NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

MEDICAL TECHNOLOGIES EVALUATION PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

The geko device for reducing the risk of venous thromboembolism

The impact on equality has been assessed during this evaluation 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 stage it was identified that the device may not be suitable for people: - with fragile skin (for example, older patients and children) and those with burns and skin conditions within the application area of the device. - whose common peroneal nerve or device application site is inaccessible or where the common peroneal nerve function is impaired.

2. Have any other potential equality issues been highlighted in the sponsor's submission, or patient organisation questionnaires, and, if so, how has the Committee addressed these?
No other equality issues have been identified in the sponsor's submission or patient organisation questionnaires.

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

The Committee identified that the device is unlikely to be suitable for some people considered disabled under the Equality Act 2010 such as bilateral leg amputees.

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 affect the ability of any specific group to access the technology compared with any other group.	

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?
There is no potential for the preliminary recommendations to have an adverse impact on people with disabilities.	

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?
N/A	

7.	Have the Committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the medical technology consultation document, and, if so, where?
Yes, the Committee considerations regarding the identified equality issue was described in section 4.5.	

Medical technologies guidance document

1.	Have any additional potential equality issues been raised during the consultation, and, if so, how has the Committee addressed these?
No additional potential equality issues were raised during the 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 access for the specific group?
The recommendations were changed after consultation. The final recommendations allow the device to be accessible to a limited group of patients who cannot access any other form of prophylaxis. There are no barriers or difficulties with access in this specific group other than those identified in the scope, which were that the device may not be suitable for those with fragile skin (for example, older patients and children) and those with burns and skin conditions within the application area of the device. It was also noted that the device may not be suitable for those patients whose common peroneal nerve or device application site is inaccessible or where the common peroneal nerve function is impaired. People with any of these conditions may be protected under the Equality Act 2010.	

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?
No additional potential equality issues were raised from the change in recommendation.	

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 additional potential equality issues were raised in questions 2 or 3.	

5.	Have the Committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the medical technologies guidance document, and, if so, where?
There were no equality issues to consider.	

Approved by Programme Director (name): Mirella Marlow

Date: 19 June 2014