



BCAVA



# Joint response to the Competition and Markets Authority consultation on veterinary services for household pets in the UK – proposed market investigation reference







21.

22. We recognise that consumers may be vulnerable due to the distress of an unwell pet or the need to make a decision quickly, however, we are extremely disappointed to see any suggestion in the [redacted] that veterinary professionals might prey on [redacted] desire to do the best for their pets by using these circumstances as a strategy to promote more sophisticated or expensive treatment. This behaviour would not be in line with the RCVS Professional Code of Conduct for veterinary surgeons. It should be noted that as part of offering owners a range of well-informed options, if a veterinary surgeon considers there are sophisticated diagnostic or treatment options that would benefit a patient, then it would be unacceptable if they did not propose them as an option.

23.

consultation fee when seeking a second opinion may be a potential barrier to alternative courses of treatment it is not fair or reasonable to expect a veterinary professional providing a second opinion to provide their professional services free of charge.

---

---

---









**Do you have any views on areas where we should undertake further analysis or gather further evidence as part of an MIR in relation to the supply of veterinary services for household pets in the UK? We would particularly welcome any specific evidence from respondents in support of their views.**

52. We have heard concerns from members about elements of the insurance market including pharmacies owned by insurance companies and insurance companies restricting consumer choice by dictating where referrals should go. It could be helpful to gather information on this as part of an MIR.