NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

STA Molnupiravir for treating COVID-19

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?
During the scoping stage equality issues were raised associated with the risks of COVID-19 outcomes, developing severe COVID-19 and the suitability of different treatments may differ by different groups within the population. The committee took these into consideration if and how these issues may differ by different groups with in the population in its decision making.	

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 submission noted that molnupiravir supports the need for an easy to administer oral treatment for mild to moderate disease to provide options for people, particularly those with protected characteristics, and for clinicians to eliminate any residual and unobserved aspects of access inequality. The patient carer organisation stated that most people eligible for molnupiravir are disabled in some way by their pre-existing condition. The clinical expert submission noted that molnupiravir is contraindicated in pregnant women and a pregnancy test is required to be taken before having it. The committee considered these equality issues, and agreed that its	

recommendations do not have a different impact on people protected by the equality legislation than on the wider population.

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 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, section 3.18 of the draft guidance.	

Approved by Associate Director (name): …Janet Robertson……

Date: 15 November 2024

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 equality issues raised	

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 draft guidance, and, if so, where?

Yes, section 3.19 of the FDG

Approved by Associate Director (name): Ross Dent

Date: 26/02/2025