

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

Medical technologies evaluation programme

Equality impact assessment: Guidance development

Guidance update: The UroLift System for the treatment of lower urinary tract symptoms secondary to benign prostatic hyperplasia

The impact on equality has been assessed during this evaluation according to the principles of the [NICE Equality scheme](#).

Medical technology consultation document

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

The risk of having benign prostatic hyperplasia increases with age. Age is a protected characteristic under the 2010 Equality Act. The committee recommended the use of UroLift in people who are 50 years and older, which is in line with the device's instructions for use.

2. Have any other potential equality issues been highlighted in the sponsor's submission, or patient organisation questionnaires, and, if so, how has the committee addressed these?

The company stated that age is an independent predictor of adverse outcomes after standard BPH surgery whereas UroLift is a minimally invasive treatment, associated with significantly lower risk of complications. Age is a protected characteristic under the 2010 Equality Act. The committee recommended the use of UroLift in people who are 50 years and older, which is in line with the device's instructions for use.

The company stated that 8 people, who identify as women, have had a Urolift procedure. Gender is a protected characteristic under the 2010 Equality Act. The committee highlighted this in section 4.15 of the guidance document.

The company stated that the risk of adverse outcomes after standard BPH surgery may vary depending on race. Race is a protected characteristic under the 2010 Equality Act. The committee recommended that UroLift be considered as an option for BPH treatment, with decisions being made on an individual basis.

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

None.

4. Do the preliminary 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 preliminary 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?

N/A.

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

Yes, section 4.15.

Approved by Associate Director: Chris Chesters (acting AD)

Date: 08/03/2021

Medical technology guidance document

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

One commentator mentioned that UroLift has been used in someone with a penile prosthesis. The committee acknowledged the comment and recommended UroLift for use in people who are 50 years and older with a prostate volume between 30 and 80ml, with choice of treatment dependent on an individual need basis.

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 the technology compared with other groups? If so, what are the barriers to access for the specific group?

None.

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?

No.

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?

N/A.

5. Have the committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the medical technology guidance document, and, if so, where?

Yes, section 4.15.

Approved by Programme Director: Chris Chesters (acting AD)

Date: 08/03/2021