

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

STA Lenalidomide for the treatment of myelodysplastic syndromes associated with an isolated deletion 5q cytogenetic abnormality in people with red blood cell transfusion dependence [ID480]

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 consultation on the draft scope, consultees highlighted that without adjustments, QALYs gained in the mostly elderly myelodysplastic syndromes patients are likely to be lower than those gained in younger populations which could represent a potential equality issue.

The Committee examined whether there were any issues affecting groups protected by equality legislation. It concluded that its recommendations do not have a particular impact on any of the groups whose interests are protected by the legislation and that there was no need to alter or add to its recommendations. (ACD section 4.14)

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?

The Committee noted comments from some consultees that MDS associated with a cytogenetic abnormality predominately affects older people and women. It concluded that its recommendations do not have a particular impact on any of the groups whose interests are protected by the legislation and that there was no need to alter or add to its recommendations. (ACD section 4.14)

--

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

Not applicable

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?

Not applicable

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?

Not applicable

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?

Not applicable

7. Have the Committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the appraisal consultation document, and, if so, where?

Yes - ACD section 4.14

Approved by Associate Director (name): Frances Sutcliffe

Technology appraisals: Guidance development
Equality impact assessment for the single technology appraisal of Lenalidomide for treating myelodysplastic syndromes associated with an isolated deletion 5q cytogenetic abnormality
Issue date: August 2014

Final appraisal determination

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

The Committee examined whether there were any potential issues affecting groups protected by equality legislation. The Committee noted the comments from consultees about the Jehovah's Witness group who are unable to receive blood transfusion for religious reasons. However, the Committee noted that no representations had been made or evidence received about the pathway of care for this particular group of patients, or about the effectiveness of lenalidomide in this patient population. Therefore the Committee agreed that it would not be appropriate to make recommendations for a subgroup of patients unable to receive blood transfusions.

9. 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?

The recommendations did not change.

10. 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?

The recommendations did not change.

11. 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?

The recommendations did not change.

12. Have the Committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the final appraisal determination, and, if so, where?

Yes, in section 4.14

Approved by Centre or Programme Director: Meindert Boysen

Date: 16/10/13

Consultation 2

13. Have the potential equality issues identified during the scoping process been addressed by the Committee, and, if so, how?

The Committee examined whether there were any potential issues affecting groups protected by equality legislation. The Committee noted comments from some consultees that MDS associated with a cytogenetic abnormality predominately affects older people and women. The Committee considered that this cannot be addressed within this technology appraisal because guidance could not address this issue. The Committee also noted the comments from consultees about the Jehovah's Witness group who are unable to receive blood transfusion for religious reasons. The Committee noted that no representations had been made or evidence received about the pathway of care for this particular group of patients, or about the effectiveness of lenalidomide in this patient population. Therefore the Committee agreed that it did not need to amend any of its recommendations for the group of patients unable to receive blood transfusions.

14. 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?

Not applicable.

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

Not applicable.

16. 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?

Not applicable.

17. 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?

Not applicable.

18. 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?

Not applicable.

19. Have the Committee's considerations of equality issues been

described in the appraisal consultation document, and, if so, where?
Yes, in section 4.17 of the appraisal consultation document.

Approved by Associate Director: Frances Sutcliffe

Date: 12 May 2014

Final appraisal determination 2

(when an ACD issued)

20. Have any additional potential equality issues been raised during the consultation, and, if so, how has the Committee addressed these?
No.

21. 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.

22. 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.

23. 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?
Not applicable.

24. Have the Committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the final appraisal determination, and, if so, where?
Yes, in section 4.15 of the final appraisal determination.

Approved by Programme Director: Meindert Boysen

Date: 31.07.2014