

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

INTERVENTIONAL PROCEDURES PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment

IPG802 Intravascular lithotripsy to treat calcified coronary arteries during percutaneous coronary intervention

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?

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Coronary artery disease (CAD) is a major cause of death in the UK and worldwide. Prevalence rates of CAD are higher in men and older people (aged over 65 years).• Death rates from coronary artery disease are higher in the lower socioeconomic groups.• Underlying risk factors are more common in specific ethnic groups e.g. type 2 diabetes (Asians) and hypertension (Afro-Caribbean)• Some people with advanced CAD may be covered under disability legislation in the Equality Act 2010 if symptoms substantially affect the ability to carry out day to day activities for longer than 12 months. Many may have a co-existing long term-condition |
|--|

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.
--

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?
<p>The key evidence the committee discussed included a large systematic review with people with heavily calcified coronary lesions, comorbidities such as hypertension, diabetes mellitus, hyperlipidaemia, chronic kidney disease, and previous MI and PCI.</p> <p>The committee concluded that there is good-quality evidence that the procedure is effective and safe. It recommended to use intravascular lithotripsy as an option to treat calcified coronary arteries during percutaneous coronary intervention with standard arrangements in place for clinical governance, consent and audit.</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?
<p>Professional expert questionnaires indicated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Calcification of coronary arteries is more common in people with impaired left ventricular function, renal impairment or failure, older people, patients following bypass graft surgery. • People with heavily calcified coronary stenoses may particularly benefit from the procedure. 	

- Calcified coronary arteries may be more challenging to treat in women but women are under-represented in published data.

The key evidence the committee discussed included a large systematic review with people with heavily calcified coronary lesions, comorbidities such as hypertension, diabetes mellitus, hyperlipidaemia, chronic kidney disease, and previous MI and PCI.

The committee concluded that there is good-quality evidence that the procedure is effective and safe. It recommended to use intravascular lithotripsy as an option to treat calcified coronary arteries during percutaneous coronary intervention with standard arrangements in place for clinical governance, consent and audit.

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, 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?

Not applicable

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. The key evidence, including study participant characteristics, are described in the evidence overview document.

Helen Gallo

Senior Analyst

Date: 19/11/2024

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?
<p>During consultation, the updated literature searches identified further key evidence. This included subgroup analyses pooling data from 4 prospective studies to compare outcomes by sex. The rates of clinical outcomes for women and men were similar.</p> <p>The committee concluded that there is good-quality evidence that the procedure is effective and safe. It recommended to use intravascular lithotripsy as an option to treat calcified coronary arteries during percutaneous coronary intervention with standard arrangements in place for clinical governance, consent and audit.</p>
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

5. Have the committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the final interventional procedures document, and, if so, where?
No. The key evidence, including study participant characteristics, are described in the evidence overview document.

Anastasia Chalkidou

Programme Director

Date: 12/12/2024