NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

INTERVENTIONAL PROCEDURES PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment

IPG553 Microwave ablation for treating liver metastases

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?

Age: Occurrence of colorectal cancer is strongly related to age, with almost three quarters of cases occurring in people aged 65 or over

Gender: There are similar incidence rates for cancer of the colon in both sexes, and a slight male predominance for rectal cancer.

Disability: All people with cancer are covered by the disability provision of the Equality Act 2010 from the point of diagnosis.

Ethnicity: Incidence in England is lower in South Asians compared to all other ethnic groups and approximately half that in Whites. Black Africans and Black Caribbeans have about a 20% lower incidence than Whites, while the incidence in Chinese is about 10% lower.

Socioeconomic status: There is evidence for a small association between colorectal cancer incidence and deprivation in the UK for males (and possibly females).

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?)

3. Has any change to the brief (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 briefing process been addressed by the committee, and, if so, how? Age: Mean 57 years for patients with liver metastases included in the overview (for whom data on age were reported). Gender: 74% (2306/3133) of patients included in the overview (for whom data on gender were reported) were male. No specific data relating to socioeconomic status or ethnicity was 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?	This was not thought to have an impact on the assessment of the procedure. No exclusions were applied.	
the committee meeting) been agreed to highlight potential equality issues? No Consultation 1. Have the potential equality issues identified during the briefing process been addressed by the committee, and, if so, how? Age: Mean 57 years for patients with liver metastases included in the overview (for whom data on age were reported). Gender: 74% (2306/3133) of patients included in the overview (for whom data on gender were reported) were male. No specific data relating to socioeconomic status or ethnicity was 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		
1. Have the potential equality issues identified during the briefing process been addressed by the committee, and, if so, how? Age: Mean 57 years for patients with liver metastases included in the overview (for whom data on age were reported). Gender: 74% (2306/3133) of patients included in the overview (for whom data on gender were reported) were male. No specific data relating to socioeconomic status or ethnicity was 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	3.	the committee meeting) been agreed to highlight potential equality
1. Have the potential equality issues identified during the briefing process been addressed by the committee, and, if so, how? Age: Mean 57 years for patients with liver metastases included in the overview (for whom data on age were reported). Gender: 74% (2306/3133) of patients included in the overview (for whom data on gender were reported) were male. No specific data relating to socioeconomic status or ethnicity was 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 No Have any other potential equality issues been identified by the	No	
Age: Mean 57 years for patients with liver metastases included in the overview (for whom data on age were reported). Gender: 74% (2306/3133) of patients included in the overview (for whom data on gender were reported) were male. No specific data relating to socioeconomic status or ethnicity was 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 Have any other potential equality issues been identified by the	Cons	sultation
overview (for whom data on age were reported). Gender: 74% (2306/3133) of patients included in the overview (for whom data on gender were reported) were male. No specific data relating to socioeconomic status or ethnicity was 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 Have any other potential equality issues been identified by the	1.	
data on gender were reported) were male. No specific data relating to socioeconomic status or ethnicity was 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 Have any other potential equality issues been identified by the		
 the literature presented in the overview. 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 Have any other potential equality issues been identified by the 		, ,
specialist adviser questionnaires or patient commentary, and, if so, how has the committee addressed these? No Have any other potential equality issues been identified by the		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
specialist adviser questionnaires or patient commentary, and, if so, how has the committee addressed these? No Have any other potential equality issues been identified by the		
Have any other potential equality issues been identified by the	2.	specialist adviser questionnaires or patient commentary, and, if so,
	No	
	3.	
No	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: 1 March 2016