

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

STA Atezolizumab in combination for treating advanced non-squamous non-small-cell lung cancer

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.

- | |
|--|
| 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 identified by the company.
--

NHS England noted in its statement that IMpower150 study did not knowingly include/exclude patients with ROS1 mutations. NHS England regards it as being consistent with the NSCLC treatment pathway for ROS1 patients to be treated in the same way as patients with EGFR or ALK mutations.
--

The committee was aware that ROS1 testing would be done at diagnosis of NSCLC, along with testing for other mutations (such as EGFR and ALK). The committee was aware that the evidence available from the IMpower150 study specified EGFR- or ALK-positive mutations and data were available for these groups together as a subgroup. No evidence was presented for
--

ROS1-positive NSCLC. The committee was aware that the NSCLC pathway is rapidly evolving and ROS1-positive NSCLC was not addressed specifically during this appraisal.

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

No equality issues were identified.

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?

No.

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

Not applicable.

Approved by Associate Director (name): Linda Landells.....

Date: 29/01/2019

Final appraisal determination

(when an ACD issued)

1. Have any additional potential equality issues been raised during the consultation, and, if so, how has the committee addressed these?

No.

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?

No.

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?
No.

5. Have the committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the final appraisal determination, and, if so, where?
Not applicable.

Approved by Associate Director (name): ...Linda Landells.....

Date: 05/04/2019