# NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

## INTERVENTIONAL PROCEDURES PROGRAMME

### Equality impact assessment

# IPG781 Pharyngeal electrical stimulation for neurogenic dysphagia

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

### Briefing

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

Age: Prevalence of neurological dysphagia increases with age.

Disability: Some people with neurogenic dysphagia may be covered by the Equality Act 2010 if their symptoms have a substantial adverse effect on day-to-day activities for longer than 12 months. People with MS are covered from point of diagnosis.

Ethnicity: The risk of having a stroke is higher amongst people in certain ethnic groups, including South Asian, African and Caribbean.

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 brief (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.

Equality impact assessment IP: IPGXXX

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

No

4. Have any additional stakeholders related to potential equality issues been identified during the committee meeting, and, if so, have changes to the stakeholder list been made?'

No

### Consultation

1. Have the potential equality issues identified during the briefing process been addressed by the committee, and, if so, how?

The key evidence showed that when reported, the mean age of patients ranged from 39.7 to 76 years. The evidence considered by the committee reflected that the prevalence of the condition increases with age.

No specific data relating to other issues mentioned earlier was identified in the literature presented in the overview.

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?

Equality impact assessment IP: IPGXXX

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, or difficulties with, access for the specific group?

There is a split recommendation but it is based on evidence of efficacy in a subgroup that is not defined by a protected characteristic.

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 obligation to promote equality?

Not applicable.

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

No

#### Amy Crossley

#### Health Technology Assessment Adviser

Equality impact assessment IP: IPGXXX

© NICE 2023. All rights reserved. Subject to Notice of rights.

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, or difficulties with, access for the specific group?

Not applicable.

3. If the recommendations have changed after consultation, 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?

Not applicable.

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.

Equality impact assessment IP: IPGXXX

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

No.

#### Anastasia Chalkidou

**Associate Director** 

Date:5/12/2023

Equality impact assessment IP: IPGXXX