NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

STA Pembrolizumab for treating relapsed or refractory classical Hodgkin lymphoma in people 3 years and over [Partial review of TA540]

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

Final appraisal determination

(when no ACD was issued)

1.	Have the potential equality issues identified during the scoping process been addressed by the committee, and, if so, how?
No equality issues were raised during the scoping process.	

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?
A clinical expert commented that lack of access to programmed cell death protein 1 (PD-1) inhibitors such as pembrolizumab after brentuximab vedotin failure will predominantly affect younger people with the condition. They also commented that the current criteria for access to pembrolizumab will disadvantage people who have received frontline brentuximab vedotin and have subsequently relapsed, which is predominantly patients treated outside of the UK or on clinical trials. The committee noted that its recommendations apply to people being treated for relapsed or refractory classical Hodgkin lymphoma who have had 2 previous treatments and cannot have an autologous stem cell transplant, which is within the marketing authorisation, and only if they have already had brentuximab vedotin. It concluded that that pembrolizumab is recommended.	

It also concluded that its recommendations do not have a different impact on people protected by the equality legislation than on the wider population.

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 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, the technology is recommended for all people eligible within its marketing authorisation.	

5.	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.	

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 final appraisal determination, and, if so, where?

Yes, in section 3.16.

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

Date: 13 March 2024