

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CLINICAL EXCELLENCE

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Scoping

MTA Total hip replacement and resurfacing arthroplasty for the treatment of pain or disability resulting from end stage arthritis of the hip (review of TA2 and TA44)

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?

During the draft scope consultation, consultees said that rates of total joint surgery in practice may vary by age, gender, ethnicity, socioeconomic status and patient characteristics despite there being no evidence that such factors affect outcome. It also was raised by some consultees that hip resurfacing arthroplasty may be contraindicated in some populations with a protected characteristic under equality legislation (women). When the review of TA2 and TA44 was being considered it was noted in the proposal paper for the review that TA2 and TA44 were published before the current NICE equalities scheme was implemented. In particular it noted that metal on metal resurfacing is currently recommended principally in younger, more active patients.

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

The potential issues raised during draft scope consultation relate to implementation of the guidance. The scope does not define eligible populations based on age, gender, ethnicity or socioeconomic status. During the appraisal the Committee will consider issues relating to implementation

that may be raised in the submissions and assessment report. For populations for whom resurfacing arthroplasty is contraindicated or is unsuitable, the cost effectiveness of total hip replacement will be compared to non-surgical management. It is anticipated that evidence for such populations shall be presented to Committee.

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

There are no changes required to the scope as it does not define the population being considered by any of the protected equality characteristics.

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 changes to the matrix have been made related to potential equality issues raised during the scoping process.

Approved by Associate Director (name): Elisabeth George.....

Date: 11 10 2012