

# NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

## HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

### Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

### STA Efgartigimod for treating generalised myasthenia gravis

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?

During the scoping process a patient group commented that it is important to ensure that no patient must travel excessive distances to receive treatment.

The committee considered that access to treatment centres is an issue that can not be addressed by a NICE technology appraisal recommendation.

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 committee noted the patient experts' comments that a person's socioeconomic status and how close they live to a gMG specialist centre may impact their ability to access efgartigimod. The committee also noted the clinical experts' comment that pregnant people may not be able to have efgartigimod until additional information is available. But, the committee noted that access to specialist centres is an implementation issue that cannot be addressed by a NICE technology appraisal recommendation. The committee considered that if efgartigimod was recommended the decision to use efgartigimod during pregnancy should be made by a patient and their clinician if the clinical benefit outweighs the risks. No other potential equalities issues were identified.

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 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?
N/A

7. Have the committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the draft guidance, and, if so, where?
Yes see section 3.13.

**Approved by Associate Director (name):** Jasdeep Hayre

Date: 24 August 2023

## Second consultation

1.	Have any additional potential equality issues been raised during the consultation, and, if so, how has the committee addressed these?
No	
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?
N/A	
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?
N/A	
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 second draft guidance, and, if so, where?

Yes see section 3.24.

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

**Date:** 04/12/2023