

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

STA Icosapent ethyl with statin therapy for reducing the risk of cardiovascular events in people with raised triglycerides

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 noted that the risk of cardiovascular disease differs between ethnic groups. However, issues related to differences in prevalence or incidence of a disease cannot be addressed in a single technology appraisal.

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?

During the appraisal, a patient organisation commented that people living in England's most deprived areas are almost 4 times more likely to die prematurely from cardiovascular disease than those in the least deprived areas. The patient organisation also commented that people with severe mental illness and learning disabilities have increased risk of developing cardiovascular disease. A clinical expert commented that some religions have restrictions on fish products. A clinical expert noted that there are people in the NHS younger than 45 with cardiovascular disease and elevated triglycerides. They explained that many of these people have South Asian family backgrounds. The committee was mindful that its recommendations

could adversely affect some of these groups. However, it concluded that icosapent ethyl was not cost-effective and could not be recommended.

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.

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?

No.

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

Yes, in section 3.18.

Approved by Associate Director (name): Ross Dent

Date: 24/01/2022

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 issues 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?

The recommendation did not change.

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?

The recommendation did not change.

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?
The recommendation did not change.

5. Have the committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the final appraisal determination, and, if so, where?
Yes, in section 3.20.

Approved by Associate Director (name): Ross Dent

Date: 16/03/2022

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 additional equality issues were raised during the second 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?
The recommendations have changed, however, the committee considered that its recommendation would apply to all patients and not affect people protected by the equality legislation any differently.

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?

N/A

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

Yes, in section 3.18.

Approved by Associate Director (name): Ross Dent

Date: 17/05/2022