



Correction to: Use of Expert Judgement Across NICE Guidance-Making Programmes: A Review of Current Processes and Suitability of Existing Tools to Support the Use of Expert Elicitation

Alison Peel¹ · Michelle Jenks¹ · Moni Choudhury² · Rosemary Lovett² · Juan Carlos Rejon-Parrilla³ · Andrew Sims^{4,5} · Joyce Craig¹

Published online: 12 February 2019
© Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2019

Correction to:

Appl Health Econ and Health Policy (2018) 16:819–836
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s40258-018-0415-5>

In Sect. 3.3.1, the second sentence of the second paragraph, which reads:

“However, it does not allow for pooling of estimates and must be used with one expert at a time, or by obtaining consensus opinions from multiple experts, face-to-face.”

should read:

“However, it does not allow for pooling of estimates and must be used with one expert at a time, or by obtaining consensus opinions from multiple experts.”

In the row of Table 2 labelled “Allow for flexibility in the manner in which elicitation is conducted (e.g. via the

internet, in person or via telephone)”, the MATCH column, which contains a red dot indicating it does not meet requirements followed by the text:

“Designed to be conducted in person.”

should contain a green dot indicating it meets requirements in full followed by the text:

“Designed to be conducted via the internet but could be used in person or via telephone.”

The corrected table is provided in this correction notice.

The original article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40258-018-0415-5>.

✉ Alison Peel
alison.peel@york.ac.uk

- ¹ York Health Economics Consortium, Enterprise House, Innovation Way, University of York, York, UK
- ² National Institute of Health and Care Excellence, London, UK
- ³ National Institute of Health and Care Excellence, Manchester, UK
- ⁴ Newcastle upon Tyne Hospitals National Health Service Foundation Trust, Freeman Hospital, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK
- ⁵ Faculty of Medical Sciences, Institute of Cellular Medicine, University of Newcastle upon Tyne, Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 7RU, UK

Table 2 NICE requirements from a tool and the extent to which two tools met these criteria

NICE Requirement	MATCH	ExpertLens
Pre-elicitation material		
Provide training materials for experts to go alongside tool (e.g. on probabilities and uncertainty)	● Materials are not provided, although some materials for use with SHELF methodology could be used.	● Materials are not provided.
Administering the Elicitation Tool or Software		
Allow for flexibility in the manner in which elicitation is conducted (e.g. via the internet, in person or via telephone).	● Designed to be conducted via the internet but could be used in person or via telephone.	● Designed to be conducted via the internet but could be used in person or via telephone.
Allow multiple parameters to be elicited during an elicitation session (both in permitting an analysis of covariance and to capture information about multiple independent parameters).	● Tool allows for this.	● Tool allows for this.
Be user friendly, allowing non-experts (either in statistics or the programme behind the tool/software) to use the programme and generate results.	● Training required.	● Involvement from tool's developers required.
Be affordable and allow elicitation to be completed within given timeframes.	● The tool is free but expenses would be incurred for the necessary training and there would be issues with conducting elicitation within given timeframes.	● There is potential for the tool to be costly and there would be issues with conducting elicitation within given timeframes.
Analysis of Elicited Data		
Capture uncertainty in estimates elicited from experts and variability between elicited values, allowing distributions and ranges to be elicited to thus inform probabilistic sensitivity analysis.	● Captures uncertainty in estimates, but values from multiple experts cannot be combined.	● Does not capture uncertainty and values from multiple experts cannot be combined.
Allow for external evidence (e.g. from published literature) to be synthesised alongside expert elicitation.	● The tool does not allow for this unless captured within a consensus.	● The tool does not allow for this unless captured within a consensus.
Provide summary outputs (statistics or diagrams) for use in reporting to Committees.	● These are provided, but only based on outputs from one expert or a consensus output from a group.	● These are provided.
KEY: ● Does not meet requirements; ● Partially meets requirements; ● Meets requirements in full.		