NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

STA Certolizumab pegol for treating rheumatoid arthritis after inadequate response to a TNF inhibitor

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?
None identified at scoping stage.	

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?
None	

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?
No specific considerations were given by committee	

Approved by Associate Director (name): …Frances Sutcliffe

Date: December 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?
Yes. The company state that not all benefits for certolizumab pegol were adequately captured by the QALY and that it may have a place for use in	

pregnancy. The committee considered these claims but concluded that the QALY adequately captured all relevant benefits and costs. Because the committee makes recommendations within the marketing authorisation, it could not consider certolizumab pegol for use in pregnancy in its final recommendations.

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?
No.	

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?
No	

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?
FAD section 4.15	

Approved by Centre or Programme Director (name): …Frances Sutcliffe

Date: 13/09/2016

Final appraisal determination

(when no ACD was issued)

1.	Have the potential equality issues identified during the scoping process been addressed by the committee, and, if so, how?
[Insert response here]	

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?
[Insert response here]	

3.	Have any other potential equality issues been identified by the committee, and, if so, how has the committee addressed these?
[Insert response here]	

4.	Do the 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?
[Insert response here]	

5.	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?
[Insert response here]	

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?
[Insert response here]	

7.	Have the committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the final appraisal determination, and, if so, where?
[Insert response here]	

Approved by Programme Director (name): ……

Date: [xx/xx/year]