

**NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE
EXCELLENCE**

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

STA

**Cabazitaxel for hormone-relapsed metastatic prostate
cancer treated with a docetaxel**

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? |
|---|

No equality issues were identified during scoping.
--

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

No equality issues were raised in the submissions, expert statements or academic report.
--

- | |
|--|
| 3. Have any other potential equality issues been identified by the Committee, and, if so, how has the Committee addressed these? |
|--|

No.

- | |
|--|
| 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?

Not applicable.

7. Have the Committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the appraisal consultation document, and, if so, where?

On the summary table, page 44.

Approved by Associate Director (name): Melinda Goodall

Date: 04/02/2016

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 equality issues were raised.

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?

After consultation, the draft guidance changed and cabazitaxel is now recommended. The clinical effectiveness evidence for cabazitaxel was obtained from patients who have an eastern cooperative oncology group (ECOG) performance status of 0 or 1 and therefore the recommendation reflects this. The committee concluded that 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.

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?

No.

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?

Recommendation 1.2 says '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 section 4.33 of the FAD.

Approved by Centre or Programme Director (name): Meindert Boysen

Date: 11/05/2016