

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 after autologous stem cell transplant, or at least two prior therapies

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 potential issues were identified 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? |
|--|

No potential equality issues have been raised.
--

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

No potential equality issues have been raised.
--

- | |
|--|
| 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.

Final appraisal determination

1. Have any additional potential equality issues been raised during the consultation, and, if so, how has the committee addressed these?
It was highlighted during the appraisal consultation that there was potential for the draft recommendation (which did not recommend pembrolizumab for people who have had 2 previous treatments without previous stem cell transplant) to affect older people disproportionately negatively. This is because stem cell transplants are more likely to be unsuitable for older

people. The committee noted that the suitability for transplant was not defined on the basis of age. It concluded that its final recommendation did recommend pembrolizumab for people who have had 2 previous treatments without previous stem cell transplant and therefore would not disadvantage people who could not have a stem cell transplant.

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?

The change in the recommendation is not expected to make it more difficult for any specific group to access pembrolizumab compared with other groups.

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?

The change in the recommendation is not expected to have an adverse impact on people with disabilities.

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?

Not applicable.

5. Have the committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the final appraisal determination, and, if so, where?

Yes. The committee's consideration of the equality issue described in question 1 is described in section 3.21.

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

Date: 16 December 2021