

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

Eptinezumab for preventing migraine [ID3803]

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? |
|---|

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? |
|--|

Stakeholders commented that:

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Migraine is more common in women, particularly in those of childbearing age.• Appropriate treatments should be available to everyone including those who cannot self-administer current treatment because of physical, cognitive or other disability.• There should be equality of access to treatment for people with migraine and best supportive care should not be the default option because of where someone lives. |
|---|

Considerations made in relation to issues raised:

- Issues about differences in the prevalence or incidence of a condition and health care implementation cannot be addressed in a technology evaluation.
- Because eptinezumab would be administered in a hospital setting intravenously, it would likely improve access to specialist treatment for people who have difficulty self-injecting current CGRP inhibitors.
- The decision making took into account any obligations in relation to the Equality Act 2010 and that eptinezumab can only be recommended for use within its marketing authorisation.

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?
Not applicable.

7. Have the committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the final appraisal determination, and, if so, where?
See section 3.5 of the final guidance.

Approved by Associate Director (name): ...Linda Landells.....

Date: 10 January 2023