The Yukon data are incorrect

Upon reading the article by Chaikof and colleagues, I noticed some factual errors related to the Yukon. My main concern is that the following statement is misleading with regards to the Yukon: “We did not include data for the Northwest Territories or Nunavut, as there were no fee-for-service specialists in obstetrics and gynecology or urology practising there.” There are none in the Yukon either, which means the article’s conclusions are in question.

The jurisdictions with the largest discrepancies were Saskatchewan (mean percentage difference in fees of 67.3% ± standard deviation [SD] 18.4%), British Columbia (61.2% ± SD 30.1%) and the Yukon (41.8% ± SD 21.6%).

The obstetricians and gynecologists in the Yukon have been on an alternative payment plan for decades. There are no, nor have there been, urologists practising in the Yukon. At most, the outdated fee schedule referenced in this paper is used to shadow bill by the obstetricians and gynecologists.

While I support the main conclusions and importance of the topic, the study should strive to be factually correct to be taken seriously. Truth be told, in the Yukon the true reimbursement of those who provide surgical care for women is exactly the opposite of that concluded in the article.
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