



The Scottish Parliament  
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba

## Official Report

# PUBLIC PETITIONS COMMITTEE

Tuesday 24 February 2015

Session 4

---

© Parliamentary copyright. Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body

Information on the Scottish Parliament's copyright policy can be found on the website - [www.scottish.parliament.uk](http://www.scottish.parliament.uk) or by contacting Public Information on 0131 348 5000

---

**Tuesday 24 February 2015**

**CONTENTS**

	<b>Col.</b>
<b>CURRENT PETITION</b> .....	1
Polypropylene Mesh Medical Devices (PE1517) .....	1

---

**PUBLIC PETITIONS COMMITTEE**  
**5<sup>th</sup> Meeting 2015, Session 4**

**CONVENER**

\*John Pentland (Motherwell and Wishaw) (Lab)

**DEPUTY CONVENER**

\*David Torrance (Kirkcaldy) (SNP)

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

\*Jackson Carlaw (West Scotland) (Con)

\*Kenny MacAskill (Edinburgh Eastern) (SNP)

\*Angus MacDonald (Falkirk East) (SNP)

\*Hanzala Malik (Glasgow) (Lab)

\*John Wilson (Central Scotland) (Ind)

\*attended

**THE FOLLOWING ALSO PARTICIPATED:**

Neil Findlay (Lothian) (Lab)

Dr Neil McGuire (Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency)

Sally Mounter (Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency)

Adam M Slater (Mazie Slater Katz & Freeman)

**CLERK TO THE COMMITTEE**

Anne Peat

**LOCATION**

The Robert Burns Room (CR1)



# Scottish Parliament

## Public Petitions Committee

Tuesday 24 February 2015

[The Convener opened the meeting at 10:05]

### Current Petition

#### Polypropylene Mesh Medical Devices (PE1517)

**The Convener (John Pentland):** Good morning. I ask everyone to switch off their mobile phones and any other electronic devices, as they may interfere with the sound system. No apologies have been received.

I welcome everyone to the meeting, for which there is just one agenda item. We will take further evidence as part of our consideration of PE1517, by Elaine Holmes and Olive McIlroy on behalf of Scottish mesh survivors, on mesh medical devices. Members have a note by the clerk.

Neil Findlay, who has an interest in the petition, is with us. I welcome him to the meeting.

I also welcome Dr Neil McGuire and Sally Mounter from the Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency. I invite Dr McGuire to make a brief statement for around five minutes before we move to questions.

**Dr Neil McGuire (Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency):** I thank the committee very much for the opportunity to come and speak to it.

Everybody in the MHRA recognises the serious complications that women have had as a result of surgical procedures and greatly sympathises with them.

I will briefly outline the MHRA's role. Our remit is to ensure that the medical device directives are followed by manufacturers. That is done through notified bodies that look after the medical device directives in relation to manufacturers on our behalf. We ensure that goods that are manufactured and brought to market have a CE mark, which shows that they have complied with the relevant medical device directives that are in place at any given time.

The directives are enshrined in European and United Kingdom law, and we have certain responsibilities under those directives as the competent authority. Most of our work is to ensure that the directives are adhered to by the relevant parties. Once the device is on the market, we monitor it through adverse incident reporting;

reports from notified bodies; manufacturers reporting; engaging with professional bodies; listening to what patients say; and engaging with regulators around the world and other competent authorities. Basically, I am saying that patient safety is a team sport. There is a mixture of regulation and all the people who are part of the process.

People do not always understand that we have no influence over clinical decisions that are made between individual practitioners—surgeons, in this case—and their patients. We work with organisations such as the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, NHS England, NHS Scotland and other devolved Administrations to ensure that we all work together for the purpose of patient safety.

**The Convener:** Thank you, Dr McGuire. Do you have anything to say, Ms Mounter?

**Sally Mounter (Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency):** No.

**The Convener:** Okay. We will move to questions.

As Dr McGuire said, manufacturers are required to undertake post-market surveillance to ensure that their products are safe and fit for their intended purpose. How does the MHRA ensure that manufacturers undertake effective post-market scrutiny?

**Dr McGuire:** That is done through the notified bodies, which audit manufacturers to ensure that they undertake those processes. To take one step back, before a manufacturer can get a CE mark, it must provide evidence of its post-market surveillance plan, as required by the medical device directives. At any time, either through the notified bodies or directly, we can make those inquiries of manufacturers. It is part of the process that we continue to look at those feedback mechanisms.

**The Convener:** In your introduction, you talked about a "team sport" in relation to the notified bodies. Although the MHRA has responsibility for the notified bodies in the UK, a manufacturer can go to a notified body somewhere else in Europe. What assurance can you give the committee and others that, whenever an incident is brought to the coal face, it is fully investigated?

**Dr McGuire:** We work with all the competent authorities across Europe and with regulators worldwide. If we are talking just about Europe, we have a monthly vigilance teleconference with all the competent authorities. Mesh and tapes are a standing item on the agenda for that. In relation to other devices, we work together as competent authorities and we undertake joint inspections of notified bodies across the European Union as part

of the European Commission's drive to harmonise standards. We take part in other competent authorities' audits of notified bodies in their countries and they take part in audits in the UK. We were aware of potential weaknesses in the system, and we have found that collaborative inspection and auditing have strengthened the process.

**The Convener:** Are you saying that a notified body in the UK works under the same strict criteria as its EU counterparts?

**Dr McGuire:** Yes.

**The Convener:** All adverse incidents should first be sent to Health Facilities Scotland. What relationship does the MHRA have with Health Facilities Scotland in investigating such reports?

**Dr McGuire:** We have a very good working relationship. We have regular contact so that any reports that come to us go into reporting systems and are investigated as necessary. As part of the process, we do not just investigate; we look at trends in reporting. For example, somebody might get a report in a particular location and to them, it is an individual report and is not a very strong signal. However, if 10 people in similar locations report the same kind of incident, we can see that there is a trend and that something is out of the ordinary, so we would investigate further.

We have daily or weekly meetings at which we look at individual reports and trending, and then we have higher-level supervision of the trending. I do not know whether members know about the type of people who work in the MHRA, but we have scientists, engineers, doctors, researchers and statisticians. Each of those groups brings something different to the equation. However, the common group in all the interactions is the clinical team. Certain aspects of devices are purely to do with engineering, biochemistry or whatever, but the key to all this is, as I said at the beginning, patient safety. We have to interpret the information from a clinical perspective. In the MHRA, we have some expertise, but we do not have all the expertise—that is not possible. However, we do have access to healthcare professionals who have expertise in all the clinical areas where we require extra advice. The clinical team takes in all that information, looks at it and then says, "This is the balance here." When we investigate and take action, we have to be proportionate and work on the best scientific evidence that is available.

10:15

If we applied the strictest criteria to regulation, there would be no innovation and no products would come on to the market. Patients would not get early benefit from new devices and new technology—and technology is turning over so

fast. There are 500,000 medical devices out there that we regulate, and something like 90,000 plus of them are highest-risk devices. That is why the systems that we have in place are about surveillance and about working with all the different groups.

For example, we will watch the trend of how a product that has recently come on to the market is performing. We might suddenly get a whole flurry of reports in, which might be due to a manufacturing fault or a bad batch going through the system. We can pick up that there is an issue and then we can investigate it.

In the not-too-distant past, we had such an incident. Suddenly, a whole group of reports about the failure of devices came into the agency from different sources. When we investigated, we asked the manufacturer what had changed and learned that it had moved its manufacturing facility from one country to another: it had a workforce that was not as highly trained as the previous workforce and the manufacturing tolerances had changed. We picked up those changes and went back to the manufacturer and said, "This is not good enough." We said that the issue needed to be fixed within a specific period of time.

That was all about the manufacturing process and, between the manufacturer, the notified body and the MHRA, we agreed that the manufacturing would be brought back into proper tolerances. The number of incidents dropped as the old stock diminished. As it was not practical to remove all the old stock, we warned clinicians that there was a potential problem. If they experienced that problem, they needed to report to us and to stop using that batch.

We needed to make sure that there was constancy of supply and that the corrective actions were taken. It is always a balancing act—that is where proportionality comes in. We cannot suddenly pull a whole load of devices off the market if there is a small problem because if we do that, there may be nothing to use instead. It is a highly complex area—there are so many interacting factors that we have to make judgments on. That is why we engage with the widest possible community to make the balance a reality.

**John Wilson (Central Scotland) (Ind):** The MHRA's report relies heavily on the York Health Economics Consortium report from 2012. The consortium reported that there was significant variance in complications as a result of mesh implants and that the rates of adverse incidents in Scotland or in the rest of the UK were unclear. What is the basis for the MHRA continuing to promote the benefits of the device, rather than the risks?

**Dr McGuire:** Something that is not well understood is that regulation—in its present form and probably into the future—is about judging risk. Benefit is where the shift into the clinical community occurs. It is a question of balance. We need to ask whether the device, in itself, is inherently safe because it complies with all the regulations. Then, when it is used, we need to ask whether it is being used in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions and in the way that it was intended to be used. There is a spectrum, with the device at one end of that spectrum and, at the other end, clinical practice and the application of the device in a clinical scenario.

As I said, we do not have any influence over what the clinician does on a day-to-day basis. That is a judgment for the clinician in conjunction with informed consent from the patient. However, that does not mean—I am weasel wording—to say that we are not involved in the process, because we are. That is why we are so heavily involved in the Scottish independent review, which is moving forward as we speak, and with the NHS England working group, which is achieving the same things. We understand that there is the device perspective and the clinical perspective, but that question involves the information that has been reviewed by NICE, which has produced quite clear guidance about the use of the devices on a number of occasions, backed up by Sir Bruce Keogh's letters of 2012 and 2013, which reinforce the advice that clinicians should use the devices in the appropriate way with the appropriate training and should audit their practice under the particular measures that are in the guidance because complication rates have previously been difficult to interpret.

More than 3.5 million devices have been sold across the world, including 170,000 in the UK, and there have been something like 130,000 operations in England—I do not have the figure for operations that have been carried out in Scotland. However, we are not seeing the level of complications that we would expect from the information that we have been given by various patient groups who tell us that hundreds and thousands of women have serious complications. The evidence from the literature, from the studies that have been conducted by NICE completely independently of the MHRA and from the reporting that we get does not put those serious complications into the same ballpark—we do not have that evidence at all, and such evidence is not available across the whole world. No competent authorities or regulators anywhere in the world have taken steps to withdraw the products.

I am aware that two small Australian companies have been pulled from the Australian therapeutic goods administration's register. However, although we have not had the opportunity to speak to the

TGA—this happened only a couple of weeks ago—it looks to us as though the reason for that was technical issues with the documentation. There is nothing to say that it was done on the ground of patient safety, so there is no new information there. In fact, we have just seen the TGA's report from 2013, which was delivered to the NHS England working group, in which it goes through the same things, although it is slightly behind the timescales for our own production of evidence, and it does not make any recommendation or come to any firm conclusions about further action or direction.

The independent review in Scotland and the NHS England working group are looking to the future. It does not matter how low the rate of serious complications is; when somebody has a complication, the working group—I am now talking as a member of that group—wants that complication to be recognised and a treatment pathway to be in place for it. We do not want to see the number of adverse incident reports increasing. When there is a complication following a surgical procedure, we want it to be taken seriously and we want something to be done about it.

I hope that that answers your question.

**John Wilson:** Thank you for your response. I am sure that other committee members will have questions arising out of it. You have certainly raised a number of issues in my mind.

**Neil Findlay (Lothian) (Lab):** Convener, I have some information that might be of assistance to Mr Wilson in relation to the point that has just been made.

**The Convener:** I will let John Wilson finish his questioning first.

**John Wilson:** A number of issues have been raised in that response. For a start, does MHRA have any views on the use of mesh implants in stress urinary incontinence and pelvic organ prolapse procedures? You seem to be referring to the clinical use of the device rather than the device itself.

**Dr McGuire:** The devices have been through the relevant procedures to satisfy the regulations in all countries; we, as a regulator, have overseen that process. Once the process is complete, the devices are given the CE mark or, in the United States, the appropriate approvals for use. Under the strictest interpretation, you could say that we could now step back and not be involved any further, but that is not how we see our place in the situation. When we see signals of complications and issues, we want to be part of the process and ensure that people feed back to us as best they can so that we get as much information as we can and can move forward and act together.

As I have said, the signals from all the different sources are giving us virtually the same complication rates. It is definitely the case that complication rates for stress urinary incontinence surgery are lower than those for pelvic organ prolapse, but something that must be added to the mix is that pelvic organ prolapse itself is a very complex illness and has a natural history of deterioration if not treated. This is my understanding from clinicians, because I am not an obstetrician or a gynaecologist; the reality is that this is a question for them. That said, for certain aspects of the procedure, we are seeing not particularly high complication rates, but for problems with sexual function, the rate is up into the 15 per cent range. To put that into context, however, I point out that up to 70 per cent of patients with pelvic organ prolapse and urinary incontinence have problems with sexual function before they have surgery. *[Interruption.]* That is in the published literature. Following surgery, that improves. *[Interruption.]*

**The Convener:** I am sure that everybody agrees that there is a great interest in this issue, but we need to follow parliamentary procedure. I say to the people in the public gallery that we really need to hear the answers to the questions. You might not agree with them, but we really need to hear them.

Mr McGuire, would you like to continue?

**Dr McGuire:** I was saying that if we had a level of reporting that showed more complications than we are seeing, we would always be prepared to change our view. If we had thousands upon thousands of reports to say that this was an issue and that complication rates were not within limits deemed acceptable by the clinical community, we would change our stance, but we cannot act without information, and that information does not appear to be out there.

The other thing to say in this situation is that thousands and thousands of women who have had these procedures have benefited greatly. Stress urinary incontinence and pelvic organ prolapse are distressing and unpleasant conditions for which women seek treatment. That is aside from the point that, according to NHS England figures, something like 6 million people in the UK have some form of urinary incontinence. Not all of those people seek help—that would completely overwhelm the health service—but I say that to put these things in context, so that we do not go down the line of disadvantaging people who are going to be helped by having these sorts of procedures. Large numbers have already been helped.

10:30

Again, that is where proportionality comes into our considerations and actions, and that is why we have engaged so heavily with the clinical community. The Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists, the British Association of Urological Surgeons and the British Society of Urogynaecology all agree, and all of you will have seen their letters, expressing surprise at the stance that was taken in Scotland on the request to suspend these surgical procedures. We are working with them, NICE and patient groups to find a way forward in addressing the serious concerns of those who have been affected by serious complications. However, we are not in a position, with the information that we have, to take any further action.

The other criticism that has been made of us is that we have not issued alerts. We have not put out a medical device alert or made the manufacturers put out a field safety notice. That was considered in 2012, and it was decided that, because the matter was so much in the clinical domain, it was better to come from Sir Bruce Keogh and Professor Keith Willett, and then be reinforced later, again by Sir Bruce Keogh. That is why we have not put out alerts.

People have asked why we have not put out alerts now, given what the Food and Drug Administration has done. We work a different regulatory system to the FDA, and it puts out different information. For example, one of its most recent statements was that complications are “not rare”. We do not know what “not rare” means, and we cannot base regulation on that kind of statement. At least we are working to the numbers that are coming in from different places, not just from one single source and not just from adverse incidents, but from the clinical community and from scientific papers, some of which are based on randomised control trials. If you want to see that information, you can. I do not have it at my fingertips, but NICE looks at all of it before it produces its guidelines.

**John Wilson:** At what point would the MHRA recommend that the devices be classified as high risk or removed from the market? You referred to studies, reports and clinical reports, but what decision or reporting mechanism would give the MHRA the confidence either to classify the devices as high risk or to recommend that they be removed from the market?

**Dr McGuire:** Given that these devices are already in the medium to high-risk category, there is no benefit in reclassifying them in the UK or Europe. We have discussed the matter with our European partners; the devices are already subject to the appropriate scrutiny for their type. In the United States, the situation is different; its



classification system is different from ours and cannot be matched up. The United States has said that it is considering reclassification, but at this point it has not done anything about the matter or changed its stance.

We have been working with the United States—for example, we have been to the public meetings where these sorts of things are discussed—and, as I have said, its website does not show any change in its stance at this time. It has made no moves to withdraw, ban or otherwise restrict the devices; if it does, it will talk to us first, as it would with regard to all other devices that cross over. After all, a lot of devices are made in the United States. Others are manufactured here, but given that some of the notified bodies for CE marking in Europe are in this country, we have regulatory powers in that respect.

When would we act? It sounds like a feeble answer, but the reality is that it depends on the device, the seriousness of the complications, the reporting rate and whether the complication rate is outside that which would be reasonably expected for the type of procedure, given current knowledge. If the manufacturer and the clinical community decided that the complication rate was—to choose an arbitrary number—5 per cent and all of a sudden the rate went from 4.5 to 5 and then to 5.1 per cent, we would start thinking, as we have done with other devices, that we had exceeded what was reasonably expected in the circumstance, given all the other information about the particular procedure, the risks associated with it and the complication rates of other procedures. Added to that mix is the question whether another device or product with a lower complication rate could reasonably be substituted for the one concerned. That, too, could be taken into account.

As I have said, if you consider suddenly withdrawing a particular procedure or device, you also have to think about the considerable number of people who are still benefiting from them. The balance will come down to the individual discussion between the clinician and patient, and it is up to them to make a judgment, provided—and I can say this as a clinician—that the process of informed consent has been undertaken in an appropriate and clear way. When the risks are explained to some people, they will still take the chance of having the procedure, because their life is being affected so badly by their current symptoms. They are in a situation analogous to that of the first people who had hip replacements. If we had analysed the results of those first replacements and concluded that the procedure was far too risky, given that the components wear out, nobody would be having hip replacements now. However, we know that the technology improves consistently over time and that, because of the natural history of all types of hip

replacement, those who have such a procedure at a younger age might be looking at a revision anyway in 10 to 15 years.

We can test something to destruction in a laboratory or engineering plant, but when it comes to implanting it into a biological organism, some of the dynamics change in a way that cannot be predicted. Post-market surveillance and vigilance are important in identifying such things.

The natural history—

**The Convener:** Dr McGuire, I appreciate your explanation, but we have a number of questions that we want to ask.

**Dr McGuire:** I am sorry.

**The Convener:** Angus MacDonald has a supplementary question.

**Angus MacDonald (Falkirk East) (SNP):** I want to clarify Dr McGuire's point about the level of complications. Are you saying that no mesh device out there has a complication rate of over 4.5 or 5 per cent?

**Dr McGuire:** No, that is not what I am saying.

**Angus MacDonald:** Okay. Can you clarify the point?

**Dr McGuire:** The published scientific and research papers show a range of figures for complications. There are different complication rates, because of the mixture of the time when the device is introduced, the experience of the surgeon and the surgical team and the device's development. It is well recognised across all medical practice that when any surgical procedure is introduced—it does not have to involve a device—there is a higher rate of complications. Over time, however, the learning curve flattens out, training programmes are put fully in place and guidance is issued.

I should go back a step and note that when we introduce a procedure, we have to bear in mind the potential complications, based on what has been seen before with the same type of surgery, procedure or device. Indeed, the manufacturers have the same thing in mind when a device is involved. The issue forms part of the complications list that goes into the instructions for using a device, and it is well known to the medical profession for training et cetera. However, there could be completely unforeseen complications, and they have to be picked up to ensure that adjustments can be made. For example, when meshes were first used, it was not known that the number of anchorage points was significant and that when you went over a certain number, the complication rate associated with that particular design of mesh also went up. There was no way that anybody could have predicted that, but now

that that is known, the anchorage points are considered in the design of the latest devices.

When the first pacemakers were introduced—I have no other way of describing things other than to use analogies—they were huge clunky things; the batteries needed changing frequently and the leads that went into the heart used to break. That was the risk that went with that new technology. Over time, things have improved, and we are thankful for the experience of the surgeons who were doing those procedures and for the fact that the manufacturers put money, effort and time into the matter. All medical devices have a similar track record.

The first of these devices came about when surgeons looked at the mesh that was being used for hernias and thought, “Let’s try it in a different place.” Bespoke meshes and bespoke tapes for urinary incontinence were produced, and there have been increasing improvements in those technologies. There is a balance to be struck in offering people surgery and medical technology that will improve their lives. People seek treatment, because their lives are upset by pain, urine incontinence, parts of their body coming out where they are not supposed to come out and, in this instance, sexual dysfunction. It is highly distressing and very unpleasant.

**Hanzala Malik (Glasgow) (Lab):** The MHRA report notes that there are

“a number of ongoing research projects that are likely to provide useful information about the long-term safety and effectiveness of vaginal mesh implants.”

What is the scale of those projects and when are they likely to report?

**The Convener:** I ask you to answer briefly because we have a lot of questions.

**Dr McGuire:** The PROSPECT trials—the prolapse surgery: pragmatic evaluation and randomised controlled trials—are sponsored by the Department of Health and are due to report in 2016. A NICE report is being produced to look into hospital episode statistics. Some preliminary work has been done on that, but I do not know when it is due for completion. We can find out for the committee and let you know.

The scientific committee on emerging and newly identified health risks is looking at meshes generally and is supposed to report in quarter 1 this year. There is also the Scottish independent review, which is due to report in early summer, and the NHS England-led report, which is due some time in the next 12 months—

**Sally Mounter:** In spring.

**Dr McGuire:** Yes, but it has been moved a little bit, for the same reason that the Scottish

independent review has been moved, which is that they realised that the amount and complexity of the information is so great that if they are going to do it properly, they might as well take the time to do so. We will be completely receptive to the findings of all those reports and take them on board.

**The Convener:** It would be extremely helpful if you would pass some of that information back to the committee.

**Dr McGuire:** Yes, of course.

**Kenny MacAskill (Edinburgh Eastern) (SNP):** You have given us an anecdotal description of issues relating to the manufacturing process. You referred to the TDA report, which says:

“the complication rate did not appear to differ between products, but factors such as the skill and training of the surgeon, selection of the patient and procedure were important.”

To what extent are adverse incidents due to clinicians’ actions and how does that influence your assessment of the device?

**Dr McGuire:** As an agency, we want every adverse incident to be reported to us because, to the person doing the reporting, it is not always apparent which end of the spectrum that incident is at. Our judgments are around whether the device has failed or has a problem that we were not aware of. We would then go to the experts who advise us and ask, “Is this a recognised complication of this type of procedure? What was the level of training?” We would pull all those things together. We would act as the honest broker in that situation to try to determine whether the device, in itself, was the problem, whether there was an interaction between the device and the surgical procedure in that particular circumstance, or whether it was a purely clinical issue. Until we view that spectrum, we cannot make a judgment.

10:45

We are happy to get all the reports and we are now working even more closely with the NHS and the national reporting and learning system so that all reports that go to NHS England from Scotland eventually—I understand that Scotland is looking at being part of that—will give us a much broader base of reporting of incidents. This number might be completely wrong, but I think that something like 1 million reports of adverse incidents come into the national reporting and learning system every year. Those data can be searched and we are now being given access to search it and make it into one database, with a single portal for reporting to make it easier for clinicians and other folks to use.

We have also streamlined reporting to the MHRA directly. The yellow card now covers drugs and devices. That is all moving forward.

There is also an initiative to produce a European database that will cover all Europe. That depends on the European Parliament and its decisions.

**David Torrance (Kirkcaldy) (SNP):** Evidence suggests that adverse incidents might be underreported. Why has there been underreporting and what is the MHRA's view of the petitioner's call for mandatory reporting by all clinicians?

**Dr McGuire:** We know that there is underreporting. We know that healthcare professionals have not been as good as they could be and, in our view, should be. That is why we have had to consider evidence from all different areas.

We discussed that at the Scottish independent review meeting yesterday and I had a think about it. We were talking slightly at cross-purposes. To me as a regulator, mandatory reporting is something that carries a regulatory sanction if you do not do it. That is not the same as the profession saying to the members of its organisation that they should report it as part of good medical practice and, if they do not, the organisation will ask questions about how fit the member is to practise and do these procedures and so on. That is a different thing altogether.

From experience, we know that, in a system with mandatory reporting, if there are sanctions for those who do it wrong and if there are sanctions that result from the report, reporting goes right down. People do not report to put their neck in a noose. Some of the most tightly regulated systems for reporting are in eastern Europe, where the level of reporting is among the lowest that there is anywhere.

We are working together towards a collaborative system, and part of the working group in England and the Scottish independent review is about engaging with all parties to improve reporting. It is about making sure that the positive incentive is that the culture is to report, that the discussion of the problem that has been exposed by the reporting is open and free and not subject to sanction and that, in doing that, we are all serving patient safety much more strongly.

The last bit of that is that people who report have to have feedback. If they do not get feedback, there is no incentive to report again. That is a loophole that we have never properly closed because it is such a big issue and it covers so many different devices. That is not just a problem for the MHRA; it is a problem for all regulators and we are looking hard at it. It will be solved only by everybody working together. As I

said right at the start of today, this is a team sport. If we are not all working for the same thing and people do not understand why it is important to do these things, they are just not going to do them.

From a regulatory perspective, we do not think that mandatory reporting would work. This is going to sound a bit foolish, but we believe that mandatory voluntary reporting within a professional set of circumstances and with incentives to do that would produce results. It has certainly worked for orthopaedic surgeons, to the point where the national joint registry and the MHRA are working so closely that they are working beyond compliance and the level of reporting is above what is required for any regulations. The manufacturers have signed up to that and are part of the process. We sit around a table together with the clinicians and manufacturers and we now have results on joint replacements that have been done over the past 10 or 20 years. Manufacturers can then go out and say, "Look, we've got a 10-year tick. Our devices have a survival rate of up to 10 years." The incentive for them to be part of the process is that they can be shown to be responsible in what they are doing.

**Angus MacDonald:** The MHRA's October report concludes by proposing the following actions: improved reporting of incidents, which you just mentioned; structured post-market clinical follow-up; registries on the use of unique device identifiers; and patient-reported outcome measures. What progress has been made on taking those suggestions forward? What role does the MHRA envisage for the Scottish Government in that process?

**Dr McGuire:** All those things are really important, which is why we put them in the report. We are keen on the idea of registries; the difficulty for us is that we cannot have registries for all the medical devices that we look after because that would be completely impractical. We would require 10 times the number of people that we have.

Whoever set up a registry would need to engage with the people who wanted the information out of the registry. In the past, registries have been set up that have not provided the information that was required, and the process has become useless. If the right things are put in at the beginning, you will get the right information out at the end. As a regulator, we want the adverse incident reporting whereas the clinicians want the patient-recorded outcome measures, and that is also what the patients need. We need to have all those things together. From the Scottish Government perspective, any acknowledgement of the resources that would be required to produce those things would be good. Registries are expensive—they require staff and data input

individuals—and that is one of the impediments to good reporting.

Reporting in the clinical setting relies on the ability to have things such as multidisciplinary meetings and morbidity and mortality meetings, and those things need to be resourced in terms of time and people being able to attend them. I am not saying that as a regulator; those issues were brought up at the meeting in Glasgow yesterday by the clinicians. They want to increase their reporting and be more compliant, but they need more time—it needs to be in their job plan—and the resources to do those things. In my clinical practice, the average morbidity and mortality meeting takes up an hour a week.

**Angus MacDonald:** My question is how much time they need to get their act together on reporting.

**Dr McGuire:** You would have to ask the clinicians that.

**Jackson Carlaw (West Scotland) (Con):** Let me take you back to the University of York report of November 2012. We have quoted quite extensively from it this morning, and you quoted from it and relied on it in your November 2014 submission. When in 2012 was the report commissioned?

**Dr McGuire:** I cannot answer that question, but Sally Mounter can.

**Sally Mounter:** It was around January or February of 2012.

**Jackson Carlaw:** What budget did it have? What was the report's cost?

**Sally Mounter:** I have not got that information to hand. It was something like £40,000, I think.

**Jackson Carlaw:** How many people at the University of York were involved in its production?

**Sally Mounter:** I am not quite sure. We liaised with around three people, but they may well have had their own teams of people.

**Jackson Carlaw:** What call for evidence did the University of York issue in advance of its consideration of the issue?

**Sally Mounter:** The university put together a protocol—it was a literature review.

**Jackson Carlaw:** A literature review.

**Dr McGuire:** It was similar to the literature searches that NICE does. Evidence is taken in a particular way. If you look at the procedures that NICE goes through to get information, you will see that it starts with the highest evidence levels and then works down to case reports.

**Jackson Carlaw:** A report that was commissioned from three people, without any call for public evidence, and then seen by you in October 2012 and published in November 2012 at a cost of £40,000 is regarded as being—in the light of everything that has happened in the two years since, including the petition being lodged in May 2014 and there appearing to be sufficient grounds for the Cabinet Secretary for Health and Wellbeing to issue a call for a moratorium on the meshes being installed—sufficiently robust to allow you to continue to make the recommendation that you are making.

**Dr McGuire:** If you review the report that we have just produced, you will see that it draws on more information—

**Jackson Carlaw:** Such as?

**Dr McGuire:** —and does not just rely on the York report.

**Jackson Carlaw:** I have the report here. It says that the MHRA used data from adverse incident reporting, manufacturers' sales figures, patients—although I understood you to say that you thought that they were unreliable as an evidence base—representatives of clinicians, manufacturers and other regulators around the world. Are all those literature-based surveys? What further evidence was taken by the MHRA in its consideration of its recommendation? Was it just a bigger literature review?

**Dr McGuire:** No, it was not just a bigger literary review. We looked at manufacturers' reporting. Bear in mind that the manufacturers under the device regulations have to report only certain incidents that come under the heading of vigilance. We went back to the manufacturers to look at all the reports that they have received in those circumstances. That included matters that did not even get to the level of vigilance.

That is something that we do with clinical investigations, for example. We take all the signals that we see and put them into the equation, to see whether they have an additive value or benefit. We also engaged directly with the clinical community that was doing surgery for problems with meshes. We also discussed it with the senior people in those professional areas.

We also have soft signals, which we get from engaging people who are speaking at conferences and who are looking at things that do not get to be published, such as posters and presentations, and different people reviewing aspects of their research and the literature. It is about accumulated experience with the devices. Therefore, we also engaged authorities across the globe to see whether they had received any other information that would lead them to act in any different way. They did not. We realised that the

York report had limitations. Therefore, we went to those extensive efforts for the report that we produced for the chief medical officer for England.

**Jackson Carlaw:** This is where I am at a loss. You said that various organisations and parties expressed surprise when the previous health secretary, with all-party support in this Parliament, called for a moratorium in June last year. Do you believe that he was acting irresponsibly in making that call?

**Dr McGuire:** I think that that would probably be a question that I would not answer, because—

**Jackson Carlaw:** I take that to mean yes. [*Laughter.*]

**Dr McGuire:** No, no. I mean—

**Jackson Carlaw:** Some health boards have ignored the cabinet secretary's call for a moratorium and have used the MHRA report as the basis for ignoring that call. Are you comfortable with that?

11:00

**Dr McGuire:** I am comfortable with the fact that we have taken all the robust evidence that is available to us into account in coming to our judgment.

**Jackson Carlaw:** Where is caution in all this? One of the reports to which you have referred as being near to reporting back to us is not a £40,000 report but a £2 million report. On that basis, is there not a need for a degree of caution to suggest that the cabinet secretary's call for a moratorium was a perfectly sensible call to make until that much wider, more contemporary and seemingly better-researched and founded evidence is made available to us?

**Dr McGuire:** In our discussions with the former cabinet secretary and the subsequent inquiries that we made as to why he took the actions that he took, we asked whether there was any further evidence that we had not been made aware of that led to that decision, and we were told that there was none. On the basis of there being no further information, and given the information available to us and across the world, we were not in a position as a regulator to take action to do anything different from what we were already doing.

**Jackson Carlaw:** All right. I understand that. You have made analogies at various points today. I suppose that I could make the analogy of a contaminated food substance in a store being withdrawn across every store in the United Kingdom because the manufacturer does not think that the fact that only a handful of people might suffer because of it is an acceptable basis for its

being available for sale elsewhere. I offer that analogy to you in contrast to your own.

I respect and appreciate the dispassionate way in which you have given evidence this morning, and I understand that that has to be the case, but my final question is this. In the light of everything that is happening just now, I would not recommend to a family member of my own that they have a mesh device implanted until further evidence is available. Would you recommend to a family member of yours that they have a mesh device implanted at this time? [*Interruption.*]

**The Convener:** Let us remember parliamentary protocol.

**Jackson Carlaw:** It is a serious question, because these are human beings.

**Dr McGuire:** I am sorry, but I was not answering—

**Jackson Carlaw:** I appreciate that you cannot answer questions from the gallery.

**The Convener:** Mr Jackson and Dr McGuire, please listen for a minute.

**Dr McGuire:** I am quite prepared to answer that question.

**The Convener:** Let me finish and then you can answer. Members of the public need to be aware of conduct in the Parliament. We may hear things that we like or things that we do not like, but please, let us listen to what is being said.

**Jackson Carlaw:** Dispassionate evidence has been given, but these are emotional issues. I simply want to ask Dr McGuire what he would recommend to his own family members at the present time.

**Dr McGuire:** I completely understand and I can answer as a husband and as a clinician. As a practising clinician, what I would say to my wife if she had incapacitating problems with incontinence or pelvic organ prolapse is, "You need to sit with the clinician who is going to do this procedure and decide what is best for you. I'll come and sit with you. I'm not going to say anything, but I will listen to what is being said on both sides. If I want to ask a question of the clinician, I will do that, but at the end of the day the judgment is about whether your quality of life is affected to the point at which you would be prepared to accept the risks of this particular procedure, which are known. If you accepted those risks, I would want to be 100 per cent assured that, if you had a complication, even if it was something that is not regularly reported, like pain, it would be treated seriously by the whole of the multidisciplinary team from the general practitioner through to the incontinence nurse, the physiotherapist and the surgeon, and that there would be mechanisms in place within



that health service to deal with those complications effectively.”

On top of that, I would want to know that we had been offered all the alternatives, that the non-surgical alternatives had been properly funded and had been gone through, and that there had been a point at which the situation without surgery was intolerable. Those judgments should be made.

**Jackson Carlaw:** I will conclude with an observation. Your experience and background have qualified you to understand everything that you have just said would need to be asked of the clinicians and others who would perform this surgery. I can assure you that I have heard from many constituents who had none of the benefit of that advice or experience and who found themselves with a mesh implant that had consequences that were not drawn to their attention at any point in the process whatsoever.

**Neil Findlay:** Mr Carlaw makes some pertinent points.

I apologise for interrupting Mr Wilson earlier. The point that I was trying to make related to the Australian situation. A number of mesh items have been removed from the register of therapeutic goods because they do not adhere to the medical devices essential principles checklist. That is the fact of the matter, as you will see if you look at the website.

**Dr McGuire:** That is in effect administrative and is not about patient safety.

**Neil Findlay:** The essential principles are about issues such as the use of medical devices not compromising health and safety and about conforming with safety principles. I could go on and on, as there are umpteen principles. It is not a minor administrative error.

**Dr McGuire:** I did not say that it was a minor administrative error. I said that an administrative process can be about major or minor conformities with regulation.

**Neil Findlay:** You say that it “can” be about that.

**Dr McGuire:** It can, but the TGA says on its website that, if there is a question of patient safety, that comes under a separate heading, and that separate heading does not apply to any one of the products that have been removed from the register there. Without going into the issue further and questioning the TGA personally, that suggests to me that there is not an issue of patient safety with the devices, and that the removal is due to failure to comply with regulation.

**Neil Findlay:** You used the words “can” and “suggests”. I think that we might need to get to the bottom of that.

**Dr McGuire:** We will speak to the TGA soon, and we would be happy to come back to the committee on that.

**Neil Findlay:** I was going to ask what discussions you have had with the TGA about the withdrawal of the products. Are any of those products being used in the UK?

**Sally Mounter:** As far as we know, they are not.

**Dr McGuire:** As far as we are aware, they are not. The seven major manufacturers of the products are well known to us. Before yesterday, I personally had never heard of the two manufacturers that are involved, which are based in Australia. Because we found out only yesterday from one of our researchers and subsequently at the meeting in Glasgow that the items have been removed, we are not even sure that those companies are the manufacturers. Under the regulations, a company becomes a manufacturer when it imports from somewhere else. Therefore, we do not even know where the products are being made, and that will be part of the inquiries that we make.

If the TGA was going to do a product withdrawal for patient safety reasons, it would have come to us directly before it took that action to let us know what it was going to do. We have no reason to believe that it would not have done that, because it has with all other things. The FDA and regulators across Europe also do that. Therefore, from our observations so far, we are pretty confident that the issue is not patient safety related, but we will definitely check, now that we have that information.

**Neil Findlay:** Given the problems that we have in Scotland and the UK with underreporting, can you take a guess, or has anybody taken a guess, as to how many problems there have been worldwide with these products?

**Dr McGuire:** We know from the literature and from our discussions with other competent authorities and regulators that the complication rates that we are seeing here are mirrored across the world.

**Neil Findlay:** How does that reflect the number of people who have submitted claims to courts? In Scotland, you suggest that we have had a small number of adverse incidents or problems. What is the number that you suggest?

**Dr McGuire:** From 2005 to February 2015, there have been 88 reports for stress urinary incontinence and 37 for prolapsed organs.

**Neil Findlay:** So we could almost suggest that that entire number of people are sitting behind you.

**Dr McGuire:** One of the things—