

**NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE
EXCELLENCE**

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Scoping

**STA Guselkumab for treating moderate to severe plaque
psoriasis**

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

1. Have any potential equality issues been identified during the scoping process (draft scope consultation and scoping workshop discussion), and, if so, what are they?

The technical team noted that severity of psoriasis is determined the Dermatology Life Quality Index (DLQI) and the Psoriasis Area and Severity Index (PASI). The DLQI is a self-assessment tool and may not be suitable for some subgroups of people with protected characteristics; it has limited validity in older people and those not working, and may also miss anxiety and depression. The PASI can underestimate disease severity in people with darker skin.

One consultee commented that there are unlikely to be any additional equality issues, unless guselkumab is manufactured with ingredients that are unacceptable to groups protected by the equality legislation.

2. What is the preliminary view as to what extent these potential equality issues need addressing by the committee?

If the committee's recommendations include restrictions according to severity, it will need to address any issues with using the DLQI and the PASI. Previous recommendations for psoriasis have included the following advice:

- “When using the DLQI, healthcare professionals should take into account any physical, sensory or learning disabilities, or

communication difficulties, that could affect the responses to the DLQI and make any adjustments they consider appropriate.”

- “When using the PASI, healthcare professionals should take into account skin colour and how this could affect the PASI score, and make the clinical adjustments they consider appropriate.”

Committee can question the company regarding whether guselkumab is manufactured with ingredients that are unacceptable to groups with protected characteristics.

3. Has any change to the draft scope been agreed to highlight potential equality issues?

No.

4. Have any additional stakeholders related to potential equality issues been identified during the scoping process, and, if so, have changes to the matrix been made?

No.

Approved by Associate Director (name): Elisabeth George

Date: 22/08/2017