# NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CLINICAL EXCELLENCE

## MEDICAL TECHNOLOGIES EVALUATION PROGRAMME

## Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

# EXOGEN ultrasound bone healing system for long bone fractures with non-union or delayed healing

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

### Consultation

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

It was noted in the scope and by the sponsor that because treatment with EXOGEN is self-administered, some patients may need help in using the technology. However, no equality issues relating to groups with protected characteristics under equalities legislation were identified

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?

No other potential equality issues have been highlighted in the sponsors submission or patient questionnaires.

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?

None.

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

The committee considered whether the device was suitable for all patients as it is self-administered and there may be some groups of people who need assistance to use it. The Committee were advised by a patient and clinical experts that the device is easy to use and can be administered by a carer instead of the patient. This is noted in section 4.5 of the MTCD.

#### Approved by Associate Director (name): Mark Campbell

Date: August 2012

## Medical technologies guidance document

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

No additional equalities issues were raised during the consultation.

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?

There were no significant changes to the recommendations after consultation.

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?

There were no significant changes to the recommendations after consultation.

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?

There were no significant changes to the recommendations after consultation.

5. Have the Committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the medical technologies guidance document, and, if so,

where?

The considerations in section 4.5 of the MTCD are unchanged in the final guidance.

#### Approved by Programme Director (name): Mirella Marlow

Date: 27 December 2012