

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

Baricitinib for treating moderate to severe atopic dermatitis [ID1622]

Final appraisal determination

(when no ACD was issued)

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

Not applicable – no potential equality issues were identified during the scoping process.

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

Equality issues related to the use of the Eczema Area and Severity Index (EASI) and Dermatology Life Quality Index (DLQI) have been addressed consistent with the previously published appraisal of dupilumab for treating moderate to severe atopic dermatitis (TA534). The following recommendations have been included:
--

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• When using the EASI, take into account skin colour and how this could affect the EASI score, and make appropriate clinical adjustments.• When using the DLQI, take into account any physical, psychological, sensory or learning disabilities, or communication difficulties that could |
|--|

affect the responses to the DLQI, and make any appropriate adjustments.

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

The efficacy of baricitinib may differ in people with different skin colours. No data is reported in people with dark skin, and it is not possible to establish baricitinib efficacy in this population. Feedback from clinical experts highlighted that the pattern of atopic dermatitis is different in people of African family origin, but that baricitinib is likely to be efficacious in all skin types. Given the lack of evidence in people with dark skin, the committee considered that it could not account for potential differences during decision-making. A statement has been included in the final appraisal document to this effect.

4. Do the 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 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 final appraisal determination, and, if so, where?

Yes, in sections 1.3, 1.4, 3.22 and 3.23 of the final appraisal document.

Approved by Associate Director (name): Henry Edwards

Date: 15/01/2021