

**NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE
EXCELLENCE**

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

STA

**Seladelpar for previously treated primary biliary
cholangitis [ID6429]**

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? |
|---|

Not applicable as no equality issues were identified during scoping.
--

- | |
|--|
| 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? |
|--|

Issues identified in other appraisals included:

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Stakeholders highlighted potential geographical disparities in access to specialist teams and second-line treatments, as identified in a recent UK audit. The committee acknowledged these concerns and remained attentive to how variations in current practice may affect patient experiences.• The committee also considered a range of equality-related issues. These included the higher prevalence of the condition in women, the tendency for men to present with more advanced and less responsive disease, and the influence of age on clinical outcomes. Additionally, the committee recognised that men and younger individuals may |
|---|

experience poorer prognoses. Concerns specific to women with PBC, particularly regarding fertility, were also considered.

The company noted:

- People with PBC may face long wait times for care, often between 3 to 4 months. They also have higher mortality rates while on liver transplant lists compared with those with other liver diseases.

The committee considered the issues raised in its deliberations. It noted that concerns about access to liver transplant were outside its remit. The committee concluded that because its recommendation does not restrict access to treatment for some people over others, these were not potential equalities issues.

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?
Not applicable.

7. Have the committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the draft guidance, and, if so, where?
Section 3.16.

Approved by Principal Technical Adviser (name): Elizabeth Bell

Date: 21/07/25