

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

INTERVENTIONAL PROCEDURES PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment

IPG608 Laparoscopic mesh pectopexy for apical prolapse of the uterus or vagina

The impact on equality has been assessed during guidance development according to the principles of the NICE Equality scheme.

Briefing

1. Have any potential equality issues been identified during the briefing process (development of the brief or discussion at the committee meeting), and, if so, what are they?

Gender: This procedure is only relevant to women.

Ethnicity: Studies have shown that white women and women of Hispanic family origin have the highest rate of prolapse.

High parity is associated with greater incidence of prolapse, and ethnicity may be associated with parity. For example, women of Bangladeshi family origin and women of Pakistani family origin are known to have higher pregnancy rates.

Disability: Women with apical prolapse of the vagina or uterus may be covered by the equalities legislation if their symptoms have a substantial adverse effect on day to day activities for longer than 12 months.

Age: Pelvic organ prolapse is more prevalent as age increases.

Religion: Some types of mesh may have an element that is derived from animal sources and may not be acceptable to some people.

2. What is the preliminary view as to what extent these potential equality issues need addressing by the committee? (If there are exclusions listed in the brief (for example, populations, treatments or settings), are these justified?)

This was not thought to have an impact on the assessment of the procedure. No exclusions were applied.

3. Has any change to the brief (such as additional issues raised during the committee meeting) been agreed to highlight potential equality issues?

No

4. Have any additional stakeholders related to potential equality issues been identified during the committee meeting, and, if so, have changes to the stakeholder list been made?

No

Approved by Programme Director and Clinical Advisor

Date: 26/01/2018

Consultation

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

Patients included in the overview had an average age between 53 to 62 years.

No specific data relating to ethnicity, religion, or disability were identified in the literature presented in the overview.

2. Have any other potential equality issues been raised in the overview, specialist adviser questionnaires or patient commentary, and, if so, how has the committee addressed these?

No

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 a technology or intervention 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?

Not applicable

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 obligation to promote equality?

Not applicable

7. Have the committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the consultation document, and, if so, where?

No

Approved by Programme Director and Clinical Advisor

Date: 26/01/2018

Final interventional procedures document

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

No

2. If the recommendations have changed after consultation, are there any recommendations that make it more difficult in practice for a specific group to access a technology or intervention compared with other groups? If so, what are the barriers to, or difficulties with, access for the specific group?

Not applicable

3. If the recommendations have changed after consultation, 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?

Not applicable

4. 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?
Not applicable

5. Have the committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the final interventional procedures document, and, if so, where?
No

Approved by Acting Director

Date: 26 January 2018