

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

MTA Cetuximab and panitumumab for previously untreated metastatic colorectal cancer

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? |
|--|

No other potential equality issues have been raised.
--

- | |
|--|
| 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 have been raised.
--

- | |
|--|
| 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, the preliminary recommendations do not make it more difficult in practice for a specific group to access the technology compared with other groups.

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, there is no potential for the preliminary recommendations to have an adverse impact on people with disabilities because of something that is a consequence of the disability.

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?

Not applicable.

Approved by Associate Director (name): Melinda Goodall

Date: 01/11/2015

Final appraisal determination 1 (withdrawn)

(when an ACD issued)

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

No potential equality issues were identified during consultation.

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?

The patient expert at the second committee meeting raised the issue that both the Scottish Medicines Consortium (SMC) and the All Wales Medicines Strategy Group (AWMSG) have recommended cetuximab for treating patients with epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR)-expressing, RAS wild-type metastatic colorectal cancer. The committee noted that both SMC and AWMSG had recommended restricted use of cetuximab, only in patients who have not previously received chemotherapy for their disease and used in combination with irinotecan-based chemotherapy or in combination with FOLFOX. The committee considered that this was not an equality issue under the equality legislation.

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 appraisal determination, and, if so, where?
Not applicable.

Approved by Centre or Programme Director (name): Meindert Boysen

Date: 13/10/2016

Final appraisal determination 2

6. Have any additional potential equality issues been raised during the consultation, and, if so, how has the Committee addressed these?
Not applicable – there was no consultation after the previous FAD was withdrawn.

7. 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

8. 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

9. 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

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

Not applicable.

Approved by Centre or Programme Director (name): Meindert Boysen

Date: 22/02/2017