as valid in Scotland as it is in England and Wales? *If yes, please explain why this is the case.* No