

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CLINICAL EXCELLENCE

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

STA Ranibizumab for treating diabetic macular oedema (rapid review of technology appraisal guidance 237)

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 phase of the NICE technology appraisal guidance 237, NICE received evidence that access to diagnosis and treatment for diabetic macular oedema may be restricted for some people in full-time residential care. However, consultees suggested that the retinal screening programme has reduced this inequality across the NHS. The Committee considered that its preliminary recommendations were not expected to have a positive or negative impact on any remaining inconsistency of access.

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?

In expert statements received for NICE technology appraisal guidance 237, the Committee was made aware that there is a higher prevalence of diabetes in people of South Asian, African and African–Caribbean family origin and that, among people with diabetes, sight-threatening eye disease is more common in people of African and African–Caribbean family origin than in white Europeans. The Committee considered that its preliminary recommendations were not expected to have an unequal impact on specific groups.

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 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 appraisal consultation document, and, if so, where?
Yes; section 4.27

Approved by Associate Director (name): Elisabeth George

Date: 21/9/2012

Final appraisal determination

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 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?

No

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

Yes, section 4.29

Approved by Centre or Programme Director (name): Elisabeth George

Date: 4 Dec 2012