

# NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

## HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

### Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

### STA Zilucoplan for treating antibody-positive generalised myasthenia gravis [ID4008]

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

#### Final draft guidance

1. Have the potential equality issues identified during the scoping process been addressed by the committee, and, if so, how?

A patient group commented that it is important to ensure that no patient has to travel excessive distances to receive the treatment given the level of disability that many will face.

The geographical location of treatment centres is not an equalities issue that is within the remit of the committee. However, the committee considered the frequency and method of treatment dosing and the associated impact in its deliberations, particularly when considering the advantages of zilucoplan over intravenous immunoglobulin and plasma exchange.

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?

A clinical expert commented that patients living away from centres with MG experts may not have access to zilucoplan. This will be even more concerning in people from lower socioeconomic classes. Therefore, educating patients and doctors will be crucial to ensure avoiding unlawful discrimination against patients that are geographically away from large centres. A consultee commented that some people with certain religious beliefs may not be able to have IVIg or PLEX because they cannot have blood products but they would be able to access complement inhibitor

treatment. The committee's considerations of these equality considerations are detailed in section 3.30 of the final draft guidance.

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?

NA

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 Have the committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the draft guidance, and, if so, where?

Section 3.30 of final draft guidance ('Equality')

**Approved by Associate Director (name):** ...Emily Crowe

**Date:** 27/06/2024 and 06/11/2024 and 19/06/2025