

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

INTERVENTIONAL PROCEDURES PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment

IPG604 Aortic valve reconstruction with processed bovine pericardium

The impact on equality has been assessed during guidance development according to the principles of the NICE Equality scheme.

Scoping

1. Have any potential equality issues been identified during the scoping process (development of the scope or discussion at the Committee meeting), and, if so, what are they?

Gender: Aortic stenosis is more common in men.

Disability: Calcific degenerative disease is frequently associated with coronary disease which may be a condition covered by the Equality Act 2010.

Age: It can be present at birth (congenital) but is more likely to occur in older people and increases with age (degenerative). Population prevalence of valve disease is 2.5% rising to 10% in individuals 75 and older.

Ethnicity: Some studies have suggested that congenital aortic stenosis is more prevalent in white children than black or Hispanic children (though this procedure is not yet being used in children; data for adults was not available from standard IP sources).

Religion: Animal pericardium may not be acceptable to some religious beliefs or strict vegetarians.

Socioeconomic Status: Rheumatic fever can be a cause of valvular heart disease in young people. It has become rare in the Western world but low socioeconomic status, is a known risk factors for rheumatic heart disease worldwide.

2. What is the preliminary view as to what extent these potential equality issues need addressing by the Committee? (If there are

exclusions listed in the scope (for example, populations, treatments or settings), are these justified?)

This was not thought to have an impact on the assessment of the procedure. No exclusions were applied.

3. Has any change to the scope (such as additional issues raised during the Committee meeting) been agreed to highlight potential equality issues?

No

Approved by Programme Director and Clinical Advisor

Date: 17/01/2018

Consultation

1. Have the potential equality issues identified during the scoping process been addressed by the Committee, and, if so, how?

Age: Mean patient age was 21 years on the largest case series.

Gender: Over 60% of patients reported in the included studies were male.

Religion: Some of the processed pericardium used in aortic valve reconstruction may be porcine in origin.

2. Have any other potential equality issues been raised in the overview, specialist adviser questionnaires or patient commentary, and, if so, how has the Committee addressed these?

No

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 a technology or intervention 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 applicable

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 obligation to promote equality?
Not applicable

7. Have the Committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the consultation document, and, if so, where?
No

Approved by Programme Director and Clinical Advisor

Date: 17.01/2018

Final interventional procedures document

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 a technology or intervention compared with other groups? If so, what are the barriers to, or difficulties with, access for the specific group?

Not applicable

3. If the recommendations have changed after consultation, 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?

Not applicable

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 interventional procedures document, and, if so, where?
No

Approved by Programme Director

Date: 17 January 2018