

**NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE  
EXCELLENCE**

**HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME**

**Equality impact assessment – Guidance development**

**STA Ibrutinib for treating Waldenstrom's  
macroglobulinaemia**

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?

Because this appraisal was a Cancer Drugs Fund review there was no scope consultation. During technology appraisal 491 it was noted Waldenstrom's macroglobulinaemia is a condition with a greater prevalence in older people. It was noted that older people may be discriminated against by clinicians who are reluctant to treat with conventional chemotherapy. Section 4.18 of the guidance in TA491 states The committee noted the potential equality issue raised by the company and the clinical experts that Waldenstrom's macroglobulinaemia is a condition with a greater prevalence in older people. It heard from the patient experts that existing treatments for Waldenstrom's macroglobulinaemia have high levels of toxicity and adverse reactions and that these are less likely to be tolerated by older people. The committee acknowledged that access to ibrutinib may be particularly beneficial for older people. This conclusion remains relevant to the CDF review guidance.

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?

There were no further potential equality issues to those raised in TA491.

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

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?
n/a

7. Have the committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the appraisal consultation document, and, if so, where?
No.

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

**Date:** January 2022

Technology appraisals: Guidance development

Equality impact assessment for the single technology appraisal of ibrutinib for treating Waldenstrom's macroglobulinaemia

Issue date: June 2022

## 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. The older age of the population was noted as a particular need for having an alternative to chemotherapy.

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?

n/a

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?

n/a

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?

n/a

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

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

**Date:** 27 April 2022