

# NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

## HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

### Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

#### MTA Lenvatinib and sorafenib for treating differentiated thyroid cancer after radioactive iodine

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 at the scoping stage.
--

- |  |
|--|
| 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 potential equalities issues were raised.
---

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

No additional equalities 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? |
|--|

Technology appraisals: Guidance development  
Equality impact assessment for the multiple technology appraisal of lenvatinib and sorafenib for treating differentiated thyroid cancer after radioactive iodine

No

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

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?

No

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

No additional equalities issues were identified by the committee.

**Approved by Associate Director (name):** Helen Knight

**Date:** 12/10/2017

## 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, without positive NICE guidance, there may be equity issues from variation in access to lenvatinib and sorafenib within the UK. The committee agreed that this does not represent a potential equality issue.

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?

No

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

**Approved by Associate Director (name):** Helen Knight

**Date:** 25/01/2018

**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?
	The committee noted comments suggesting that, without positive NICE guidance, there may be equity issues from variation in access to lenvatinib and sorafenib within the UK. In a previous committee meeting, the committee agreed that this does not represent a potential equality issue.

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

Technology appraisals: Guidance development  
 Equality impact assessment for the multiple technology appraisal of lenvatinib and sorafenib for treating differentiated thyroid cancer after radioactive iodine

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?

N/A

**Approved by Associate Director (name):** Helen Knight

**Date:** 28/06/2018