

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CLINICAL EXCELLENCE

INTERVENTIONAL PROCEDURES PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment

IPG 370 Percutaneous closure of patent foramen ovale for recurrent migraine

The impact on equality has been assessed during guidance development according to the principles of the NICE Equality scheme.

Scoping

1. Have any potential equality issues been identified during the scoping process (development of the scope or discussion at the Committee meeting), and, if so, what are they?

Some people with recurrent migraine may be covered by the equalities legislation.

Prevalence of migraine is higher in women and Caucasians, and may be related to lower household income (related to socioeconomic status) for those without a family history of migraine but it is not known if this is true in patients with migraine that is 'recurrent' or in those who also have a patent foramen ovale.

2. What is the preliminary view as to what extent these potential equality issues need addressing by the Committee? If there are exclusions listed in the scope (for example, populations, treatments or settings), are these justified?

This was not thought to have an impact on the assessment of the procedure. No exclusions were applied.

3. Has any change to the scope (such as additional issues raised during the Committee meeting) been agreed to highlight potential equality

issues?
No.

Consultation

1. Have the potential equality issues identified during the scoping process been addressed by the Committee, and, if so, how?
<p>The evidence reflects that women are more likely to suffer from migraine than men. No specific data relating to ethnicity or socioeconomic status were identified in the literature presented in the overview.</p> <p>Some of the newer devices are made with engineered tissue from porcine material so may be unacceptable for people belonging to certain religions. However, there are other devices available so it is unlikely that this will preclude this treatment in these patients.</p>

2. Have any other potential equality issues been raised in the overview, specialist adviser questionnaires or patient commentary, and, if so, how has the Committee addressed these?
No.

3. Have any other potential equality issues been identified by the Committee, and, if so, how has the Committee addressed these?
No.

4. Do the preliminary recommendations make it more difficult in practice for a specific group to access a technology or intervention compared with other groups? If so, what are the barriers to access for the specific group?

No.

5. Are there any recommendations or explanations that the Committee could make to remove or alleviate barriers to access identified in question 4, or otherwise fulfil NICE's obligation to promote equality?

Not applicable.

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

No.

Final interventional procedures document

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 a technology or intervention compared with other groups? If so, what are the barriers to access for the specific group?

Not applicable.

3. If the recommendations have changed after consultation, are there any recommendations or explanations that the Committee could make to remove or alleviate barriers to access identified in question 2,

or otherwise fulfil NICE's obligations to promote equality?

Not applicable.

4. Have the Committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the final interventional procedures document, and, if so, where?

No.

Approved by Centre or Programme Director: Mirella Marlow

Date: 24 November 2010