

**NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE
EXCELLENCE**

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

**STA Cabozantinib for previously treated advanced
differentiated thyroid cancer unsuitable for or refractory to
radioactive iodine**

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? |
|--|

The company stated that women are more likely to be diagnosed with thyroid cancer. But a clinical expert explained that the proportions of men and women are similar in the metastatic setting, as demonstrated by the trial population in COSMIC-311. Issues about differences in the prevalence or incidence of a condition and health care implementation cannot be addressed in a technology evaluation. So this was not considered to be an equality issue which could be addressed by the appraisal committee's recommendations.
--

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

No other 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 Have the committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the draft guidance, and, if so, where?

Yes, in section 3.16.

Approved by Associate Director (name): Jasdeep Hayre

Date: 27 March 2023

Final draft guidance

(when draft guidance issued)

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

No additional issues were raised during the consultation process.

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 draft guidance, and, if so, where?

Yes. The committee's considerations of equality issues were described in section 3.17 of the final draft guidance.

Approved by Associate Director (name): Jasdeep Hayre

Date: 31 May 2023