COST-EFFECTIVENESS OF A COMMUNITY MALE UROLOGY SERVICE: IS IT WORTH IT?

Hypothesis / aims of study
The aim of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of a community male urology service.

Study design, materials and methods
A community urology service was established in September 2011 for male urological conditions which included LUTS and Urinary Tract Infections mainly as well as scrotal and penile conditions. This service provided GPwSI led two urology clinics per week, one clinic for assessment of LUTS and management of BPH and the second clinic dealing with other urological conditions. In addition, there was one joint urology clinic per month with a Consultant Urologist from local Hospital to review complex urological patients. A flow rate machine and bladder scan was available for diagnostics in the clinic. An Ultrasonographer was available for scanning on the day to provide a one stop service. The service was evaluated over a 12 month period from September 2011 to August 2012.

Results
Over the 12 month pilot 275 GP referrals were triaged to the service which represented 25% of all GP urology referrals. The financial model cost for the community service is £58,155 in comparison to secondary care cost of provision which is £121,080. The average cost per case in the community is £194 compared to secondary care cost of £404. The GPwSI urology service is 52% less expensive than for a patient being treated in secondary care. The annual net saving is £62,925. Patient survey result showed that patient satisfaction with the service was in the main good to excellent.

Interpretation of results
A community urology service is a cost-effective and extremely viable venture.

Concluding message
Community urology service is definitely worth it not only because of its cost-effectiveness but also in terms of patient satisfaction. However, in order to provide the best care and governance for patients it is important that there is strong collaboration between the primary and secondary care.
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