

# Out-of-Pocket Costs of Men Undergoing Infertility Care and Associated Financial Strain

Peter A. Elliott, Jacquelyn Hoffman, Matthew Abad-Santos, Christopher Herndon, Patricia P. Katz and James F. Smith\*

From the Department of Urology, Kaiser Permanente (PAE), Los Angeles and Departments of Obstetrics and Gynecology (CH) and Urology (MAS, PPK) and Institute for Health Policy Studies (PPK), University of California-San Francisco (JFS), San Francisco, California

## Abstract

**Introduction:** We determined the out-of-pocket expenses, measures taken to finance these expenses and associated financial strain in men seeking fertility care.

**Methods:** In this retrospective cohort the patients completed questionnaires recording the total amount of money spent on infertility care and on what aspect of care the money was spent. Participants also recorded measures taken to finance these costs, the amount of financial strain experienced and how this strain impacted decisions to seek and continue care. Multivariable logistic regression was performed to assess the relationships of fertility characteristics to financial costs and financial strain.

**Results:** A total of 111 participants completed the full survey. During the course of care 16% of patients spent more than \$50,000 dollars. 16% spent between \$30,000 and \$49,999, 32% spent between \$15,000 and \$29,999, and 37% spent less than \$15,000. Procedures comprised the largest component of costs. Of the subjects 47% reported financial strain. On multivariate analysis patients who used savings and went into debt were significantly more likely to experience financial strain ( $p = 0.03$  and  $<0.001$ , respectively).

**Conclusions:** This study elucidates the previously uncharacterized economic hardships of male infertility care. Overall 64% of men who pursued fertility treatment had out-of-pocket expenses exceeding \$15,000 dollars. Almost half reported financial strain and limitation of treatment options due to these expenses. These data give men and their partners a realistic expectation of the cost of pursuing fertility treatment, the extreme measures that many patients take to finance care and the financial strain associated with such options.

**Key Words:** testis; infertility, male; expenditures, out-of-pocket; reproductive techniques, assisted; questionnaires

## Abbreviations and Acronyms

- ART = assisted reproductive technology
- ICSI = intracytoplasmic sperm injection
- IUI = intrauterine insemination
- IVF = in vitro fertilization
- OOP = out-of-pocket
- SES = socioeconomic status

Submitted for publication May 26, 2015.

No direct or indirect commercial incentive associated with publishing this article.

The corresponding author certifies that, when applicable, a statement(s) has been included in the manuscript documenting institutional review board, ethics committee or ethical review board study approval; principles of Helsinki Declaration were followed in lieu of formal ethics committee approval;

institutional animal care and use committee approval; all human subjects provided written informed consent with guarantees of confidentiality; IRB approved protocol number; animal approved project number.

\* Correspondence: Department of Urology, University of California-San Francisco, 1600 Divisadero St., Box 1695, San Francisco, California 94143 (telephone: 415-353-3694; FAX: 415-885-7443; e-mail address: james.smith@ucsf.edu).

97 Infertility or the inability to achieve pregnancy in 1 year  
98 with continued intercourse affects approximately 15% of  
99 couples. A male factor is solely responsible in 17% and a  
100 male factor contributes in 33% to 35% of couples.<sup>1</sup>

101 Since the first live birth conceived via IVF in 1978,<sup>2</sup> large  
102 advances have been made in the field of ART in the number  
103 of available treatment modalities and technicians capable of  
104 performing such procedures, and overall success rates.  
105 These treatments, in addition to more traditional surgical  
106 techniques, provide patients with a variety of options.<sup>3,4</sup>  
107 Despite recent advances the costs of fertility treatments  
108 remain high, impose significant barriers to access for  
109 households of lower socioeconomic status,<sup>5,6</sup> and typically  
110 are poorly mitigated by insurance coverage<sup>7,8</sup> as most in-  
111 surers recognize male infertility as a lifestyle choice,  
112 although in 2008 ASRM (American Society of Reproduc-  
113 tive Medicine) classified infertility as a disease.<sup>8,9</sup>

114 We reported that the median cost to women undergoing  
115 infertility treatment can range from \$1,182 for medications  
116 to \$24,373 for IVF and \$38,015 for IVF with donor eggs.<sup>10</sup>  
117 Other groups have examined the per cycle and per live birth  
118 costs of IVF with estimates ranging from \$9,547<sup>11</sup> to  
119 \$58,395.<sup>12</sup> More recently we evaluated OOP expenses of  
120 couples pursuing fertility care with a median OOP expense  
121 of \$5,338 and a median as high as \$19,234 for those un-  
122 dergoing IVF.<sup>13</sup> These estimates are limited to monetary  
123 costs and do not characterize the significant time spent, work  
124 hours lost and mental stress imposed by such treatments.<sup>14</sup>

125 Little has been published on the direct costs incurred by  
126 men pursuing fertility care. Previous studies have compared  
127 the cost-effectiveness of common surgical interventions  
128 (vasectomy reversal and varicocelectomy) vs ART. Older  
129 studies concluded that, in general, surgery tended to be more  
130 cost-effective from a payor standpoint and immediate IVF is  
131 never cost-effective.<sup>15–18</sup>

132 In our cohort of men seeking fertility care we used  
133 retrospective survey data to estimate the total OOP expen-  
134 ditures incurred while pursuing reproductive treatment, the  
135 components of these costs, the financial strain that subjects  
136 experienced and how this impacted their fertility care de-  
137 cisions. We hypothesized that infertility expenditures are  
138 associated with the treatment selected, socioeconomic fac-  
139 tors and insurance coverage.

## 141 **Methods**

### 143 *Cohort Description*

145 Men were recruited from the Center for Reproductive Health  
146 at University of California-San Francisco upon presentation  
147 for infertility evaluation, hypogonadism or abnormal semen

148 analysis. Of 263 men who met study inclusion criteria 216  
149 agreed to participate, including 121 who pursued infertility  
150 care and submitted full questionnaires at the conclusion of  
151 care (supplementary Appendix, <http://jurology.com/>). The  
152 latter was defined as a patient report of no longer pursuing  
153 treatment and successful pregnancy was the most common  
154 reason. Pregnancies were self-reported by patients. Ten  
155 additional subjects were excluded due to discrepancies in  
156 financial reporting. Additional information on treatments  
157 used and diagnoses were gathered through patient chart re-  
158 views. The University of California-San Francisco institu-  
159 tional review board approved the study protocol and all  
160 subjects provided written consent.

### 163 *Primary Outcomes*

164 Direct costs of fertility treatment were determined by pa-  
165 tient responses to a survey administered after the conclu-  
166 sion of care. Subjects were asked the question, “From the  
167 beginning of your care until the end, what was the total  
168 amount you spent on fertility care?” Answer choices were  
169 stratified into costs ranges from \$1 to \$499 and to more  
170 than \$75,000. Due to few responses in many ranges data  
171 were collapsed into the categories less than \$5,000, \$5,000  
172 to \$14,999, \$15,000 to \$29,999, \$30,000 to \$49,999 and  
173 greater than \$50,000. Details of expenses were elucidated  
174 further with a series of questions to characterize how much  
175 was spent on medications for the subject, medications for  
176 the partner, testing/diagnosis (ultrasound, laboratory eval-  
177 uation, hysterosalpingogram, etc), fertility procedures (ie  
178 IUI and IVF/ICSI), surgery for the subject (ie sperm  
179 retrieval, vasectomy reversal and varicocelectomy) and  
180 surgery for the partner.

181 To assess financial strain participants were asked, “Did  
182 your fertility treatment cause financial strain?” To allow for  
183 logistic regression the answers were limited to yes or no.  
184 Subjects were also asked how the cost of fertility treatment  
185 impacted access to care, options and cycles of treatment, and  
186 whether cost greatly influenced the decision to stop fertility  
187 treatment.

### 190 *Predictor Variables*

191 Demographic information was collected with survey re-  
192 sponses. Education was dichotomized to less than college  
193 graduate or college graduate. Income was stratified into less  
194 than \$100,000, \$100,000 to \$199,999, \$200,000 to  
195 \$299,999 and greater than \$300,000 for linear and logistic  
196 regression models. Race and ethnicity were self-reported  
197 and dichotomized to white or nonwhite.

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/4276906>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/4276906>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)