

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CLINICAL EXCELLENCE

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

MTA - Cilostazol, naftidrofuryl oxalate, pentoxifylline and inositol nicotinate for the treatment of intermittent claudication in people with peripheral arterial disease

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 equalities issues were identified by consultees during the scoping process.
--

No changes were made to the scope regarding equalities issues.
--

- | |
|--|
| 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 equality issues have been raised in submissions, expert statements or academic reports.
--

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

The Committee noted that no issues had been highlighted during the scoping exercise or during the course of the appraisal. The Committee was aware that the prevalence of peripheral arterial disease differs by ethnic groups, but concluded that the preliminary recommendations do not affect access to the technology for any specific groups.
--

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 access for the specific group?

No.

5. Are there any recommendations or explanations that the Committee could make to remove or alleviate barriers to access identified in question 4, or otherwise fulfil NICE's obligations to promote equality?

Not applicable.

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

The considerations section and the summary table of the ACD explains that no issues had been highlighted during the scoping exercise or during the course of the appraisal. The Committee was aware that the prevalence of peripheral arterial disease differs by ethnic groups, but concluded that the preliminary recommendations do not affect access to the technology for any specific groups.

Approved by Associate Director (name): Elisabeth George

Date: 27 Jan 2011

Final appraisal determination

1. Have any additional potential equality issues been raised during the consultation, and, if so, how has the Committee addressed these?

No equality issues have been 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 access for the specific group?
No.

3. If the recommendations have changed after consultation, are there any recommendations or explanations that the Committee could make to remove or alleviate barriers to access identified in question 2, or otherwise fulfil NICE's obligations to promote equality?
No.

4. Have the Committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the final appraisal determination, and, if so, where?
The considerations section and the summary table of the FAD explains that no issues had been highlighted during the scoping exercise or during the course of the appraisal. The Committee was aware that the prevalence of peripheral arterial disease differs by ethnic groups, but concluded that the preliminary recommendations do not affect access to the technology for any specific groups.

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

Date: 30/03/2011