

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

STA Selpercatinib for advanced thyroid cancer with RET alterations untreated with a targeted cancer drug in people 12 years and over [ID6132]

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 equality issues were identified 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? |
| Stakeholders highlighted that females are more likely to be diagnosed with thyroid cancer, that children should have access to selpercatinib and that there was regional variation in molecular testing, although the transition to Genomics Hubs should standardise this. The committee noted that issues related to differences in prevalence or incidence of a disease cannot be addressed in a technology appraisal. The committee noted that it could not appraise selpercatinib outside of its marketing authorisation, which was for people aged 12 and above. Another stakeholder stated that molecular genetic testing for RET alterations was well-established in the UK. The committee did not consider that its recommendations have a different impact on people protected by the equality legislation than on the wider population. |

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?

Noted in 3.14.

Approved by Associate Director (name): ...Jasdeep Hayre

Date: 19 April 2024

Final draft guidance

(when draft guidance issued)

1. Have any additional potential equality issues been raised during the consultation, and, if so, how has the committee addressed these?
No further equality issues were raised.
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, or difficulties with, access for the specific group?
No, the recommendation covers the whole of the marketing authorisation.
3. If the recommendations have changed after consultation, is there potential for the recommendations to have an adverse impact on people with disabilities because of something that is a consequence of the disability?
No, the recommendation covers the whole of the marketing authorisation
4. If the recommendations have changed after consultation, are there any recommendations or explanations that the committee could make to remove or alleviate barriers to, or difficulties with, access identified in questions 2 and 3, or otherwise fulfil NICE's obligations to promote equality?
N/A

5. Have the committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the final draft guidance, and, if so, where?
Yes, section 3.14.

Approved by Associate Director (name): Jasdeep Hayre

Date: 14 August 2024