

# NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

## HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

### Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

#### STA Zanubrutinib for treating Waldenström's macroglobulinaemia [ID1427]

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? |
| Not applicable – none 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?   |
| It was noted in the patient expert submission that the technology is expected to “add especial benefit for those who are too frail for chemotherapy-based treatment”. The committee noted that treatment options are very limited for this group and acknowledged the specific benefit for these patients (section 3.2). |

- |  |
|--|
| 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?

The preliminary recommendations did not include a recommendation for people for whom chemoimmunotherapy is unsuitable because no cost effectiveness evidence was provided by this group by the company.

The preliminary recommendations do not make it more difficult for any group defined by the protected characteristics to access the technology.

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?

Having a disability does not directly impact whether chemo-immunotherapy is suitable for an individual. Also, to our knowledge, it doesn't impact whether they would receive BR as their first treatment (rather than DRC). Therefore, the recommendations should not have an adverse impact on people with disabilities.

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:** 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? |
|--|

Stakeholders described the groups of people who would not be covered by the optimised recommendation, which defines the population by whether BR would be considered suitable as a second or later line option. Stakeholders described that there are disease-related and patient-related reasons for choosing BR first rather than later, or not being able to have BR as a second or later treatment. The patient related factors related to a person's fitness to tolerate BR, which is less well tolerated than DRC. The committee considered how the recommendations would affect the treatment pathway, the people who would not be covered by the recommendations and whether the recommendations would exclude any groups in which zanubrutinib had been demonstrated to be cost effective (section 3.19)
---

- |  |
|--|
| 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?
n/a

5. Have the committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the final appraisal determination, and, if so, where?
Section 3.19 of the FAD

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

**Date:** 07 September 2022