

easily be performed for other commonly performed procedures with the aim of decreasing healthcare costs.

## CONCLUSION

The unnecessary use of ASCs and ancillary pathology services for vasectomy may lead to tens of millions of dollars in potentially avoidable healthcare costs annually.

## SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

Supplementary material associated with this article can be found in the online version at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urology.2019.01.064>.

## References

1. Eisenberg ML, Lipshultz LI. Estimating the number of vasectomies performed annually in the United States: data from the National Survey of Family Growth. *J Urol*. 2010;184:2068–2072.
2. Barone MA, Hutchinson PL, Johnson CH, Hsia J, Wheeler J. Vasectomy in the United States, 2002. *J Urol*. 2006;176:232–236. discussion 6.
3. Sharlip ID, Belker AM, Honig S, et al. Vasectomy: AUA guideline. *J Urol*. 2012;188(6 Suppl):2482–2491.
4. Coward RM, Badhiwala NG, Kovac JR, Smith RP, Lamb DJ, Lipshultz LI. Impact of the 2012 American Urological Association vasectomy guidelines on post-vasectomy outcomes. *J Urol*. 2014;191:169–174.
5. Senanayake E, Pacey AA, Maddireddy V, Shariff U, Hastie K, Rosario DJ. A novel cost-effective approach to post-vasectomy semen analysis. *BJU Int*. 2011;107:1447–1452.
6. Hollingsworth JM, Saigal CS, Lai JC, et al. Surgical quality among medicare beneficiaries undergoing outpatient urological surgery. *J Urol*. 2012;188:1274–1278.
7. Mitchell JM. Effect of physician ownership of specialty hospitals and ambulatory surgery centers on frequency of use of outpatient orthopedic surgery. *Arch Surg*. 2010;145:732–738.
8. Mitchell JM. Do financial incentives linked to ownership of specialty hospitals affect physicians' practice patterns? *Med Care*. 2008;46:732–737.
9. Stroppe SA, Daignault S, Hollingsworth JM, Ye Z, Wei JT, Hollenbeck BK. Physician ownership of ambulatory surgery centers and practice patterns for urological surgery: evidence from the state of Florida. *Med Care*. 2009;47:403–410.
10. Ostrowski KA, Holt SK, Haynes B, Davies BJ, Fuchs EF, Walsh TJ. Evaluation of vasectomy trends in the United States. *Urology*. 2018;118:76–79.
11. Preston JM. Vasectomy: common medicolegal pitfalls. *BJU Int*. 2000;86:339–343.
12. Labrecque M, Hays M, Chen-Mok M, Barone MA, Sokal D. Frequency and patterns of early recanalization after vasectomy. *BMC Urol*. 2006;6:25.
13. Lowe G. Optimizing outcomes in vasectomy: how to ensure sterility and prevent complications. *Transl Androl Urol*. 2016;5:176–180.
14. Hollenbeck BK, Hollingsworth JM, Dunn RL, Zaojun Y, Birkmeyer JD. Ambulatory surgery center market share and rates of outpatient surgery in the elderly. *Surg Innov*. 2010;17:340–345.
15. Henry MA, Howard DH, Davies BJ, Filson CP. Variation in use of prostate biopsy following changes in prostate cancer screening guidelines. *J Urol*. 2017;198:1046–1053.
16. Hollingsworth JM, Ye Z, Stroppe SA, Krein SL, Hollenbeck AT, Hollenbeck BK. Urologist ownership of ambulatory surgery centers and urinary stone surgery use. *Health Serv Res*. 2009;44:1370–1384.

## EDITORIAL COMMENT



The overuse of resources and excessive spending of healthcare dollars in the US are among the reasons that the US is the most expensive healthcare system in the world, while still failing to achieve similar outcome metrics as many other developed nations. There is no better procedure to evaluate such excess than vasectomy. As the most effective, safest, and lowest cost option of permanent sterilization, vasectomy is a commonly utilized and incredibly important procedure for couples. However, as one of many alternatives in contraception, it remains a comparatively expensive, elective procedure utilized almost exclusively by an insured population.

Vasectomy is, and has always been, an office-based procedure requiring only local anesthesia and approximately 15–20 minutes of procedure time. Therefore, the sheer possibility that more than a few percent of vasectomies are occurring in an operating room is an alarming overuse of resources, particularly as private ownership of ambulatory surgery centers (ASCs) by surgeons is on the rise. For these reasons, this study by Zholudev et al<sup>1</sup> that evaluates healthcare costs of vasectomies based on potential areas of overuse of resources is an extraordinarily important contribution to not only the urologic literature, but to the healthcare policy literature as well.

The authors used Truven MarketScan data to assess the outcomes of vasectomy costs based on exposure variables that included the procedure setting of either the office vs an ASC, as well as the use of ancillary pathology services. Remarkably, almost 20% of vasectomies in this database were performed in ASCs, at almost triple the cost. Additionally, the authors report another astounding finding that, despite recommendation against such practice by the American Urological Association, vasa segments were submitted for pathologic evaluation in 65% of cases performed at an ASC. This use of ancillary pathology services occurred almost twice as often than when the procedure was performed in the office setting, overall increasing healthcare costs by 55% per case. These observed trends resulted in \$9 million total excess healthcare cost burden annually just for the fraction of patients within the MarketScan database.

As the authors note, the paper is limited by the available data in MarketScan, which does not include the surgeons' specialty, the practice setting such as private vs academic practice, the ownership of the ASCs, and many other variables which would help to understand why these trends were observed. The next step will be to determine the driving forces behind such blatant overuse of resources so that it can be addressed in the future.

**R. Matthew Coward**, Department of Urology, University of North Carolina School of Medicine, Chapel Hill, NC; UNC Fertility, Raleigh, NC

## Reference

1. Insert reference for “Use of Office Versus Ambulatory Surgery Center Setting and Associated Ancillary Services on Healthcare Cost Burden for Vasectomy Procedures”.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urology.2019.01.065>  
UROLOGY 129: 33, 2019. © 2019 Elsevier Inc.