

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

STA Vorasidenib for treating astrocytoma or oligodendroglioma with IDH1 or IDH2 mutations after surgery in people 12 years and over [ID6407]

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? |
| Equalities issues raised at scoping included the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">A stakeholder suggested that age should be considered because gliomas impact a younger age group: The committee considered that age is protected under the Equality Act 2010. But because its recommendation does not restrict access to treatment for some people over others, the committee agreed this was not a potential equalities issue that could be addressed by this evaluation.Stakeholders also raised that people may struggle to attend hospital appointments because of socioeconomic disadvantage: The committee considered that there was no significant additional monitoring for vorasidenib compared with active surveillance because it was an oral treatment that could be taken at home. So, the committee did not consider this an equalities issue. |
| |

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?

A patient organisation submission highlighted that vorasidenib is not licensed for use in pregnancy and treatment is expected to continue until progression which affects the ability to have children. The committee considered that pregnancy is protected under the Equality Act 2010. But because its recommendation does not restrict access to treatment for some people over others, the committee agreed this were not a potential equalities issue that could be addressed by this evaluation.

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, or difficulties with, access for the specific group?

No

5. Is there potential for the preliminary recommendations to have an adverse impact on people with disabilities because of something that is a consequence of the disability?

No

6. Are there any recommendations or explanations that the committee could make to remove or alleviate barriers to, or difficulties with,

access identified in questions 4 or 5, or otherwise fulfil NICE's obligations to promote equality?
N/A

7. Have the committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the draft guidance, and, if so, where?
Yes: Section 3.23 of the draft guidance

Approved by Associate Director (name): Christian Griffiths

Date: 03/10/2025