

**NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE  
EXCELLENCE**

**HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME**

**Equality impact assessment – Guidance development**

**STA Fluocinolone acetonide intravitreal implant for  
treating chronic diabetic macular oedema after an  
inadequate response to prior therapy (rapid review of  
technology appraisal 271)**

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?

N/A

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 equality issues have been identified in the rapid review of technology appraisal 271.

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

No equality issues have been identified by the Committee in the rapid review of technology appraisal 271.

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?

N/A

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

No considerations of equality were raised during the rapid review of technology appraisal 271.

**Approved by Associate Director (name):** Frances Sutcliffe

**Date:** 29 05 2013

## Final appraisal determination

(when an ACD 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 have been raised during the consultation of the rapid review of technology appraisal 271.

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, the recommendations have not changed after consultation.

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, the recommendations have not changed after consultation.

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, the recommendations have not changed after consultation.

5. Have the Committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the final appraisal determination, and, if so, where?
No, none identified.

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

**Date:** 06 09 2013