APPENDIX A

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

Review Proposal Project

NICE Technology Appraisal No. 288; Dapagliflozin for the treatment of type 2 diabetes (recommendation 1.3)

Provisional matrix of consultees and commentators

Consultees	Commentators (no right to submit or appeal)
Company • AstraZeneca (dapagliflozin) Patient/carer groups • Afiya Trust • BEMDA: Black and Ethnic Minority Diabetes Association • Black Health Agency • Diabetes Research and Wellness Foundation • Diabetes UK • Equalities National Council • InDependent Diabetes Trust • INPUT • Insulin Pumpers UK • Muslim Council of Britain • Network of Sikh Organisations • South Asian Health Foundation • Specialised Healthcare Alliance • Surya Foundation 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 • Society for Endocrinology • TREND UK • UK Health Forum • United Kingdom Clinical Pharmacy	General • 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 • NHS Commercial Medicines Unit • NHS Confederation • Scottish Medicines Consortium Comparator manufacturers • Actavis UK (pioglitazone) • Accord Healthcare (pioglitazone) • AstraZeneca (exenatide, saxagliptin) • Boehringer Ingelheim (empagliflozin) • Boehringer Ingelheim and Lilly (linagliptin) • Bristol-Myers Squibb (exenatide, saxagliptin) • Dr Reddy's Laboratories (pioglitazone) • Janssen (canagliflozin) • Lilly (insulin) • Merck Sharpe and Dohme (sitagliptin) • Novartis Pharmaceuticals (vildagliptin) • Novo Nordisk (insulin, liraglutide) • Sanofi (insulin, lixisenatide) • Takeda (pioglitazone) • Wockhardt (insulin)

Association Others • Department of Health • NHS England • NHS West Hampshire CCG • NHS West Kent CCG • Welsh Government	• Zentiva (pioglitazone) Relevant research groups • Cochrane Metabolic & Endocrine Disorders Group • MRC Clinical Trials Unit • National Institute for Health Research Assessment Group • Assessment Group tbc • National Institute for Health Research Health Technology Assessment Programme Associated Guideline Groups • National Clinical Guideline Centre 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

Definitions:

Consultees

Organisations that accept an invitation to participate in the appraisal; the manufacturer(s) or sponsor(s) of the technology; national professional organisations; national patient organisations; the Department of Health and the Welsh Government and relevant NHS organisations in England.

The manufacturer/sponsor of the technology are invited to prepare a submission dossier, can respond to consultations, nominate clinical specialists and has the right to appeal against the Final Appraisal Determination (FAD).
All non-manufacturer/sponsor 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 specialists and/or patient experts and have the right to appeal against the Final Appraisal Determination (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: manufacturers of 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-manufacturers/sponsors commentator organisations can nominate clinical specialists and patient experts to present their personal views to the Appraisal Committee.

Assessment group

An independent academic group (commissioned by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Health Technology Assessment Programme (HTA Programme) to assist in the appraisal) prepares an Assessment Report on the health technology (a review of the clinical and cost effectiveness of the technology(ies)) based on a systematic review of the manufacturer/sponsor and non-manufacturer/sponsor submission dossier to the Institute.