

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

MTA TNF-alpha inhibitors for ankylosing spondylitis and non-radiographic axial spondyloarthritis (including a review of TA143 and TA233)

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?

It was noted during the scoping process that:

- Ankylosing spondylitis has a higher prevalence in men than in women whereas the prevalence of non-radiographic axial spondyloarthritis is similar in men and women, so it is important to assess the gender impact of any recommendations made for ankylosing spondylitis and non-radiographic axial spondyloarthritis.
- Prescribing TNF-alpha inhibitors requires radiographic sacroiliitis to be present. Because ankylosing spondylitis (which is associated with radiographic disease) is less common in women than in men, women with axial spondyloarthritis can be denied effective treatment.
- People with severe disease are currently not allowed to switch to second TNF-alpha inhibitor if their disease does not respond to their first TNF-alpha inhibitor.

All TNF-alpha inhibitors with a UK marketing authorisation to treat ankylosing spondylitis or non-radiographic axial spondyloarthritis were considered by the Committee and all recommendations were within the marketing authorisations for the technologies under consideration. The Committee did not discriminate between male and female patients in its recommendations. The evidence for sequential use of TNF-alpha inhibitor treatments was

Technology appraisals: Guidance development

Equality impact assessment for the multiple technology appraisal of TNF-alpha inhibitors for ankylosing spondylitis and non-radiographic axial spondyloarthritis (including a review of TA143 and TA233)

Issue date: January 2016

considered by the Committee. It noted the limited clinical-effectiveness data available and concluded that it had insufficient cost effectiveness evidence to allow it to recommend sequential use of TNF-alpha inhibitors as a cost-effective use of NHS resources.

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?

No other potential equality issues have been raised.

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

The Committee acknowledged that patient preferences for particular drugs may be influenced by the route and the frequency of their administration. It considered NICE's principles on social value judgements; in particular, the principle to consider individual choice and respect for autonomy, but not with the effect of promoting the use of interventions that are not cost-effective. Because 4 cost-effective treatment options (adalimumab, certolizumab pegol, etanercept and golimumab) are recommended for the treatment of ankylosing spondylitis, and because the available evidence persuaded the Committee that infliximab was not cost-effective in treating this condition, it concluded that it could not recommend the use of infliximab simply on the basis of another treatment choice.

The Committee considered whether its preliminary recommendations were associated with any potential issues related to equality. It noted that there are circumstances in which it may not be appropriate for healthcare professionals to use a person's Bath Ankylosing Spondylitis Disease Activity Index (BASDAI) and spinal pain visual analogue scale (VAS) scores to inform a conclusion about the presence of an adequate response to treatment. It concluded that when using BASDAI and spinal pain VAS scores, healthcare professionals should take into account any physical, sensory or learning disabilities, or communication difficulties that could affect the responses to the questionnaire and make any adjustments they consider appropriate (which may include adapting the use of the questionnaire to suit the individual's circumstances).

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, the preliminary recommendations do not make it more difficult in practice for a specific group to access the technology compared with other groups.

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, there is no potential for the preliminary recommendations to have an adverse impact on people with disabilities because of something that is a consequence of the disability.

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?

The potential equality issues identified by the Committee are recorded in the recommendations (paragraph 1.7), the considerations (paragraphs 4.107 and 4.108) and in the summary table.

Approved by Associate Director (name): ...Janet Robertson.....

Technology appraisals: Guidance development

Equality impact assessment for the multiple technology appraisal of TNF-alpha inhibitors for ankylosing spondylitis and non-radiographic axial spondyloarthritis (including a review of TA143 and TA233)

Issue date: January 2016

Date: 12/03/2015

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?
NA
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?
NA

Technology appraisals: Guidance development

Equality impact assessment for the multiple technology appraisal of TNF-alpha inhibitors for ankylosing spondylitis and non-radiographic axial spondyloarthritis (including a review of TA143 and TA233)

Issue date: January 2016

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

See section 4.73

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

Date: 24/08/2015