

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

STA Siponimod for treating secondary progressive multiple sclerosis [ID1304]

The impact on equality has been assessed during this appraisal according to the principles of the NICE equality scheme.

Final appraisal document

(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?

There were some issues raised that have already been addressed in the earlier EIA form for consultation. These were as follows, please see “Equality impact assessment – Guidance development” for NICE responses:

- More women being affected by multiple sclerosis than men
- Some people with secondary progressive multiple sclerosis may struggle to take Extavia, whereas siponimod is an oral treatment (note the committee considered this when making its recommendations)

In response to consultation, the following equalities issues were raised, all of which related to the recommendation being negative, but it is now positive:

- Two members of the public commented that secondary progressive multiple sclerosis primarily affects older people and not recommending siponimod is discriminating by age
- The recommendation discriminates against SPMS patients who have been offered no treatment compared with those who started on the NHS before guidance was issued, or people in other areas such as the US or Europe

- Disability and age need to be considered
- The treatment may be more effective in some patients

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?

N/A

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

Section 3.14

Approved by Associate Director (name):Ross Dent.....

Date: 7/10/2020