

# NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CLINICAL EXCELLENCE

## HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

### Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

#### MTA Percutaneous vertebroplasty and percutaneous balloon kyphoplasty for treating osteoporotic vertebral compression fractures

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 scoping it was noted that the population predominantly comprises older women, many of whom are caregivers to other people. This, however was not expected to lead to unfair restrictions of access to treatment, and therefore not considered an equality issue relevant for the Committee discussions.

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 their submissions, professional groups noted that people unable to have local or general anaesthesia, and people living in areas where there was no local service, would find it difficult to access the technologies. Because people unable to have local or general anaesthesia because of contraindications could not be offered the procedures, this was not an issue relevant to the Committee's decision making. The potential issue of local services relates to implementation and is outside of the Appraisal Committee's remit.

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

No 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?

No

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?

Not applicable

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

Not applicable

**Approved by Associate Director (name):** ...Elisabeth George.....

**Date:** 26/10/2012

### **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 potential equality issues have been raised during consultation.

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?

Not applicable

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?

Not applicable

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

Not applicable

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

**Date:** 13 Feb 2013