

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

STA Berotralstat for preventing recurrent attacks of hereditary angioedema

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 potential equality issues were 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 company's submission positioned berotralstat for people with at least 2 angioedema attacks per month who have previously used androgens. The clinical experts highlighted the inconsistent supply of attenuated androgens and the Department of Health and Social Care's advice to clinicians to not start prescribing androgens to people who have not had them before. They also advised that people under 18 cannot have androgens. The committee was concerned that the company's positioning may inadvertently prevent some people from accessing berotralstat and that it would consider this in its decision making.

- | |
|--|
| 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?

No

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

Yes, section 3.2 of ACD

Approved by Associate Director (name): Ross Dent

Date: 29/06/2021

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?

The committee considered the implications of the company's positioning for berotralstat including any equality considerations. No additional equality issues were raised.

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?

Section 3.15 of the final appraisal determination

Approved by Associate Director (name): Ross Dent

Date: 27/08/2021