

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

STA Crizotinib for treating ROS1-positive advanced non- small-cell lung cancer [ID1098]

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, concerns were raised that restricting ROS1 testing to patients with a diagnosis of adenocarcinoma may lead to inequality in the access of crizotinib for treating ROS1+ NSCLC.

The committee agreed that ROS1 testing should be done upfront at diagnosis of non-small cell lung to help prevent inequality of access.

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 commented that regional variations in the access to ROS1 testing could lead to inequitable access, and highlighted that sequential testing (that is, done after testing for EGFR and ALK) would also delay access to crizotinib.

The committee agreed that ROS1 testing should be done at diagnosis to help prevent inequality of access.

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

None

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?

None

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?

None

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 appraisal consultation document, and, if so, where?

Yes, please see section 3.22

Approved by Associate Director (name): ...Frances Sutcliffe.....

Date: 12/03/2018

Technology appraisals: Guidance development

Equality impact assessment for the single technology appraisal of crizotinib for treating ROS1-positive advanced non-small-cell lung cancer

Issue date: March 2018

Final appraisal determination

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

The committee noted comments suggesting that, if crizotinib was recommended within the Cancer Drugs Fund, there may be equity issues from variation in access within the UK. The committee agreed that this does not represent a potential equality issue.

The committee also noted comments around routine testing for ROS1 status. The committee agreed that ROS1 testing should be done upfront at diagnosis of non-small cell lung to help prevent inequality of access.

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?

N/A

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

Yes please see section 3.21 of the final appraisal determination

Approved by Associate Director (name): ...Frances Sutcliffe.....

Date: 21/03/2018