

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

STA Fremanezumab for preventing migraine [ID1368]

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 scoping process, it was highlighted that migraine is more common in women than in men, and more common in people of working age.

The committee considered these issues but concluded that there were no specific adjustments required to the NICE methods in this circumstance.

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?

The clinical and patient submissions highlighted that migraine can be classed as a disability under the Equality Act 2010. The committee considered this issue and concluded that it would make an adjustment to appraisal consultation document (ACD) consultation period. It recognised that people with migraine may find it challenging to comment on the ACD if they have a period of consecutive migraine days which overlaps the standard consultation period. It agreed that, if people notify NICE, it may be reasonable to allow people more time to comment on the ACD.

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

No.

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?

See ACD section 3.26.

Approved by Associate Director (name): Jasdeep Hayre

Date: 07/11/2019

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

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 FAD section 3.25

Approved by Associate Director (name): Jasdeep Hayre

Date: 21/02/2020