

National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence

Topic selection process for technology appraisals - Comments

Please enter your answers to the specific questions and then add any general comments below. Please use one row for each comment – add extra rows if necessary.

Organisation Name:	British Association of Dermatologists	
Name of commentator:	Dr Hazel Bell, Chair, Therapy and Guidelines subcommittee	
Questions	Comments	
	Please insert each new comment in a new row. Please do not paste other tables into this table, as your comments could get lost – type directly into this table.	
Q1. Do you agree the minded ministerial referral stage should be removed from the topic selection process for all technology appraisal topics?	Yes	
Q2. Do you agree that ROG should no longer be a decision point in the topic selection process for technology appraisal topics?	Yes	
Q3. Do you have any comments or observations about the proposal to increase the number of formal decision points and the proposed process underpinning these?	In general this looks better but we have concerns about the fact that topics that have been rejected are not reviewed at an early stage	
Q4. Do you agree that specific, separate criteria should be developed for the technology appraisal work programme?	Yes	
Q5. Do the proposed criteria reflect the correct priorities for selection of technology appraisal topics for NICE? Do you think there are any important omissions from the proposed criteria?	Yes, no obvious omissions	
Q6. Do you agree that technologies aimed at very small populations should be treated in the way described in section 5?	Yes	
Q7. Would you like to make any other additional comments about the proposals outlined in this consultation	Yes	

document?		
Section Number <small>Indicate section number or 'general' if your comment relates to the whole document</small>	Page Number <small>Indicate number or 'general' if your comment relates to the whole document</small>	Comments
Example 2.3	3	My comments are as follows ò ò
5.4		Although we understand the reasons given at the end of para 5.4, we still have concerns that starting the process 2 years before a drug is licensed is premature as clinicians will have no experience of it and published data will be sparse
Proformas that are not correctly submitted as detailed in the line above may be returned to you		

Please email this form to: topicselection2009@nice.org.uk

Closing date: 22nd May 2009

PLEASE NOTE: The Institute reserves the right to summarise and edit comments received during consultations, or not to publish them at all, where in the reasonable opinion of the Institute, the comments are voluminous, publication would be unlawful or publication would be otherwise inappropriate.