

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CLINICAL EXCELLENCE

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – TA Guidance in development

Rivaroxaban for the treatment of deep vein thrombosis and prevention of recurrent deep vein thrombosis and pulmonary embolism

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 consultation on the scope, it was suggested that due consideration should be given to people who on religious or cultural values object to receiving pig-derived heparin. The range of available products in this therapeutic area means that it was not considered that this needs to be addressed by the Committee.
--

- | |
|--|
| 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? |
|--|

No further equality issues were identified.

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

No further equality issues were identified by the Committee.
--

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 access for the specific group?

The preliminary recommendation of a minded no means that all groups will not currently have access to this technology.

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 obligations to promote equality?

No.

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

The Committee discussed the advantages of rivaroxaban in section 4.9 and were aware of the equality highlighted by the ERG (section 3.22).

Approved by Associate Director (name): Janet Robertson

Date: March 2011

Final appraisal determination

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

Following consultation, it was noted by Consultees that religious authorities can and have issued opinions on the use of porcine-derived heparin products on the basis of medical care. Therefore, the Committee was persuaded that access to heparin products for people of certain religious groups was not a

concern in light of these religious opinions.

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 access for the specific group?

No.

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?

No.

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

No. The Committee's consideration of equality has been addressed in the response to Consultee comments on the Appraisal Consultation Document (ACD).

Approved by Centre or Programme Director (name): Meindert Boysen.....

Date: 17/07/2012