

APPENDIX 6

COSMETIC/ PLASTIC SURGERY

Overall the policy for funding of cosmetic/plastic surgery is that this is not normally funded and only considered following surgery, trauma or for congenital malformation. (Post-surgical reconstruction would be part of service level agreements for surgical services in any case.)

The effect of the problem on essential **activities of day-to-day living** is a key factor in decision-making. In such cases, psychological treatment such as counselling or cognitive behavioural therapy may be considered as an appropriate alternative to surgery.

It is not necessary to obtain a psychiatric opinion to support an application. We would expect mental health professionals to treat related problems through established procedures commissioned from the mental health trust and this would not include surgery. Our Panel consistently takes the view that psycho-social considerations should not be a justification for surgery.

Exceptions criteria in previous policies for procedures such as breast augmentation, breast reduction, mastopexy, implant removal and replacement, gynaecomastia, pinnaplasty and abdominoplasty have been removed with referrers asked to provide individual detail of exceptional circumstances and conditions in line with the points above.

We would request that all applications for such procedures should be accompanied by suitable clinical photography that demonstrates the extent of the problem. This, of course, would be subject to patient consent.

Social and psychological circumstances (quoted from Dorset CCG policy 2015)

If social and psychological factors are included in decision making, it becomes more difficult to prevent inequity. Agreeing to fund a case based on social or psychological factors almost inevitably sets a precedent for funding a sub group and so, would prompt a review of access protocols. Therefore the CCG has defined exceptionality in relation to unique clinical factors. Case examples in Appendix C outline the rationale for decisions not to have social and psychological circumstances as the basis is for consideration of exceptionality.

The CCG has not identified a group of patients whose social worth overrides the usual considerations of cost and clinical effectiveness, not only for the intervention in question but arguably for all their health care needs. If it did do this it would mean that others with a different social contribution or whose non-clinical circumstances are unknown would be subjected to inequity.

The CCG has not identified a group of patients with psychological factors that would override the usual considerations of cost and clinical effectiveness. The CCG takes the view that because of the difficulties associated with obtaining normative values for the majority of patients for whom an intervention is not available and in the interests of equity, psychological distress alone will not be considered as reason for exceptionality.

Exceptionality has been defined solely in clinical terms; to consider social and other non clinical factors automatically introduces subjectivity and inequality, implying that some patients have a higher intrinsic social worth than others with the same condition. It runs contrary to a basic tenet of the NHS namely, that people with equal need should be treated equally and introduces discrimination into the provision of medical treatment. Therefore social and psychological circumstances are not factors that would make an individual exceptional.