From:
Sent: 08 May 2013 14:59
To:
Cc:
Subject: RE: Initial scrutiny letter: Renal cell carcinoma, locally advanced and/or metastatic (2nd line) - axitinib [ID518]

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear

The RCP is grateful to be given the opportunity to respond to the Appeal Committee Chair's initial scrutiny letter regarding the RCP's appeal against the above technology appraisal. Our experts have now had time to consider the response by the committee chair regarding:

1.1. Rejection of views and failure to invite Professor Hawkins to the second appraisal meeting.

We would like to make comments with regard to two sections of the response as follows:

'I am unclear what more a committee would reasonably be required to do. It seems to me that what remains is a disagreement between experts. Each can explain the reasons for their views, but to what extent is it possible to give reasons as to why one view is preferred over another?'

Does this statement mean that the Committee had a logical reason why they preferred one expert's view over another? If so, and to be transparent and fair, we believe that the reasons behind that logic should be made available.

'As to attendance at the second committee meeting, an appeal committee considered a similar point in the appeal in the guidance for Ranibizumab for the treatment of diabetic macular oedema TA 237. While appeal committees do not set precedents I am guided by their past decisions as I expect them to be broadly consistent. I am not minded to refer this point on as valid, in light of the approach taken in TA 237, but invite your comment on that approach before taking a final decision.'

It may well be justifiable to say what the reason was for the decision in the Ranibixmab case and that the same reason applies here. However, without including details of that reasoning/approach it is difficult for our experts to understand any comparison . Again, it cannot be transparent and fair unless the reasons are made available. We would therefore value further explanation of this statement.

I would be grateful if you could confirm receipt.

Best wishes

Direct line

From:
Sent: 23 April 2013 10:00

To:
Cc:
Subject: Initial scrutiny letter: Renal cell carcinoma, locally advanced and/or metastatic (2nd line) - axitinib [ID518]
Importance: High

Dear

Please find attached the Appeal Committee Chair's initial scrutiny letter for the Royal College of Physician's appeal against the above technology appraisal.

If you would like to respond to any of the points in the letter, please can you send your response to me by **Wednesday 8 May.**

Kind regards

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence
10 Spring Gardens | London SW1A 2BU
| Fax: 44 (0)845 003 7784
Web: http://nice.org.uk Meetings held in public: http://www.nice.org.uk/mip

The information contained in this message and any attachments is intended for the addressee(s) only. If you are not the addressee, you may not disclose, reproduce or distribute this message. If you have received this message in error, please advise the sender and delete it from your system. Any personal data sent in reply to this message will be used in accordance with provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998 and only for the purposes of the Institute's work.

All messages sent by NICE are checked for viruses, but we recommend that you carry out your own checks on any attachment to this message. We cannot accept liability for any loss or damage caused by software viruses.

http://www.nice.org.uk

This message may contain confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient please inform the sender that you have received the message in error before deleting it. Please do not disclose, copy or distribute information in this e-mail or take any action in reliance on its contents: to do so is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

Thank you for your co-operation.

Delivered via MessageLabs