

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

STA Larotrectinib for treating NTRK fusion-positive advanced solid tumours (Managed access review of TA630) ID6292

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?

During scoping, a stakeholder highlighted variation in genomic services or NTRK testing in the UK may result in inequality in access to larotrectinib, because of:

- regional disparities, particularly inequalities between people treated in smaller hospitals and those treated in urban hospitals
- conscious or unconscious biases particularly for people from black and ethnic minority backgrounds who may be excluded from being tested
- lack of inclusivity of certain ethnic groups because of language barriers.

It also highlighted that if larotrectinib's NHS funding is removed, socio-economic inequalities may be introduced because access would then depend on the person's ability to self-fund or access private healthcare.

It also suggested that people with rare conditions may be systematically disadvantaged in HTA processes because the rarity of biomarkers often limits the availability of robust clinical and economic evidence.

Another stakeholder noted that age should be included as a subgroup to account for potential inequalities in usage and accessibility between age groups.

The committee acknowledged that there might be variations in access to genomic testing for NTRK fusion tumours that could affect access to

larotrectinib if recommended. But it explained that access to testing, which is now considered standard NHS practice, is an implementation issue that cannot be address by a NICE technology appraisal. It considered whether there were any equality issues relevant to protected characteristics that could be addressed by the evaluation process. But the committee noted that its recommendation does not restrict access to treatment for some people over others. So, the committee agreed that these were not potential equality issues in this evaluation.

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 clinical expert at the meeting said that unequal access to genomic testing for NTRK fusions may also disadvantage older adults, young children and people with rare or severe conditions. These are in addition to groups identified to be disadvantaged during the scoping process. The committee acknowledged that there might be variations in access to genomic testing for NTRK fusion tumours that could affect access to larotrectinib if recommended. But it explained that access to testing, which is now considered standard NHS practice, is an implementation issue that cannot be address by a NICE technology appraisal. It considered whether there were any equality issues relevant to protected characteristics that could be addressed by the evaluation process. But the committee noted that its recommendation does not restrict access to treatment for some people over others. So, the committee agreed that these were not potential equality issues in this evaluation.

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

No other potential equality issues identified by the committee.

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?

No.

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

Yes, section 3.22.

Approved by Principal Technical Adviser: Elizabeth Bell

Date: 24th March 2026