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Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

STA Sacubitril valsartan for treating heart failure with systolic dysfunction

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 scoping, the scoping workshop attendees noted that trials of treatments for chronic heart failure tend to recruit predominantly middle aged men. They further noted that hydralazine with nitrate is taken further along the treatment pathway than sacubitril valsartan and that hydralazine with nitrate is particularly recommended for people of African or Caribbean origin. The scoping workshop attendees agreed that taking or not taking sacubitril valsartan would not preclude any group of people from receiving subsequent treatments. The generalisability of trial data to clinical practice in England is not an equalities issue, and therefore the Committee did not need to alter its recommendations in any way. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. 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?
 |
| Comments were received during consultation that stated that there were higher rates of angio-oedema in those of African descent exposed to ACE inhibitors, and that extra vigilance would be required because of the low numbers of this cohort included in the trial (5%). Bearing in mind that the Committee had recommended sacubitril valsartan, it concluded that there was no unfairness or unlawful discrimination and no need to alter or add to its recommendations |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Have any other potential equality issues been identified by the Committee, and, if so, how has the Committee addressed these?
 |
| No other comments regarding equalities issues have been received. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. 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 |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. 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 |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. 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 |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Have the Committee’s considerations of equality issues been described in the appraisal consultation document, and, if so, where?
 |
| Yes, in section 4.18 of the ACD, and the summary table. |

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

**Date:** 02/12/2015

# 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 other comments regarding equalities issues have been raised during consultation. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. 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?
 |
| No |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. 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 |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. 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 |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Have the Committee’s considerations of equality issues been described in the final appraisal determination, and, if so, where?
 |
| Yes, in section 4.21 of the FAD, and the summary table. |

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

**Date:** 26/02/2016