

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

STA Tarlatamab for previously treated advanced small-cell lung cancer [ID6364]

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? |
| At scoping, the technical team noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lung cancer incidence is strongly related to age. The highest rates are in in the 75 to 79 age group for females and the 85 to 89 age group for males.• Lung cancer incidence is higher in people of European family origin (compared to people of African or Asian origin) It was decided at scoping that issues related to differences in prevalence or incidence of a condition cannot be addressed in a technology appraisal. Therefore this was not presented to the committee for consideration | |
| 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? |
| None identified | |

3.	Have any other potential equality issues been identified by the committee, and, if so, how has the committee addressed these?
None 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: tarlatamab is not recommended for the population in its full marketing authorisation.	

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: tarlatamab is not recommended for the population in its full marketing authorisation.	

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?
None	

7.	Have the committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the draft guidance, and, if so, where?
Yes: section 3.17	

Approved by Associate Director: Emily Crowe

Date: 17/01/2025

Final draft guidance

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

No

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 has not changed after consultation.

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 has not changed after consultation.

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 appraisal determination, and, if so, where?

Yes: section 3.14

Approved by Associate Director (name): ...Emily Crowe.....

Date: 26/06/2025