**SUMMARY REPORT FOR PUBLICATION**

**August 2020** Promotion of unlicensed medicines on <https://www.dermatica.co.uk/> by Dermatica Limited

MHRA received a complaint about promotion of unlicensed medicines on the website’s homepage. The complainant alleged that the homepage made an unsubstantiated claim to unlicensed treatments being “clinically proven”. Furthermore, the MHRA was concerned with information provided for the “adapalene” webpage, which suggested the use of a product outside its licenced indication(s) as listed in the Summary of Product Characteristics.

[Regulation 279](https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2012/1916/regulation/279/made) of the Regulations prohibits the advertising of medicines that do not have a valid UK marketing authorisation or registration.

[Regulation 280](http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2012/1916/regulation/280/made) of the Regulations states an advertisement must: comply with the particulars listed in the Summary of Product Characteristics; encourage the rational use of the product; and not be misleading.

MHRA upheld the complaint. An unlicensed medicinal product would not have been formally assessed through the licensing process for safety, quality and efficacy, the risks associated with their use cannot be presumed to have been evaluated and therefore MHRA considered the claim that such treatment being “clinically proven” is misleading. Dermatica Limited confirmed that they would remove the claim and also review the “adapalene” webpage so as to comply with the Regulations going forward.

The company also agreed to review their website and related content to ensure it complies with MHRA guidance for providers that offer medicinal treatment services in [Appendix 6](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/824545/Appendix_6_-_Blue_Guide.pdf) of the MHRA [Blue Guide](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/blue-guide-advertising-and-promoting-medicines).