EDITORIAL COMMENT

The rapid growth in reconstructive urology has resulted in the proliferation of fellowships and increased resident exposure to reconstructive urological cases, driving further interest in the field. This article characterizes the early results of the Society of Genitourinary Reconstructive Surgeons (GURS) fellowship match. This study is important because it opens the GURS match to future study. However, there are several things this article does not do. A comparative analysis of prematch graduates was not performed and this survey was not designed to determine if the current match is better.

The job opportunities and practice settings are of great interest to those entering the field. The practice distribution shows that 58.3% of graduates chose academic positions. It is unknown if the current practice distribution is reflective of practice distributions from the past. My suspicion is prematch fellows sought academic positions in higher numbers. All fellows found employment, but nearly 2 in 10 (16.7%) thought their volume of reconstruction was inadequate. The reconstructive needs of the workforce are unclear and the number of fellows we need per year is unknown. An analysis of the Society of Urologic Oncology fellowship trainees revealed a potential decrease in future case volumes per urologic oncologic surgeon relative to current levels.1 This poses a threat to maintaining surgical skills. Tracking of these employment metrics is critical as more GURS trained surgeons accumulate.

Satisfaction with practice selection should be viewed with caution as this isn’t an objective measure of job quality or availability. The candidates interviewed at a median of 3 jobs and the majority practice in 1 of their top 3 destinations. It goes without saying that people are likely to seek jobs in places they desire and having an available job dramatically increases the desirability of a location. The psychology literature is rife with ways in which we view our personal decisions with choice-supportive bias. After choosing, people view their chosen option with more positive features and attribute negative features to the rejected alternatives.2

Overall satisfaction with the match was high at 79.2%. Another interesting phenomenon is that satisfaction decreases with increasing number of choices. The availability of options lead to high expectations, personal responsibility over decision making, and a feeling of regret over choices that weren’t selected.3 It makes one wonder if the match brings high satisfaction because the ultimate selection of a fellowship program is taken out of the candidate’s hands. Two questions remain: is the current level of satisfaction among these recent graduating classes durable over the long-term and will the future graduating classes have similar satisfaction levels with the experience?
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