

**NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE
EXCELLENCE**

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

**STA Rifaximin for preventing episodes of overt
hepatic encephalopathy**

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?

No potential equality issues were identified during the scoping process.

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 potential equality issues were raised in the submissions, expert statements or ERG report.

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

No 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.

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?
Not applicable.

7. Have the Committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the appraisal consultation document, and, if so, where?
The summary table notes that no potential equality issues were identified.

Approved by Associate Director (name): Helen Knight

Date: 18/06/2013

Appraisal Consultation 2

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 were 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, or difficulties with, access for the specific group?

There are no recommendations that make it more difficult in practice for a specific group to access the technology.

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?

Not applicable.

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

The summary table notes that no potential equality issues were identified.

Approved by Associate Director (name): Helen Knight

Date: 19/11/2013

Final appraisal determination

(when an ACD issued)

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

The Committee noted comments received during consultation from the clinical specialist that people with hepatic encephalopathy should be considered vulnerable adults.

The Committee understood that this condition can have a substantial disabling effect, but considered that its recommendations do not discriminate on the basis of any characteristics protected under the equalities legislation.

7. 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?

Rifaximin is recommended as an option within its marketing authorisation. There are no recommendations that make it more difficult in practice for a specific group to access the technology.

8. 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 – rifaximin is recommended as an option within its marketing authorisation.

9. 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?
Not applicable – rifaximin is recommended as an option within its marketing authorisation.

10. Have the Committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the final appraisal determination, and, if so, where?
Yes; section 4.23.

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

Date: May 2015