

# NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

## HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

### Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

#### STA Atezolizumab with carboplatin and etoposide for untreated extensive-stage small-cell lung cancer [1504]

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? |
|---|

None.
-------

- |  |
|--|
| 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? |
|--|

Comment in expert statement:

*'Small Cell Lung Cancer is more common in patients with lower socio-economic status (PMID: 24586771) and therefore has a higher impact on this group who are also less likely to be given chemotherapy.'*

*'The availability of atezolizumab may emphasise inequities in access, as patients with higher socio-economic status are more likely to ask for newer innovative treatments.'*

In accordance with NICE's social value judgement principles, no priority is given based on individuals' income, social class, position in life or social roles in guidance developed for the NHS.

As the treatment is not recommended in the draft guideline it applies equally to all individuals and does not discriminate against anyone with protected

Technology appraisals: Guidance development

Equality impact assessment for the single technology appraisal of atezolizumab with carboplatin and etoposide for untreated extensive-stage small-cell lung cancer [1504]

characteristics. Although it should be considered if the recommendations disadvantage certain socioeconomic groups as (1) this may indirectly discriminate against people with certain protected characteristics and (2) awareness of this provides the committee with the opportunity to mitigate any difference in prescribing/uptake in certain groups.

The committee were aware of this but it's not an equalities issue that the committee can address.

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?

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?

Yes, in 'Other factors' section.

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

**Date:** 19/12/2019

### 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?

None.

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?

Yes – ECOG performance status limitation.

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?

Yes – standard wording, 'When using ECOG performance status, healthcare professionals should take into account any physical, sensory or learning disabilities, or communication difficulties that could affect ECOG performance status and make any adjustments they consider appropriate.'

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

Yes – in main recommendations, as well as 'other factors' section.

**Approved by Associate Director (name):** ...Linda Landells.....

**Date:** 14/5/20