

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

DIAGNOSTICS ASSESSMENT PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Scoping

Adjunctive colposcopy technologies for assessing suspected cervical abnormalities (update of DG4)

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

1. Have any potential equality issues been identified during the scoping process (scoping workshop discussion, assessment subgroup discussion), and, if so, what are they?

During scoping it was identified that all people with cancer are covered under the disability provision of the Equality Act (2010) from the point of diagnosis. Cervical cancer may be more prevalent in certain ethnic groups.

Older people may be more likely to have a colposcopy examination that is classed as unsatisfactory because the cervical transformation zone may not be fully visualised. Colposcopy management is likely to be different for women who are pregnant because watchful waiting until after delivery may be recommended as an alternative to biopsies and treatment. Identification of cellular changes during colposcopy may also be more difficult in women who are pregnant because of changes that occur in the cervix during pregnancy.

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

Differences in prevalence between groups of people are a characteristic of the disease and cannot be addressed within a NICE assessment. The committee may need to consider whether the technologies may have a differential impact in older people and women who are pregnant.

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

The draft scope has been changed to highlight that older people may be more likely to have an unsatisfactory colposcopy and that women who are pregnant may receive watchful waiting instead of biopsies and treatment.

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

No additional stakeholders have been identified.

Approved by Associate Director (name): Carla Deakin

Date: 14 December 2016