

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CLINICAL EXCELLENCE

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

STA Ivabradine for the treatment of chronic heart failure

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 phase, the potential equality issue regarding the race, sex and age of the trial population was raised. The Committee considered that older people and women were under-represented in the trial, and that the recommendation for ivabradine was not based on sex or age, does not vary according to the sex or age of the patient, and that all patients would benefit from ivabradine. The Committee considered that these were not equality issues under the legislation. It concluded that its preliminary recommendation would not have a particular impact on any of the groups whose interests are protected by the legislation and that there was no need to alter or add to its preliminary recommendations.

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?

The patient experts raised the potential equality issue regarding the higher prevalence of non-revascularisable coronary disease in the Asian population because of the aggressive nature of diabetes as a risk factor. Higher prevalence rates are not an equality issue which technology appraisal guidance can address. However, the Committee did not consider that the wording of the preliminary recommendation affected access to the treatment

by this group.

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

None.

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?

The Committee's considerations of equality issues have been described in section 4.15 and the summary table of the ACD.

Approved by Associate Director (name): Frances Sutcliffe

Date: 30/07/2012

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 additional equality issues were 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 recommendations 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?

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?

No.

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

The Committee's considerations of equality issues have been described in section 4.20 and the summary table of the FAD.

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

Date: 10 October 2012