

# NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

## HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

### Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

#### STA Quizartinib for induction, consolidation and maintenance treatment of newly diagnosed FLT3-ITD- positive acute myeloid leukaemia

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

#### Final draft guidance

- |   |
|---|
| 1. Have the potential equality issues identified during the scoping process been addressed by the committee, and, if so, how? |
|---|

Yes – at scoping, a stakeholder noted that although QuANTUM-First included people ages 18-75, quizartinib should be evaluated for all adults. The committee noted that it would evaluate quizartinib within its marketing authorisation indication, which was for adults and does not have an upper age limit. Because the recommendation is for quizartinib in line with its marketing authorisation, the committee did not consider that its recommendation had a different impact on people protected by the equality legislation than on the wider population.
--

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

Yes, stakeholders highlighted that midostaurin appeared to be associated with a survival improvement in men but not women, but quizartinib may favour survival in men. But stakeholders considered that there is not currently enough evidence for this to be a consideration. Because the recommendation is for quizartinib in line with its marketing authorisation, the
--

committee did not consider that its recommendation had 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 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

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?

N/A

7. Have the committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the final draft guidance, and, if so, where?

Yes, in section 3.14.

**Approved by Associate Director (name):** Ross Dent

**Date:** 03/09/2024