

National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence

**PUBLIC HEALTH PROGRAMME
PREVENTION OF CARDIOVASCULAR DISEASE**

**Consultation on the Evidence from 12 May – 10 June 2009
Comments and additional evidence to be submitted by 5pm at the very latest on
Wednesday 10th June 2009**

Stakeholder Comments Form

Please use this form for submitting your comments to the Institute.

1. Please put each new comment in a new row.
2. Please insert the **Document name (and number if relevant)** in the 1st column. If your comment relates to all of the documents, please put 'general' in this column
3. Please insert the **Section** and/or **Page numbers** in the 2nd and 3rd column. If your comment relates to the document as a whole, please put '**General**' in the section column
4. Please remember to insert your name and the organisation's name on the first page

Name:	Cardiovascular Health Committee		
Organisation:	UK Faculty of Public Health		
Document Name and Number <i>(e.g. Evidence review 1, Economic Review, etc)</i>	Section number <i>Indicate section number or '<u>General</u>' if your comment relates to the whole document</i>	Page Number	Comments <i>Please insert each new comment in a new row.</i>
Reviews 1,2 & 3: Effectiveness	General		This systematic review represents an exhaustive trawl through the literature on multifactorial interventions in community settings. It is thus useful within this narrow context, which sadly now looks rather dated. As stakeholders consistently emphasised when commenting on the scope in 2008, the issue in the 21 st century will be the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of interventions targeting SINGLE important risk factors (such as smoke free bans, FSA programmes to reduce dietary salt etc). The widening of the original (over-narrow) scope is thus very welcomed. The decision to commission relevant evidence from experts is also very valuable.

Please add extra rows as needed

Please return the comments form and evidence to: cardiovascular@nice.org.uk

Name:	Cardiovascular Health Committee		
Organisation:	UK Faculty of Public Health		
Document Name and Number <i>(e.g. Evidence review 1, Economic Review, etc)</i>	Section number <i>Indicate section number or 'General' if your comment relates to the whole document</i>	Page Number	Comments <i>Please insert each new comment in a new row.</i>
Review 4: Cost-Effectiveness	General		<p>This is a disappointing paper. It confines itself to the original (over-narrow) scope.</p> <p>Much of the reviewing work was apparently done by researchers not experienced in CVD epidemiology or health economics.</p> <p>Furthermore, this general review has missed key papers from Australia and the USA. These are appended.</p> <p>Failing to review the cost-effectiveness of single interventions is a major limitation. Happily that crucial issue has been addressed in most of the expert papers.</p>
Review 5: Qualitative studies	General		<p>This is an outstanding review of the key factors which facilitate or obstruct the success of community-based multifactorial risk factor programmes.</p> <p>A corresponding review of single factor interventions would be equally valuable.</p>
Review 6: Primary Qualitative study	General		No comment
Expert papers	General		These are mostly excellent. The inclusion of cost-effectiveness issues in many is very welcome.
	General		<p>We understand that papers have also been produced on cardiovascular risk factor pathways, lessons from CVD trends in other countries, and the potential effects of CVD prevention programmes on inequalities. These latter papers are not currently provided on the NICE consultation website; they will also need to be exposed to peer review and public scrutiny.</p>

Please add extra rows as needed

Please return the comments form and evidence to: cardiovascular@nice.org.uk