

# Broadening candidate office circumcision patients: outcomes in children outside of conventional age and weight range



Lauren Nicassio, Yuri Sebastiao, Molly Fuchs, Daryl McLeod, Seth Alpert, Rama Jayanthi,  
Daniel DaJusta, Christina Ching

September 27, 2019

Fall Congress of Societies for Pediatric Urology 2019

Scottsdale, AZ



**NATIONWIDE CHILDREN'S**  
*When your child needs a hospital, everything matters.™*

# Background

- Office circumcision is often restricted in practice by patient age and size
  - Concern for proper fitting on restraining device
  - Possibility of increased risk of complications
- Recommendations often include:
  - Age  $\leq$  3 months old
  - and
  - Weight  $\leq$  5.1 kg
- Reviewed office circumcision in children  $>3$  months and  $>5.1$  kg

# Background

- Office circumcision is often restricted in practice by patient age and size
  - Concern for proper fitting on restraining device
  - Possibility of increased risk of complications
- Recommendations often include:
  - Age  $\leq$  3 months old
  - and
  - Weight  $\leq$  5.1 kg
- Reviewed office circumcision in children  $>3$  months and  $>5.1$  kg

HYPOTHESIS: older and heavier children will have a higher rate of bleeding and plastibell malfunction

# Methods

- Retrospective chart review of office circumcisions
  - January 2015 - August 2018

## PATIENT GROUPS



- Comparison of
  - Demographics: circumcision technique
  - Complications (need for intervention)
  - ED/UC/urology clinic visits outside of those planned
  - Office phone calls

# Results

	Group 1 (n=285)	Group 2 (n=357)	p-value
Median age in weeks (mean; range)	6.0 (6.6; 2.0 - 10.0)	18.0 (19.1; 14.0 - 54.0)	<0.0001
Median weight in kg (mean; range)	4.49 (4.39; 2.96 - 5.10)	6.78 (6.79; 5.11 - 13.10)	<0.0001
Circumcision technique			
Plastibell (%)	168 (59)	276 (77)	<0.0001
Gomco (%)	117 (41)	81 (23)	
Median follow-up in days (mean; range)	17 (22; 7 - 140)	16 (23; 0 - 181)	0.5560

# Results

Overall post-procedure course	Group 1 (n=285)	Group 2 (n=357)	p-value
Bleeding (%)	3 (1.1)	10 (2.8)	0.1181
Infection (%)	0 (0)	5 (1.4)	NA
Dehiscence (%)	0 (0)	3 (0.8)	NA
Cicatrix (%)	4 (1.4)	24 (6.7)	<b>0.0010</b>
Lysis of cicatrix (%)	3 (1.1)	18 (5.0)	<b>0.0048</b>
OR intervention (%)	1 (0.4)	5 (1.4)	0.1696
Circumcision revision (%)	1 (0.4)	3 (0.8)	0.4336
ED/UC visits (%)	4 (1.4)	28 (7.8)	<b>0.0002</b>
ED/UC intervention (%)	1 (0.4)	9 (2.5)	<b>0.0274</b>
Office visits outside of planned follow-up (%)	16 (5.6)	24 (6.7)	0.5637
Office visit intervention (%)	32 (11.2)	44 (12.3)	0.6691
Office phone calls (%)	52 (18.3)	75 (21.0)	0.3826
Post-procedure course of those with plastibell	Group 1 (n=168)	Group 2 (n=276)	p-value
Plastibell malfunction (%)	2 (1.2)	12 (4.3)	0.0648
Plastibell removal (%)	2 (1.2)	11 (4.0)	0.0902

# Results

Overall post-procedure course	Group 1 (n=285)	Group 2 (n=357)	p-value
Bleeding (%)	3 (1.1)	10 (2.8)	0.1181
Infection (%)	0 (0)	5 (1.4)	NA
Dehiscence (%)	0 (0)	3 (0.8)	NA
Cicatrix (%)	4 (1.4)	24 (6.7)	0.0010
Lysis of cicatrix (%)	3 (1.1)	18 (5.0)	0.0048
OR intervention (%)	1 (0.4)	5 (1.4)	0.1696
Circumcision revision (%)	1 (0.4)	3 (0.8)	0.4336
ED/UC visits (%)	4 (1.4)	28 (7.8)	0.0002
ED/UC intervention (%)	1 (0.4)	9 (2.5)	0.0274
Office visits outside of planned follow-up (%)	16 (5.6)	24 (6.7)	0.5637
Office visit intervention (%)	32 (11.2)	44 (12.3)	0.6691
Office phone calls (%)	52 (18.3)	75 (21.0)	0.3826
Post-procedure course of those with plastibell	Group 1 (n=168)	Group 2 (n=276)	p-value
Plastibell malfunction (%)	2 (1.2)	12 (4.3)	0.0648
Plastibell removal (%)	2 (1.2)	11 (4.0)	0.0902

# Conclusions

- Office circumcision can be performed outside of conventional age and weight ranges
  - Higher risk cicatrix and visits to the ED/UC
  - Weigh these risks relative to risk of surgical circumcision
- Awareness could aid in family counseling