

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CLINICAL EXCELLENCE

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

MTA – Lapatinib and trastuzumab in combination with an aromatase inhibitor for the first-line treatment of metastatic hormone-receptor-positive breast cancer that overexpresses HER2

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?

No potential equalities issues were raised during the scoping process.

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 potential equality issues were raised in the submissions, 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

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?

No

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?

Not applicable

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

No equality issues were raised during the scoping exercise or through the course of this appraisal.

Approved by Associate Director (name): Janet Robertson

Date: December 2010

Final appraisal determination

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

Yes one of the consultees thought that older less fit women are likely to receive less effective doses of chemotherapy if the option of HER2-targetted therapy is not available and so they thought that these women are likely to be disadvantaged by the recommendations. The Committee discussed this and concluded that its recommendation would be the same for any woman with breast cancer covered by the current indication, and therefore issues of discrimination did not arise.

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?

Not applicable

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?

Not applicable

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

Yes in section 4.3.3

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

Date: 25/06/2012

Post-appeal appraisal consultation document

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

No new issues raised.

2. If the recommendations have changed after appeal, 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?

Not applicable - the recommendations have not changed.

3. If the recommendations have changed after appeal, 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?

Not applicable - the recommendations have not changed.

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

Not applicable

Approved by Associate Director (name): Janet Robertson,

Date: February 2012

Post appeal Final appraisal determination

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

Yes one of the consultees indicated that a small population of older patients who are not fit enough to receive chemotherapy may not have access to an alternative treatment and so may be disadvantaged. The Committee discussed this and agreed that this was not an issue of age discrimination because other factors can also affect whether people are fit enough to receive chemotherapy, such as comorbidities. The Committee also noted that the cost effectiveness estimates had been based on the comparison with aromatase inhibitor alone and not with chemotherapy, and that neither lapatinib nor trastuzumab plus an aromatase inhibitor were cost effective relative to an aromatase inhibitor alone. The Committee concluded that there was no need to alter or add to its recommendations.

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?

Not applicable - the recommendations have not changed.

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?

Not applicable - the recommendations have not changed.

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

Yes in section 4.3.24

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

.....
Date: 25/06/2012