

Correspondence

Hepatitis C Treatment Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices Among Primary Care Providers—Los Angeles County, 2023

Dear Editor

We read with great interest the article by Stewart and colleagues that documented increased hepatitis C virus (HCV) treatment in primary care settings associated with a multifaceted intervention that included a decision-support tool, education for clinicians, and enhanced inter-professional team supports.¹ The outcomes documented by Stewart et al., including their qualitative finding that showed their intervention increased physicians' confidence in treating HCV, complement results of a survey that we conducted to understand barriers to initiating HCV therapy by primary care physicians (PCPs). We conducted a survey in Los Angeles County to assess PCPs' knowledge, attitudes, and practices surrounding HCV treatment. We created the survey tool by using SurveyMonkey and distributed it by e-mail to Los Angeles County members of the American College of Physicians (ACP).

Among the 1990 LA County ACP members sent the survey, 69 participated. We included 36 (52%) general internal medicine outpatient providers and excluded 33 (48%) specialist/hospitalist respondents. Among all included respondents, 10 (28%) directly treated patients with HCV with all-oral direct-acting antivirals and 15 (42%) were comfortable treating HCV. Barriers to treatment were reported by 21 respondents (96%) and included not being trained in HCV treatment (41%), not being familiar with HCV treatment guidelines (23%), and not having institutional leadership support to implement HCV treatment (18%). Among all respondents, 29 (81%) identified restrictions to HCV treatment placed by health plans or their institution. The 14 (39%) respondents not currently comfortable treating HCV indicated they would have improved comfort with access to an HCV consultation line (79%), additional training (71%), and increased clinic encounter time (57%).

Increasing the number of health care providers who treat HCV, including among primary care providers, is a key pillar of the national HCV elimination strategy.² A recent analysis of administrative data, however, demonstrated that only 1 in 3 persons initiated HCV treatment within a year of a positive HCV RNA test.³ Our results provide qualitative insights into PCPs' knowledge, attitudes and practices on HCV treatment that can inform national efforts to scale up the number of physicians treating HCV. Having immediate access to a specialist for consultation on treatment questions in the form of a national or institutional HCV "warm-line" might serve as a cost-effective strategy to increasing the number of PCPs who treat HCV. Improving institutional support,

including increasing case management and clinic time to treat patients with HCV, and increasing access to training and educational programs in HCV management, would also likely improve comfort in HCV treatment. Finally, further efforts to remove existing insurance and institutional restrictions, including private health insurance restrictions, is essential to optimizing HCV treatment capacity.

The authors thank the American College of Physicians for their support this this work and their contributions to disseminating our survey.

Katherine A. Loomis, MD
Debika Bhattacharya, MD, MSc
Raiza Amiling, MPH
Mirna Ponce-Jewel, MPH, MA
Michael E. Lazarus, MD
Gus Chavez, MPA
and Prabhu Gounder, MD, MPH

From the Division of Infectious Diseases David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA Los Angeles, CA (KAL, DB); Acute Communicable Disease Control Viral Hepatitis and Respiratory Disease Unit Los Angeles County Department of Public Health, Los Angeles, CA (RA, MP-J, PG); Department of Medicine David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA, Los Angeles, CA (MEL); American College of Physicians Southern California Region I (GC)
E-mail: PGounder@ph.lacounty.gov

To see this article online, please go to: <http://jabfm.org/content/38/1/192.full>.

References

1. Stewart A, Craig-Neil A, Hodwitz K, et al. Increasing treatment rates for hepatitis C in primary care. *J Am Board Fam Med* 2023;36:591–602.
2. White House Office of Management and Budget. Budget of the US government: fiscal year 2024. Accessed September 6, 2023, 2023. Available at: https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/budget_fy2024.pdf.
3. Thompson WW, Symum H, Sandul A, DHSc, et al. Vital signs: hepatitis C treatment among insured adults—United States, 2019–2020. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2022;71:1011–7.

doi: 10.3122/jabfm.2024.230354R0

Re: Physician and Advanced Practice Clinician Burnout in Rural and Urban Settings

In the article "Physician and Advanced Practice Clinician Burnout in Rural and Urban Settings," Harry et al report a result of no significant difference in rates of burnout

between urban and rural physicians and advanced practice clinicians (APCs) within their Upper Midwest health care system.¹ The article's definitions of rural and urban, while based on the Veteran Health Administration's (VHA) interpretation of the US rural-urban commuting area (RUCA) codes, do accurately stratify urban and rural health clinicians and therefore may misrepresent their respective rates of burnout for each. The authors mention that their findings refute prior claims that practicing in a rural setting may increase burnout compared with an urban setting. Their miscategorized data may steer efforts away from initiatives to decrease rates of physician burnout in rural locations.²

The authors coded rurality using the VHA RUCA codes. The VHA uses RUCA code 1 for urban areas, while RUCA codes 2 to 10 correspond to rural areas.³ Other governmental organizations, such as the US Census Bureau and United States Department of Agriculture's Economic Research Service (USDA-ERS), interpret these codes differently. The US Census Bureau states that "urban areas" contain 50,000 or more people.⁴ The USDA-ERS includes detailed descriptions for each of the 10 RUCA codes. Codes 1 to 3 do not refer to population size at all; Code 4 refers to a "micropolitan area core... within an urban cluster of 10,000 to 49,999."⁵ US agencies are using RUCA codes differently to define rurality differently. Had the authors used the USDA-ERS categorizations of RUCA codes, for example, they might have found significant results regarding burnout experiences between rural and urban areas. Unfortunately, the authors did not include individual respondents' information, making it impossible to explore alternative groupings of the data which could yield a significant difference in burnout rates between urban and rural clinicians.

While it is tempting to follow the rural-urban classification patterns of a large organization such as the Veterans Health Administration, inaccurately categorizing the data may steer efforts away from initiatives to decrease rates of physician and APC burnout in rural locations. I encourage the authors to reanalyze the data using the interpretation of rural and urban definitions discussed in this letter to determine if a significant difference in burnout exists.

Cody J. Klinker, MD

From the OhioHealth Riverside Methodist Hospital,
Columbus, OH (CJK)

E-mail: cody.klinker@ohiohealth.com

To see this article online, please go to: <http://jabfm.org/content/38/1/193.full>.

References

1. Harry ML, Sudak NL, Engels MJ, et al. Physician and advanced practice clinician burnout in rural and urban settings. *The J Am Board Fam Med* 2024;37:43–58.
2. Physician burnout: definition(s), cause(s), impact(s), solution(s) - the rural monitor. *The Rural Monitor*. Published 2020. Accessed August 13, 2024. Available at: <http://www.ruralhealthinfo.org/rural-monitor/physician-burnout-solutions>.
3. Aboumradi M, Peritz DC, Friedman SL, Zwain G, Watts BV, Taub CC. Rural-urban trends in health care utilization, treatment, and mortality among US veterans with congestive heart failure: a retrospective cohort study. *J Rural Health* 2023;39:844–52.
4. US Census Bureau. Chapter 1: Defining "Rural" Areas. Published 2019. Available at: https://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/publications/2019/acs/ACS_rural_handbook_2019_ch01.pdf.
5. USDA ERS - Documentation. *Usda.gov*. Published 2017. Accessed August 13, 2024. Available at: <http://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/rural-urban-commuting-area-codes/documentation/>.

doi: 10.3122/jabfm.2024.240300R0

Re: Factors Influencing Patient Confidence in Screening Mammography

We read with great interest the article by Jarvis et al., published in the November 2023 issue of the *Journal of the American Board of Family Medicine*.¹ The authors underscore the importance of understanding factors associated with patients' confidence in screening mammography. Their study reveals that while 80% of women trust screening mammography, those with higher education (OR=0.43; $P=.02$) and dense breast tissue (OR=0.16; $P=.004$) report lower confidence. Factors such as age, race, and family history were not significant. These findings emphasize the need for enhanced education, particularly for women with dense breast tissue, regarding the efficacy of mammography.

As radiologists, we have observed that mammography and breast cancer detection often provoke negative emotions such as anxiety, discomfort, and worry, potentially impacting adherence to screening protocols and health outcomes. Thus, a patient-centered approach, which addresses emotional responses and prioritizes patient involvement, is essential. Recognizing the emotional impact of breast imaging, particularly in the context of evolving screening recommendations and cultural and socioeconomic barriers, is commendable.

In our practice, empowering patients through active involvement in decision making fosters better communication and ensures that their concerns are promptly addressed. This approach not only enhances the patient experience but can also improve health outcomes and adherence to recommendations. For example, same-day biopsies have been associated with higher satisfaction and reduced anxiety, as patients appreciate the prompt resolution of their concerns.³

At our institution, we extend our responsibilities beyond the procedure itself, ensuring the timely communication of pathology results and providing appropriate recommendations. We deliver potentially distressing results in a specialized space designed to reduce stress, ensuring that patients feel supported and heard.

In conclusion, Jarvis et al. present survey results highlighting that confidence in screening mammography is inversely associated with education level and self-reported increased breast density. This underscores the