

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

INTERVENTIONAL PROCEDURES PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment

IPG502 Assessing motility of the gastrointestinal tract using a wireless capsule

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

Scoping

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

The procedure is intended for use in people with suspected gastroparesis / chronic constipation.

Gender: In 1998, an American study on long-term outcomes of gastroparetic adults reported that 82% of patients were female. The prevalence of constipation is almost twice as high in women as in men.

Age: prevalence of constipation is higher in older patients.

Disability: people with gastroparesis are likely to be covered by the disability provision of the Equality Act 2010 if their symptoms affect their ability to cope with activities of daily living for longer than 12 months. The device is contraindicated in some other people likely to be classed as disabled, and protected under the act including those with severe dysphagia to food, inflammatory bowel disease, or who have an implanted electro medical device such as a pacemaker. The cereal bar (SmartBar®) used in the procedure is a standardized meal replacement (similar to a granola bar) and although it is low in gluten, is not gluten-free and may not be suitable for people with coeliac disease.

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 scope (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 scope (such as additional issues raised during the Committee meeting) been agreed to highlight potential equality issues?
No

Consultation

1. Have the potential equality issues identified during the scoping process been addressed by the Committee, and, if so, how?
The majority of patients included in the literature reported in the overview were female ($\geq 80\%$ for all studies) – this is as expected from the data found at the scoping stage. The mean age was 42 – 53 years across the 7 papers included in table 2 of 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

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 Programme Director

Date: 30 July 2014