16. Kurtz MP, Leow JJ, Varda BK, et al. Robotic versus open pediatric ureteral reimplantation: Costs and complications from a nationwide sample. *J Pediatr Urol.* 2016;12:408.e401–408.e406.
17. Kasturi S, Sehgal SS, Christman MS, Lambert SM, Casale P. Prospective long-term analysis of nerve-sparing extravesical robotic-assisted laparoscopic ureteral reimplantation. *Urology.* 2012;79:680–683.
18. Akhavan A, Avery D, Lendvay TS. Robot-assisted extravesical ureteral reimplantation: outcomes and conclusions from 78 ureters. *J Pediatr Urol.* 2014;10:864–868.
19. Grimsby GM, Dwyer ME, Jacobs MA, et al. Multi-institutional review of outcomes of robot-assisted laparoscopic extravesical ureteral reimplantation. *J Urol.* 2015;193:1791–1795.
20. Smith RP, Oliver JL, Peters CA. Pediatric robotic extravesical ureteral reimplantation: comparison with open surgery. *J Urol.* 2011; 185:1876–1881.
21. Gundeti MS, Boysen WR, Shah A. Robot-assisted Laparoscopic extravesical ureteral reimplantation: technique modifications contribute to optimized outcomes. *Eur Urol.* 2016;70:818–823.
22. Herz D, Fuchs M, Todd A, McLeod D, Smith J. Robot-assisted laparoscopic extravesical ureteral reimplant: A critical look at surgical outcomes. *J Pediatr Urol.* 2016;12:402.e401–402.e409.
23. Hauber AB, Gonzalez JM, Groothuis-Oudshoorn CG, et al. Statistical methods for the analysis of discrete choice experiments: a report of the ISPOR conjoint analysis good research practices task force. *Val Health.* 2016;19:300–315.
24. Lloyd JC, Yen T, Pietrobon R, et al. Estimating utility values for vesicoureteral reflux in the general public using an online tool. *J Pediatr Urol.* 2014;10:1026–1031.
25. Nelson CP, Routh JC, Logvinenko T, et al. Utility scores for vesicoureteral reflux and anti-reflux surgery. *J Pediatr Urol.* 2015;11:177–182.
26. Berinsky AJ, Huber GA, Lenz GS. Evaluating online labor markets for experimental research: Amazon.com's mechanical turk. *Polit Anal.* 2012;20:351–368.
27. Horton JJ, Rand DG, Zeckhauser RJ. The online laboratory: conducting experiments in a real labor market. *Exp Econ.* 2011;14:399–425.
28. Barbosa JA, Barayan G, Gridley CM, et al. Parent and patient perceptions of robotic vs open urological surgery scars in children. *J Urol.* 2013;190:244–250.
29. Garcia-Roig M, Travers C, McCracken CE, Kirsch AJ. *National trends in management of primary vesicoureteral reflux in children. The Societies for Pediatric Urology Fall Congress.* Montreal, CA. 2017.
30. Lee OT, Durbin-Johnson B, Kurzrock EA. Physician preference is a major factor in management of vesicoureteral reflux. *Pediatr Nephrol.* 2015;30:131–138.

EDITORIAL COMMENT

The authors have provided a unique perspective on the management vesicoureteral reflux (VUR) that incorporates parental preferences regarding various aspects of treatment options. They utilized an innovative, crowd-sourced approach to recruit a national sample of parents online who presumably did not have any "real-world" experience with VUR. Many readers may question whether the wisdom of crowds should supplant the experience of those who have actually dealt with a given scenario in their own children. Previous studies in political science, economics, and psychology, however, have confirmed the external and internal validity of a similar approach to subject recruitment.[1-3] In addition, the description of a "preference model" in the current study is a precursor to the development of a decision aid for parents of children with VUR. The authors have presented a type of "values clarification exercise" that the International Patient Decision Aids Collaboration considers a key component of patient decision aids.[4] Decision aids are tools designed to help people make informed, values-based choices about their healthcare options in partnership with their providers.[5] Shared decision-making represents the state of the art in counseling patients faced with difficult or uncertain medical decisions and its implementation has been widely encouraged by The American Urologic Association.[6] The current study is an important contribution to the pediatric urologic literature because it will have future implications for the dissemination of shared decision-making and the development of decision aids in our field.

Katherine H. Chan, Department of Urology, Indiana University School of Medicine, Indianapolis, IN; Department of Pediatrics, Center for Pediatric and Adolescent Comparative Effectiveness Research, Indiana University School of Medicine, Indianapolis, IN

References

1. Berinsky AJ HG, Lenz JS. Evaluating online labor markets for experimental research: Amazon.com's mechanical turk. *Polit Anal.* 2012; 20:351–368.
2. Buhrmester MD KT, Gosling SD. Amazon's mechanical turk: a new source of inexpensive, yet high-quality, data? *Perspect Psychol Sci.* 2011;6:3–5.
3. Horton JJ RD, Zeckhauser RJ. The online laboratory: conducting experiments in a real labor market. *Exp Econ.* 2011;14:399–425.
4. Sepucha KR, Abhyankar P, Hoffman AS, Bekker HL, LeBlanc A, Levin CA, et al. Standards for UNiversal reporting of patient Decision Aid Evaluation studies: the development of SUNDAE Checklist. *BMJ Qual Saf.* 2018;27:380–388.
5. Volk RJ, Coulter A. Advancing the science of patient decision aids through reporting guidelines. *BMJ Qual Saf.* 2018;27:337–339.
6. Makarov DV CK, Gore JL, Maranchie J, Nielson ME, Saigal C, Tessier C, Fagerlin A. AUA white paper on implementation of shared decision making into Urological practice. *Urol Pract.* 2016;3:355–363.