

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

Ruxolitinib for treating acute graft versus host disease that responds inadequately to corticosteroids in people 12 years and over [ID6377]

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 the scoping process, consultees highlighted the following equality issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Higher risk of GvHD in people from certain ethnic minority backgrounds• Current treatment can require regular travel to specialist centres The committee noted these concerns but concluded that they could not be addressed by its recommendations. |
| 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? |
| Submissions from the company, patient and professional organisations and experts identified potential equality issues for consideration. The further issues identified included: |

- Ruxolitinib was available during the COVID-19 pandemic through an NHS England rapid commissioning policy. This policy was withdrawn in 2022, but some people are still able to access ruxolitinib through individual funding requests or local approval from some hospital trusts.
- Ruxolitinib is commissioned in Scotland and Wales.

The committee acknowledged the concerns raised but concluded that they were not relevant equality considerations that could be addressed in its decision making in a technology appraisal.

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

No 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, or difficulties with, access for the specific group?

No issues identified.

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 issues identified.

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 issues identified.

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 Have the committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the draft guidance, and, if so, where?

Section 3.17 of the draft guidance.

Approved by Associate Director (name): Ian Watson

Date: 21 November 2024

Final draft guidance

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

During consultation, the stakeholders further highlighted issues the higher risk of GvHD in people from certain ethnic minority backgrounds, the access issues associated with standard care, and the geographical issues with access to ruxolitinib.

The committee acknowledged the concerns raised but concluded that they were not relevant equality considerations that could be addressed in its decision making in a technology appraisal.

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.

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.	

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?
No.	

5.	Have the committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the final draft guidance, and, if so, where?
Section 3.17 of the final draft guidance.	

Approved by Associate Director (name): Ian Watson

Date: 6 March 2025