

Beaumont Health

## Beaumont Health Scholarly Works and Archives

---

Conference Presentation Abstracts

Urology

---

10-2021

### Is a Preoperative Type and Screen Required in Patients Undergoing Common Urological Procedures? A Cost-Benefit Analysis

Joshua Volin

Patrick Herndon

Aviv Spillinger

Patrick Karabon

James Blumline

*See next page for additional authors*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarlyworks.beaumont.org/urology\\_confabstract](https://scholarlyworks.beaumont.org/urology_confabstract)



Part of the [Pathology Commons](#), and the [Urology Commons](#)

---

---

**Authors**

Joshua Volin, Patrick Herndon, Aviv Spillinger, Patrick Karabon, James Blumline, Deanna Tran, Craig Fletcher, and Jason Hafron

---

## Podium #10

### REIMBURSEMENT INCENTIVE ASSOCIATED WITH DECREASED INPATIENT OPIOID PRESCRIBING FOLLOWING ROBOTIC RADICAL PROSTATECTOMY

Brett Watson, MD<sup>1</sup>, Ross Touriel<sup>2</sup>, Joshua Volin<sup>2</sup>, Frank Burks, MD<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Beaumont Health, Dept of Urology, Royal Oak, MI, <sup>2</sup>Oakland University William Beaumont School of Medicine, Rochester, MI

Presented By: Mit Shah, MD, BS

**Introduction:** Various strategies have been explored to decrease the quantity of opioids prescribed for post-operative pain. The Michigan Opioid Prescribing Engagement Network, in partnership with BCBS-Michigan, has developed a pain optimization pathway for several surgical procedures, including prostatectomy. Urologists who follow the pain optimization pathway, which includes pre-operative patient education and limiting discharge opioids to 6 tablets of oxycodone 5 mg, can report a modifier for additional reimbursement. We explored the impact of this incentive on inpatient opioid prescribing practices following robotic assisted radical prostatectomy (RARP).

**Methods:** Patients undergoing RARP between January 2017 and August 2019 at a single institution were retrospectively reviewed. This interval included cases both before, and after, the reimbursement incentive was implemented on July 1, 2018. Outcomes included quantity of opioid administered during hospitalization, reported in morphine milligram equivalents (MME), and average inpatient pain scores, reported with numerical pain scale.

**Results:** A total of 300 patients underwent RARP, 209 prior to implementation of the reimbursement incentive, and 91 after. Mean MME administered during hospitalization decreased 18% after the incentive went into effect, from 73 to 54 MME ( $p=0.04$ ). There was no difference in average pain scores or length of stay.

**Conclusion:** For patients undergoing RARP, a reimbursement-based incentive tied to limiting outpatient opioid prescriptions was associated with a decrease in opioids administered during hospitalization, with no impact on subjective pain scores or length of stay. This may reflect the effectiveness of pre-operative patient education on the dangers of opioid use and alternative pain management options.

**Funding:** N/A

## Podium #11

### IS A PREOPERATIVE TYPE AND SCREEN REQUIRED IN PATIENTS UNDERGOING COMMON UROLOGICAL PROCEDURES? A COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS

Joshua Volin, BS<sup>1</sup>, Patrick Herndon, BS<sup>1</sup>, Aviv Spillinger, BS<sup>1</sup>, Patrick Karabon, MS<sup>1</sup>, James Blumline, BS<sup>1</sup>, Deanna Tran, BS<sup>1</sup>, Craig Fletcher, MD<sup>2</sup>, Jason Hafron, MD<sup>1,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Oakland University William Beaumont School of Medicine, <sup>2</sup>William Beaumont Hospital-Royal Oak, <sup>3</sup>William Beaumont Hospital-Royal Oak, Department of Urology

Presented By: Joshua Ryan Volin

**Introduction:** Our objective was to evaluate the cost-effectiveness of obtaining preoperative type and screen (TS) for common urological procedures and to determine patient and hospital factors associated with receiving blood transfusions.

**Methods:** Retrospective database analysis of the 2006-2015 Nationwide Inpatient Sample (NIS) was performed to identify patients undergoing a variety of urological procedures. A total of 4,113,144 cases were identified. Transfusion rates were then determined from NIS data, and multivariate regression analyses was used to identify factors associated with transfusions. A cost-effectiveness analysis was performed to determine the incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) of obtaining preoperative TS to prevent an emergency-release transfusion (ERT), with a willingness-to-pay threshold of \$1,500.

**Results:** Transfusion rates of common urological procedure ranged from .91% to 33.14%. On multivariate modeling, all comorbidities with the exception of obesity were significantly associated with blood transfusion. Some examples included diabetes (OR, 1.26; 95% CI, 1.19-1.33), liver disease (OR, 1.20; 95% CI, 1.13-1.29), and metastatic cancer (OR, 2.69; 95% CI 2.54-2.85) ( $p < 0.01$  for all). One-way sensitivity analysis demonstrated that the risk of transfusion should exceed 4.12% to justify preoperative TS. The ICER of preoperative TS for radical prostatectomy (transfusion rate = 3.88%) and penile implants (transfusion rate =

0.91%) were \$1,607 and \$7,709 per ERT prevented, respectively.

**Conclusion:** Based on a large national database, institutions should consider a risk of transfusion greater than or equal to 4.12% to justify a preoperative TS. A selective TS policy for high-risk patients may reduce costs and unnecessary workload for laboratory staff.

**Funding:** N/A

## Podium #12

### ASSOCIATION BETWEEN CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND PUBLISHED POSITION ON USE OF UROLIFT DEVICE FOR LOWER URINARY TRACT SYMPTOMS

Armaan Singh<sup>1</sup>, Luke Reynolds<sup>2</sup>, Parth Modi<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Pritzker School of Medicine, University of Chicago*, <sup>2</sup>*Section of Urology, University of Chicago*

Presented By: Armaan Singh, BA

**Introduction:** The receipt of industry payments has been associated with pharmaceutical prescribing, surgical device selection, and research findings. Recent studies suggest that payments may be associated with positive positions in editorials and reviews. The Urolift device, manufactured by NeoTract LLC, has mixed results compared to TURP for lower urinary tract symptoms. Our goal was to examine associations between authors' financial conflicts-of-interest and their published comments on the Urolift device.

**Methods:** We searched Google Scholar for all articles that cite the 2013 L.I.F.T. study in Journal of Urology. We screened for editorials or reviews written by American authors. Two blinded attending urologists coded included articles as favorable or neutral. A separate blinded researcher recorded conflict-of-interest data using the Open Payments Registry.

**Results:** We identified 13 articles by 15 unique authors. Since 2014, these authors have collectively received \$270,000 from NeoTract. 3 papers were coded as favorable, and 10 papers were coded as unfavorable. All (4/4; 100%) authors of favorable articles received payments, while 5/12 (41.7%) authors of neutral papers had payments. From the 8 unique authors with payments from NeoTract, there were only two disclosures.

**Conclusion:** These data suggest a relationship between payments from a manufacturer and positive published position on that company's device. Further work is needed in this area.

	Favorable Articles (n = 3)	Neutral articles (n = 10)
Number of unique authors*	4	12
No. of Authors who declared financial conflict of interest	1	1
No. of Authors with undisclosed financial conflict of interest	3	4
No. of Authors who received > 100 dollars in funding from NeoTract	4	5
No. of Authors who received > 1,000 dollars in funding from NeoTract	3	3
No. of Authors who received > 10,000 dollars in funding from NeoTract	2	1

\*One author included in both favorable and neutral articles

**Funding:** N/A