

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

STA Filgotinib for treating moderate to severe rheumatoid arthritis

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

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? |
| 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? |
| During technical engagement, clinical and patient experts raised that: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• people with RA may be protected under Equality Act 2010 (disability),• BAME populations underrepresented - education also needed to ensure adherence to treatment• filgotinib and some other biological and targeted synthetic disease-modifying antirheumatic drugs (DMARDs) may be contraindicated for pregnant women The committee agreed no adjustment to the recommendations are needed to address these potential inequality issues. |

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

Technology appraisal guidance 665 ([Upadacitinib for treating severe rheumatoid arthritis](#)) highlighted that it may be more difficult to use DAS28 measure to assess outcomes for people who have difficulty communicating.

The committee recommended that when using the DAS28, healthcare professionals should take into account any physical, psychological, sensory or learning disabilities, or communication difficulties that could affect the responses to the DAS28 and make any adjustments they consider appropriate.

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 – Section 1.7 (recommendation) and section 3.25 (description of the equality issue raised)

Approved by Associate Director (name): Jasdeep Hayre

Date: 12th January 2021