

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

STA Ozanimod for moderately to severely active ulcerative colitis

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

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? |
|---|

The following comments were raised in the equality section during scoping:

- There is inequality of access based on postcode, as some clinical commissioning groups do not fund later lines of therapy whereas others do
- A request that the company provide more detail on the management of people over the age of 55
- A comment that the mode of administration (oral) may reduce the need for travel to hospital and therefore be a benefit for: people with disability, people “in cultures where it may be harder to speak openly about the condition” or people living in remote areas
- Some treatments attract prescription costs which may cause a barrier to treatment for some people

The committee considered that inequality of access based on postcode, or cost of prescriptions, do not directly cover protected characteristic groups. Moreover, it did not consider that the comment on age included any specific equality issue. The committee acknowledged the benefits of oral

administration but noted that other oral options are available such as tofacitinib.

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 patient experts explained that for some religious groups the impact of active disease and the effects of surgery may interfere with religious practices and cause distress.

The committee did not consider this an equality issue that could be resolved by this appraisal. Moreover, it did not consider the recommendation would disadvantage groups with protected characteristics.

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 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 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 final appraisal determination, and, if so, where?
Yes, section 3.13.

Approved by Associate Director (name): Henry Edwards

Date: 21/09/2022