

**NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE
EXCELLENCE**

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

**STA Ibrutinib for treating Waldenström’s
macroglobulinaemia [ID884]**

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 scoping it was noted that older people may be discriminated against by clinicians who are reluctant to treat with conventional chemotherapy. The committee noted the potential equality issue raised and acknowledged that access to ibrutinib may be particularly beneficial for older people.
--

- | |
|--|
| 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 company noted that Waldenström’s macroglobulinaemia is a condition with a greater prevalence in older people.

- | |
|--|
| 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 were identified by the committee.
--

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?

The preliminary recommendations do not make it more difficult 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?

The preliminary recommendations is unlikely to have an adverse impact on people with disabilities.

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?

In the ACD (section 4.16), the committee note that existing treatments for Waldenström's macroglobulinaemia have high levels of toxicity and adverse events and that these are less likely to be tolerated by older people. The committee acknowledged that access to ibrutinib may be particularly beneficial in older people, but it was unable to recommend ibrutinib because it could not be considered a cost-effective use of NHS resources.

Approved by Associate Director (name):Janet Robertson.....

Date: October 2016

Technology appraisals: Guidance development

Equality impact assessment for the single technology appraisal of ibrutinib for treating Waldenström's macroglobulinaemia

Issue date: July 2017

Final appraisal determination

(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 additional potential equality issues been raised during the 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 recommendation does not make it more difficult for a specific group to access the technology compared with other groups
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?
The recommendations does not have an adverse impact on people with disabilities
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?
Not applicable

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

In the FAD (section 4.18), the committee noted the potential equality issue raised by the company and clinical experts that Waldenstrom's macroglobulinaemia is a condition with a greater prevalence in older people. It heard from the patient experts that existing treatments for Waldenstrom's macroglobulinaemia have high levels of toxicity and adverse reactions and that these are less likely to be tolerated by older people. The committee acknowledged that access to ibrutinib may be particularly beneficial for older people.

Approved by Associate Director (name):Janet Robertson...

Date: 21 September 2017