

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

NICE guidelines

Equality impact assessment

Non-Hodgkin's lymphoma: diagnosis and management

The impact on equality has been assessed during guidance development according to the principles of the NICE equality policy.

1.0 Scope: before consultation (To be completed by the developer and submitted with the draft scope for consultation)

1.1 Have any potential equality issues been identified during the development of the draft scope, before consultation, and, if so, what are they?

No equalities issues have been identified within the scope.

It was noted that various lymphoma subtypes preferentially affect various ethnic groups, including those of African-Caribbean descent and those from the Far East. However, the lymphoma types that affect these groups are not dealt with in this guideline. The reason for this is that they affect very small numbers of patients. According to the HMRN database fewer than 100 people per annum will be diagnosed with these conditions. It is also noted that these disease types have been the subject of a recent guideline produced by a professional body.

1.2 What is the preliminary view on the extent to which these potential equality issues need addressing by the Committee? For example, if population groups, treatments or settings are excluded from the scope, are these exclusions justified – that is, are the reasons legitimate and the exclusion proportionate?

- **Children under 16 years.**

This group has been excluded because the treatment protocols for children are different and require separate consideration.

- **Adults and young people (16 years and older) with chronic lymphocytic leukaemia and small lymphocytic lymphoma.**

1.0.7 DOC EIA

Small lymphocytic lymphoma is treated as a chronic leukaemia and as such does not fit within a lymphoma guideline. It has been excluded to allow for the group to focus on other common lymphomas with a predominantly nodal presentation.

- **Adults and young people (16 years and older) with lymphoblastic lymphoma.**

Lymphoblastic lymphoma is treated as an acute leukaemia and is sufficiently different to warrant their exclusion from this guideline.

- **Adults and young people (16 years and older) with rare T-cell lymphoma, such as, NK T-cell lymphoma, mycosis fungoides, Sezary syndrome, anaplastic large-cell lymphoma of T/null type ALK-, anaplastic large-cell lymphoma of T/null type, anaplastic large cell lymphoma of T/null type ALK+, enteropathy-type T-cell lymphoma, primary cutaneous CD30-positive T-cell lymphoproliferative disorder, extranodal NK/T-cell lymphoma, nasal type, adult T-cell lymphoma/leukaemia (HTLV-1 positive).**

Lymphoma subtypes affecting less than 1% of the population will not be included in this guideline. The GDG has a finite timescale and resource to complete the guideline and has been asked to prioritise the content.

- **Adults and young people (16 years and older) with post transplant lymphoproliferative disease.**

This group of patients are biologically different from patients with common lymphomas. The treatment is sufficiently different to warrant their exclusion from this scope.

- **Adults and young people (16 years and older) with skin lymphoma.**

This group of lymphomas are relatively rare and are biologically different from patients with common lymphomas. The treatment is sufficiently different to warrant their exclusion from this scope.

- **Adults and young people (16 years and older) with central nervous system lymphoma.**

This group of lymphomas are relatively rare and are biologically different from patients with common lymphomas. The treatment is sufficiently different to warrant their exclusion from this scope.

2.0 Scope: after consultation (To be completed by the developer and submitted with the final scope)

2.1 Have any potential equality issues been identified during consultation, and, if so, what are they?

Stakeholder Consultation took place from 8th November 2013 until 5th December 2013. No equality issues were identified.

2.2 Have any changes to the scope been made as a result of consultation to highlight potential equality issues?

No changes were necessary

1.0.7 DOC EIA

2.3 Is the primary focus of the guideline a population with a specific disability-related communication need?

If so, is an alternative version of the 'Information for the Public' document recommended?

If so, which alternative version is recommended?

The alternative versions available are:

- large font or audio versions for a population with sight loss;
- British Sign Language videos for a population who are deaf from birth;
- 'Easy read' versions for people with learning disabilities or cognitive impairment.

No

1.0.7 DOC EIA

3.0 Guideline development: before consultation (to be completed by the developer before draft guideline consultation)

3.1 Have the potential equality issues identified during the scoping process been addressed by the Committee, and, if so, how?

No equalities issues that would need to be specifically addressed were identified.

3.2 Have any **other** potential equality issues (in addition to those identified during the scoping process) been identified, and, if so, how has the Committee addressed them?

No new equality issues have been identified.

3.3 Were the Committee's considerations of equality issues described in the consultation document, and, if so, where?

The GC did not identify any potential equalities issues that needed documenting.

3.4 Do the preliminary recommendations make it more difficult in practice for a specific group to access services compared with other groups? If so, what are the barriers to, or difficulties with, access for the specific group?

No

3.5 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

1.0.7 DOC EIA

3.6 Are there any recommendations or explanations that the Committee could make to remove or alleviate barriers to, or difficulties with, access to services identified in questions 3.1, 3.2 or 3.3, or otherwise fulfil NICE's obligation to advance equality?

We do not believe that the recommendations in this guideline should cause any difficulties with accessing services on the grounds of equality.

Completed by Developer

Andrew Champion

Date

18.12.15

Approved by NICE quality assurance lead

Christine Carson

Date

12.01.16