

**NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE
EXCELLENCE**

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

**STA Sodium zirconium cyclosilicate for the
treatment of persistent hyperkalaemia with a
serum potassium level between 5.5 mmol/litre
and 5.9 mmol/litre**

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? |
|---|

No

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

<p>In its submission, the company stated that sodium zirconium cyclosilicate was previously incorporated into the NICE COVID-19 rapid guideline: dialysis service delivery (NG160, withdrawn now). The company was unable to provide economic modelling for people having chronic dialysis because of the paucity of data for this population. But it stated that restricting access to sodium zirconium cyclosilicate in this population because of lack of data, after previously allowing access in NG160, would result in inequitable access across the full population in the marketing authorisation.</p>

<p>During the committee meeting, the company clarified that it would like the committee to consider a recommendation for sodium zirconium cyclosilicate</p>

in an emergency setting. This would apply to people on dialysis who develop hyperkalaemia but are not able to have or access dialysis treatment.

The committee noted that it had not seen any evidence for this population, and the current evaluation is for the treatment of persistent hyperkalaemia, not for hyperkalaemia in an emergency setting. So, it concluded that treatment in the dialysis population was not an equality issue that it could address.

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 – please see Section 3.20 of the draft guidance

Approved by Associate Director: Emily Crowe

Date: 23/10/2025

Final draft guidance

(when draft guidance issued)

8. Have any additional potential equality issues been raised during the consultation, and, if so, how has the committee addressed these?

No.

9. 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?

No. At the second committee meeting, the committee considered whether the serum potassium thresholds were appropriate for people with chronic kidney disease or heart failure from ethnic minority backgrounds. The company noted that it had previously explored this and stated that hyperkalaemia management does not differ between different ethnic backgrounds. The committee concluded there were no further equality issues.

10.	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?
No.	

11.	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?
No.	

12.	Have the committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the final appraisal determination, and, if so, where?
Yes, section 3.22	

Approved by Associate Director: Emily Crowe...

Date: 27/03/2026