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Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

STA Abiraterone for newly diagnosed high-risk hormone sensitive metastatic prostate cancer

The impact on equality has been assessed during this appraisal according to the principles of the NICE equality scheme.

# Appeal

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Have the potential equality issues identified during the appeal been addressed by the committee, and, if so, how? |
| During the appeal, stakeholders raised that a people for whom docetaxel is contraindicated or unsuitable tend to be older. The appellants suggested that not making a recommendation for this group separately may discriminate against older people.  The appeal panels conclusions were   * ‘The current reasoning around the failure to define this subgroup [in the FAD] does not address the fact that the subgroup will tend to comprise older men’ * …’although equality legislation requires this subgroup to be more fully considered it does not necessarily follow that in this case, after appropriate consideration, special provision will need to be made for them’   The committee   * considered data submitted by stakeholders showing that use of docetaxel was lower in older people * determined a framework to define people for whom docetaxel is contraindicated or unsuitable noting that although age was a risk factor for being in this group, it did not define who could and could not have docetaxel * considered the available evidence for the group of people for whom docetaxel is contraindicated or unsuitable and the evidence for the treatment effect of abiraterone compared with ADT in different age groups * noted that making recommendations based on age to reflect people who cannot or should not have docetaxel could discriminate against younger people for whom docetaxel is contraindicated or unsuitable. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. 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? |
| Prostate Cancer UK submitted the data on docetaxel uptake by age referred to in the appeal and this was taken into account in the committee’s considerations described above. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Have any other potential equality issues been identified by the committee, and, if so, how has the committee addressed these? |
| No. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. 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. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. 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. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. 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. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Have the committee’s considerations of equality issues been described in the appraisal consultation document, and, if so, where? |
| Yes in section 3.24 of the post-appeal appraisal consultation document. |
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# Final appraisal determination

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Have any additional potential equality issues been raised during the consultation, and, if so, how has the committee addressed these? |
| No further equalities issues identified. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. 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 change to recommendation after consultation. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. 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 change to recommendation after consultation. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. 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 change to recommendation after consultation. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Have the committee’s considerations of equality issues been described in the final appraisal determination, and, if so, where? |
| Yes in section 3.24 of the final appraisal document. |

**Approved by Associate Director (name):** Nicole Elliott

**Date:** 16/06/2021

# 