

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

STA Erenumab for preventing migraine [ID1188]

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? |
|---|

There were no potential equality issues identified during the scoping process.
--

- | |
|--|
| 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 clinical and patient submissions highlighted that migraine can be classed as a disability under the Equality Act 2010, and that because migraine is most common in people of working age and affects more women than men, women may be further disadvantaged in the workplace. It was also noted that there may be unequal access to specialist headache clinics.

The committee considered these issues but concluded that there were no specific adjustments required to the NICE methods in this circumstance.
--

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

No.

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?
Not applicable.

7. Have the committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the appraisal consultation document, and, if so, where?
Yes, in section 3.20.

Approved by Associate Director (name): Jasdeep Hayre

Date: 17/12/2018

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?

During the appeal, it was noted that there are differences in access to botulinum toxin. However, unequal access was not associated with a protected characteristic. The committee considered this issue but concluded that there were no specific adjustments required to the NICE methods in this circumstance.

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?

Yes, in section 3.29

Approved by Associate Director (name): Jasdeep Hayre

Date: 25 November 2020