NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

MTA Prasugrel with percutaneous coronary intervention for treating acute coronary syndrome (review of TA182)

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 equalities issues were identified 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?

The Committee noted a potential equality issue raised by the patient experts. The Committee heard that in people of South Asian family origin, clopidogrel is less likely to be effective. However, the Committee agreed that the options available to people of South Asian family origin (including ticagrelor, prasugrel and clopidogrel for people with diabetes and ticagrelor and

clopidogrel for people without diabetes) minimised any potential inequality. ACD section 4.3.19.	
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?
ACD Section 4.3.19.	

Approved by Associate Director (name): Frances Sutcliffe.....

Date: 25 03 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?

No potential equality issues were identified during the consultation process.

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 after consultation, however, the recommendations do 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 barriers to or difficulties with access were identified in questions 2 and 3.

5. Have the Committee's considerations of equality issues been

described in the final appraisal determination, and, if so, where?

No equality issues relevant to the Committee's recommendation were raised.

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

Date: 12 June 2014