

**NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE
EXCELLENCE**

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

**MTA Intrabeam Radiotherapy System for the adjuvant
treatment of early breast cancer**

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? |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

There were no equality issues 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? |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

There were no equality issues raised in the submissions, expert statements or academic report.

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

Subsequent to the Committee meeting a Committee member raised the question whether there was the potential for some patients to be disadvantaged by the preliminary recommendations as there may be some patients who lack the capacity to understand the information provided by the clinician and to make an informed choice such as people with learning disabilities or communication difficulties. The Committee considered that providing clinicians act in the interest of their patients, in line with their usual responsibilities, and tailor their explanation in accordance with the each patient's level of understanding and discuss the risks and benefits with the patient's carers where applicable, patients would not be disadvantaged by the preliminary recommendations.

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?

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?

The Committee considered that providing clinicians act in the interest of their patients, in line with their usual responsibilities, and tailor their explanation in accordance with each patient's level of understanding and discuss the risks and benefits with the patient's carers where applicable, patients would not be disadvantaged by the preliminary recommendations.

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?

The Committee concluded that there was no need to alter or add to its preliminary recommendations.

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 have been described in section 4.4.14 in the appraisal consultation and in the summary table.

Approved by Associate Director (name): ...Janet Robertson.....

Date: 17th July 2014

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?

One consultee raised the issue of the location of the machines, being mostly located in the South of England, and concentrated in London. This was not considered to be an equalities issue as it did not impact unequally on any protected group.

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?

See section 4.18 of the FAD

Approved by Centre or Programme Director (name): ...Carole Longson.....

Date: 24 August 2017