

# NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CLINICAL EXCELLENCE

## HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

### Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

#### STA of mifamurtide for the treatment of osteosarcoma

The impact on equality has been assessed during this appraisal according to the principles of the NICE Equality scheme.

#### Consultation

1. Have the potential equality issues identified during the scoping process been addressed by the Committee, and, if so, how?

The following equalities issues were raised at the scoping stage and were considered by the Committee: the observation that osteosarcoma predominantly affects children, teenagers and young adults; and that osteosarcoma is a rare disease with little development in treatment over the past 20 years. The Committee agreed that the latter point was not related to obligations under the equality legislation and that the recommendation for mifamurtide was not based on age and does not vary according to the age of the patient. The Committee was therefore satisfied that there were no equalities issues in relation to age in this appraisal.

2. Have any other potential equality issues been raised in the submissions, expert statements or academic report, and, if so, how has the Committee addressed these?

No additional potential equality issues were raised in the submission, expert statements or academic report.

3. Have any other potential equality issues been identified by the Committee, and, if so, how has the Committee addressed these?

No other issues identified.

4. Do the preliminary recommendations make it more difficult in practice for a specific group to access the technology compared with other groups? If so, what are the barriers to access for the specific group?

The Committee was satisfied that the preliminary recommendation did not make it more difficult for any specific group to access the technology.

5. Are there any recommendations or explanations that the Committee could make to remove or alleviate barriers to access identified in question 4, or otherwise fulfil NICE's obligations to promote equality?

No barriers to access were identified.

6. Have the Committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the appraisal consultation document, and, if so, where?

The Committee's considerations of equalities issues are described in ACD section 4.18.

**Approved by Associate Director (name):** ...Janet Robertson...

**Date:** October 2011

### **Final appraisal determinations (October 2010 and August 2011)**

1. Have any additional potential equality issues been raised during the consultation, and, if so, how has the Committee addressed these?

No additional potential equality issues were raised during consultation.

2. If the recommendations have changed after consultation, are there any recommendations that make it more difficult in practice for a specific group to access the technology compared with other groups? If so, what are the barriers to access for the specific group?

The recommendation changed following consultation. The Committee was satisfied that the final recommendation did not make it more difficult for any specific group to access the technology.

3. If the recommendations have changed after consultation, are there any recommendations or explanations that the Committee could make to remove or alleviate barriers to access identified in question 2, or otherwise fulfil NICE's obligations to promote equality?

No barriers to access were identified.

4. Have the Committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the final appraisal determination, and, if so, where?

The Committee's considerations of equality issues are described in FAD section 4.15.

**Approved by Centre or Programme Director (name):** Meindert Boysen.....

**Date:** October 2011