

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

STA Palopegteriparatide for treating chronic hypoparathyroidism

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?

At scoping consultation, consultees highlighted the following potential equalities issues:

- Post-surgical hypoparathyroidism is more common in women than men since women are more likely to have thyroidectomies as a result of increased risk of thyroid disease.
- Issues with learning disabilities, communication difficulties and language may impair access to treatment.
- Pregnancy may prevent patients from accessing treatment.

The committee considered these potential equalities issues in its deliberations. Because its recommendation does not restrict access to treatment for some people over others, the committee agreed these were not potential equalities issues.

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 EAG raised a further issue that, as palopegteriparatide is a once-daily treatment, some people may require daily nurse visits to assist with administration. This level of provision may be greater than the NHS can provide and so the EAG thought that more vulnerable people could be excluded from treatment with palopegteriparatide. However, at the meeting, the committee heard from the clinical experts that use of palopegteriparatide could decrease the need for nurse visits to help with treatment administration. So, the committee concluded that this was not a potential equality issue.

No further equality issues were raised at the second committee meeting.

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

No further issues identified.

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 draft guidance, and, if so, where?
--

Yes, section 3.23.

Approved by Principal Technical Adviser: Lizzie Walker

Date: 10/07/2026