NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CLINICAL EXCELLENCE

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

STA Rituximab in combination with corticosteroids for treating anti-neutrophil cytoplasmic antibody-associated vasculitis

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 draft scope consultation, it was suggested that paediatric patients should be included in the population. However, the European marketing authorisation, which was issued after consultation, specifies that the technology is licensed only for adults with the condition. Because the technology appraisal is confined to the licensed indication, this did not need to be addressed by Committee. There were no other issues raised that fell within the remit of a NICE technology appraisal of rituximab.

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?
A professional organisation suggested that paediatric patients should be included in the population. However, the European marketing authorisation, specifies that the technology is licensed only for adults with the condition. Because the technology appraisal is confined to the licensed indication, this did not need to be addressed by Committee.

3. Have any other potential equality issues been identified by the Committee, and, if so, how has the Committee addressed these?
No other potential 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, or difficulties with, access for the specific group?
No, the preliminary recommendations do not make it more difficult in practice for a specific group to access the technology compared with other groups.

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, there is no potential for the preliminary recommendations to have an adverse impact on people with disabilities because of something that is a consequence of the disability.

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?
Not applicable.

7. Have the Committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the appraisal consultation document, and, if so, where?
The Committee's considerations of equality issues are described in section 4.19 of the appraisal consultation document.

Approved by Associate Director (name): Helen Knight

Date: 16/07/2013

Second consultation

1. Have any additional potential equality issues been raised during the consultation, and, if so, how has the Committee addressed these?
No additional equality issues were raised during the 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, 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, in section 4.23.	

Approved by Associate Director (name): Helen Knight

Date: 26/09/2013

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?	
The ACD recommended rituximab for a subgroup of people. A consultee advised that the failure to make rituximab available to other subgroups would represent an inequality and constitute discrimination against those subgroups. A list of the subgroups was provided. The Committee did not agree that the ACD was discriminatory, but it did consider evidence regarding cost-effectiveness, the NICE Social Value Judgements, and the innovative nature of rituximab. As a result, the FAD recommends the use of rituximab for most of the subgroups listed in the consultee's response. The only exceptions are patients with active infection, children, adolescents, and people who require maintenance treatment with rituximab. The summary of product characteristics does not support the use of rituximab for these subgroups of people.	

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?	

Section 1.1 recommends rituximab for people who have not completed their family and for whom treatment with cyclophosphamide may materially affect their fertility. The Committee considered that this recommendation was associated with 2 potential equalities issues, both relating to the effect of rituximab on fertility. The Committee discussed these potential issues (see sections 4.23-4.25 of the FAD) and concluded that the recommendations would not make it more difficult in practice for a specific group to access the technology compared with other groups.

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, in section 4.23–4.26.

Approved by Programme Director (name): Meindert Boysen

Date: 24/02/2014