

BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email info.bmjopen@bmj.com

BMJ Open

Rare diseases in Primary Care: Prevalence and Practice

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-027248
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	15-Oct-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Jo, Ara; University of Florida, Health Services Research, Management and Policy; Larson, Samantha; University of Florida Carek, Peter; University of Florida Peabody, Michael R; American Board of Family Medicine, Peterson, Lars E.; Amer Board Family Med Mainous III, Arch; University of Florida, Health Services Research, Management, and Policy
Keywords:	PRIMARY CARE, PREVENTIVE MEDICINE, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Rare diseases in Primary Care: Prevalence and Practice

Ara Jo, PhD ¹, Samantha Larson, MPH ¹, Peter J. Carek, MD, MS ², Michael R. Peabody, PhD ³, Lars E. Peterson, MD, PhD ^{3,4}, Arch G. Mainous III, PhD ^{1,2}

1. Department of Health Services Research, Management and Policy, University of Florida

2. Department of Community Health and Family Medicine, University of Florida

3. The American Board of Family Medicine, Lexington, KY

4. Department of Family and Community Medicine, University of Kentucky

Corresponding Author:

Ara Jo, PhD

Department of Health Services Research, Management and Policy

University of Florida

Health Sciences Center, PO Box 100195

Gainesville, FL 32610 USA

Phone: 352-273-6539

Fax: 352-273-6075

ara13j@ufl.edu

Word count of the abstract: 289

Word count of the text: 1,535

Tables: 3

Keywords: Rare disease, primary care, scope of practice

Abstract

Objectives: There are more than 7,000 rare diseases in the US and they are prevalent in 8% of the population. Due to life-threatening risk and limited therapies, early detection and treatment are critical. The purpose of this study was to explore characteristics of visits for patients with rare diseases seen by primary care physicians (PCPs).

Design: The study used a cross sectional study using a national representative dataset, the National Ambulatory Medical Care Survey for the years 2012-2014.

Setting: Primary care setting

Participants: Visits to PCPs (n= 22,306 representing 354,507,772 office visits to PCPs).

Primary Outcome Measures: Prevalence of rare diseases in visits of PCPs was the primary outcome. Bivariate analyses and logistic regression analyses were used to compare patients with rare diseases and those without rare diseases and examined characteristics of PCP visits for rare diseases and practice pattern.

Results: Among outpatient visits to PCPs, rare diseases account for 1.6% of the visits. The majority of patients with rare diseases were established patients (93.0%) and almost half (49.0%) were enrolled in public insurance programs. The time spent in visits for rare diseases (22.4 minutes) and visits for more common diseases (21.3 minutes) was not significantly different (p=.09). In an adjusted model controlling for patient characteristics (age, sex, types of insurance, reason for this visit, total number of chronic disease, having a rare disease and established or new patient), patients with

1
2
3 rare diseases were 34% less likely to be referred to another provider (OR 0.66, 95% CI,
4
5 0.44-0.99).
6
7

8 **Conclusions:** Visits for rare diseases are uncommon in primary care practice. Future
9
10 research may help to explain whether this low level of management of rare diseases in
11
12 primary care practice is consistent with a goal of a broad scope of care.
13
14

15 16 17 18 19 **Strengths and limitations of this study** 20

- 21
22 • This study is the first research to investigate characteristics of patients with rare
23
24 diseases seen in primary care practice and the association between physician
25
26 referral and rare disease diagnosis.
27
28
- 29 • The study used population-based national representative data allowing for
30
31 generalizability.
32
33
- 34 • Primary care physicians may play a vital role in providing continuous care and
35
36 managing patients with rare diseases effectively.
37
38
- 39 • The study is limited to the actions recorded in one visit due to study design.
40
41
- 42 • The study was unable to determine if that referral is for a consult or part of a
43
44 shared care relationship between primary care and specialty care
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Introduction

Primary Care Physicians (PCPs) are trained to provide care for a broad scope of conditions within their patient population. When PCPs maintain a broad scope of practice this safeguards access and quality of care for the general population. Some of these conditions are managed directly by the PCP and with others the PCP coordinates the care for the patient. One recent study indicated that in one year, family physicians typically manage about 1,700 diagnoses in office visits, with 100 diagnoses managed frequently.(1)

In addition to common, high prevalence diseases like diabetes, hypertension and arthritis, a substantial proportion of the general patient population, has a rare disease, or diseases. As of 2017, the National Institute of Health (NIH) Genetic and Rare Disease Information Center (GARD) had identified 7,000 rare diseases, affecting approximately 25-30 million people in the US population. (2) Rare diseases are categorized as life-threatening, with only few limited effective therapies available. In addition to the emotional and physical burden associated with diagnosis, patients with a rare disease often face financial burden due to the significant cost associated with drugs and therapies. As such, early detection and treatment are critical. For example, in one study, more than half of patients with rare diseases being seen at a PCP practice had been diagnosed with rare diseases at a PCP practice.(3)

However, to date there have been few studies investigating the role of PCPs in the management of patients with rare diseases. The purpose of this study was to

1
2
3 examine in a nationally representative sample of visits, the prevalence of rare diseases
4
5 cared for in primary care practice as well as characteristics of patients and providers.
6
7

8 **Methods**

9
10
11 This study used the National Ambulatory Medical Care Survey (NAMCS), a national
12
13 representative dataset, for the years 2012-2014. The NAMCS is a national probability
14
15 sample survey of ambulatory medical care visits to office-based physicians that allows
16
17 for national estimates regarding medical care in the US.(3) NAMCS data is collected
18
19 annually by the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS). The sample frame for
20
21 NAMCS data in the years 2012-2014 was composed of PCPs who specialize in primary
22
23 care (e.g., General and Family Practice, Internal medicine and Pediatrics), and who
24
25 identified themselves as the primary care physician (PCP) of the patient.(4) This list
26
27 conforms to the definition used by the NAMCS to categorize primary care. The
28
29 unweighted sample size was 22,306 representing 354,507,772 office visits to PCPs in
30
31 the US from 2012-2014.
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 **Rare disease**

39
40 A rare disease is defined as a case that affects fewer than 200,000 people.(2) For this
41
42 study, diagnoses were identified as a rare disease using the list provided by the GARD
43
44 Information Center.(2)
45
46
47

48 **Independent Variables**

49
50 Demographics of patients seen by PCPs, such as age, gender and race/ethnicity, were
51
52 used. Gender and race/ethnicity (i.e., Non-Hispanic White, Non-Hispanic Black,
53
54 Hispanics and Others) were considered categorical variables whereas age was used as
55
56
57

1
2
3 a continuous variable. In addition, their form of health insurance, major reason for the
4 visit, and total number of diagnosed chronic diseases were included as categorical
5 variables. Health insurance was stratified into four categories: private insurance, public
6 insurance such as Medicaid and Medicare, self-pay, and others. Major reason for the
7 visit was also categorized into four groups: new problems, chronic problems, pre- or
8 post-surgery care and preventive care.
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Providers characteristics including practice location (i.e., urban or rural), referral to other
providers (i.e., yes or no) were examined. Time spent with providers in primary care
setting was compared between patients with rare diseases and those without rare
diseases.

Statistical Analysis

To account for the complex survey design used in the NAMCS, a weighted variable was
used to consider survey design effect. This allows for us to provide population estimates
of United States ambulatory health care utilization.⁽³⁾ The prevalence of rare disease
seen in the primary care setting was estimated. Chi-square tests were used to compare
characteristics of PCPs who care for rare diseases against those who do not. Logistic
regression was also employed to examine the association between PCP referral to
other providers and patient diagnosis of a rare disease. All analyses were conducted in
SAS version 9.4 (Cary, NC). This study was approved as exempt by the Institutional
Review Board at the University of Florida.

Patient and Public Involvement

Patients and/or public were not involved in this study.

Results

The final sample was 22,306 representing 354,507,772 office visits to PCPs in the US from 2012-2014. A total of 1,508 PCPs participated to submit data for sample patient visits. Of the total patient visits to a PCP, a rare disease was noted in 1.6% of those visits. PCPs cared for 177 different rare diseases. Patients with rare diseases were significantly older than those without rare diseases (age difference = 8.3 years, $p < .01$), while no significant differences were found in the distribution of sex and race/ethnicity (Table 1). The majority of patients with rare diseases were established patients (93.0%), having been seen by the PCP more than one time, and almost half (49.3%) were enrolled in private insurance programs. Of the visits for patients diagnosed with a rare disease, 39.0% visited their PCPs with a comorbid chronic problem. In addition, they had a higher total number of chronic diseases compared to patients without rare diseases (Table 1).

Of visits by patients with rare disease, 14.3% were referred to other providers (Table 2). While PCPs spent slightly more time with their patients who had rare diseases (22.4 min), compared to patients without rare diseases (21.3 min), it was not significantly different (Table 2). The majority of visits for patients with rare diseases and more common diseases who were seen by PCPs were located in urban areas. PCPs practicing in rural areas (7.6%) were not significantly less likely than PCPs practicing in urban areas (16.8%; $p = .06$) to refer patients with rare diseases to another physician. In a bivariate analysis, care for rare disease was also not associated with rurality ($p = .32$) (Table 2).

1
2
3 In an unadjusted regression model, patients with rare diseases were 41% less likely to
4 be referred to other providers than those without rare diseases. After controlling for
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

In an unadjusted regression model, patients with rare diseases were 41% less likely to be referred to other providers than those without rare diseases. After controlling for covariates, such as patients characteristics (i.e., age, sex, race/ethnicity, types of insurance, major reason for this visit, total number of chronic disease, having a rare disease and established or new patient), patients with rare diseases were 64% less likely to be referred to another provider (Table 3).

Discussion

This study found that few patients with a rare disease were identified as being managed in primary care practice. Patients with rare diseases show significantly different characteristics compared to those without a rare disease diagnosis. Not surprisingly, visits in primary care for patients with rare diseases are more likely than patients without rare diseases to lead to referral to another provider. To our knowledge, this is the first study to investigate characteristics of patients with rare diseases seen in primary care practice and the association between physician referral and rare disease diagnosis.

Much of medical practice and the corresponding comfort in diagnosing and treating conditions is affected by the frequency of occurrence of the condition and pattern recognition. Rare diseases are by their very nature uncommon and thus PCPs may not always feel comfortable with the nuances of treatment and potential complications for a disease that they encounter very infrequently. According to the National Academy of Medicine, since rare diseases tend to accompany multiple common conditions, it disrupts a clinician's ability to recognize clues of rare diseases.⁽⁷⁾ In many of these cases PCPs need more than a consult from a specialist, especially when the primary

1
2
3 care team does not have the specialized medical knowledge. Receiving all of their care
4 from specialists may not be the best situation for the patient. Patients with rare diseases
5 need to be managed in primary care or at least have shared care between primary care
6 and specialists in complementary roles to provide a more effective management of
7 these complex patients.
8
9

10
11
12
13
14
15 There are some limitations to this study. First, due to the design of the NAMCS we are
16 limited to the actions recorded in that one visit. The design does allow us to have an
17 understanding of the types of patients seen in primary care but it is not data on a cohort
18 of patients. Thus, we do not know what sort of care may have transpired between the
19 patient and the physician in previous visits. Second, we are able to see if patients are
20 referred in that one visit, we are unable to determine if that referral is for a consult or
21 part of a shared care relationship between primary care and specialty care.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 32 Conclusion

33
34
35 This study identified characteristics of patients with rare diseases who are seen in
36 primary care practice and the delivery patterns of PCPs managing patients with rare
37 diseases. Findings from this study suggest that PCPs must possess a broad scope of
38 practice in order to deliver comprehensive, high-quality care. A better understanding of
39 the overall management of patients with rare diseases managed solely outside of
40 primary care would help to improve the care for these patients.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Acknowledgements

Contributors:

Ara Jo, PhD led the entire research as the first and corresponding author from writing the manuscript, analyzing the data and interpretation.

Samantha Larson, MPH, analyzed the data and contributed to writing the manuscript.

Peter J. Carek, MD, MS contributed to writing the manuscript.

Michael R. Peabody, PhD, contributed to writing the manuscript.

Lars E. Peterson, MD, PhD, contributed to writing the manuscript.

Arch G. Mainous III, PhD, contributed to writing the manuscript and guided the direction of the study.

Conflict of Interest: Drs. Peterson and Peabody are employees of the American Board of Family Medicine. No other authors have no declaration of conflict of interests.

Funding Statement: This work was supported by a grant from the American Board of Family Medicine Foundation.

Ethics approval: This study was approved as exempt by the Institutional Review Board at the University of Florida.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Data sharing statement: Data are available through the National Ambulatory Medical
Care Survey access from
https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/ahcd/datasets_documentation_related.htm.

For peer review only

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2018-027248 on 1 April 2019. Downloaded from <http://bmjopen.bmj.com/> on July 2, 2023 by guest. Protected by copyright.

References

1. Peabody MR, O'Neill TR, Stelter KL, Puffer JC. Frequency and Criticality of Diagnoses in Family Medicine Practices: From the National Ambulatory Medical Care Survey (NAMCS). *The Journal of the American Board of Family Medicine*. 2018;31(1):126-38.
2. GARD. FAQs About Rare Diseases: National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences; 11/30/2017 [Available from: <https://rarediseases.info.nih.gov/diseases/pages/31/faqs-about-rare-diseases>].
3. Phillips WR. Zebras on the commons: rare conditions in family practice. *The Journal of the American Board of Family Practice*. 2004;17(4):283-6.
4. NCHS. NAMCS Scope and Sample Design: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; 11/6/2015 [Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/ahcd/ahcd_scope.htm].
5. NHCS. 2014 NAMCS micro-data file documentation. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; 2014.
6. Genes G. RARE Diseases: Facts and Statistics-Statistics and Figures on Prevalence of Genetic and Rare Diseases [Available from: <https://globalgenes.org/rare-diseases-facts-statistics/>].
7. Boat TF, Field MJ. Rare diseases and orphan products: Accelerating research and development: National Academies Press; 2011.

Table 1. Characteristics of Patients with Rare Diseases in Primary Care, NAMCS 2012-2014 (unweighted N= 22,306, weighted N= 354,507,772)

	Patients with rare diseases (%)	Patients without rare diseases (%)	p-value
Unweighted Sample Size	363	21,943	
Weighted Sample Size	5,581,791	348,925,981	
Age (year-old) **	47.7	39.4	<0.001
Sex			
Female	56.4	53.8	0.44
Race			
Non-Hispanic White	75.0	70.6	0.54
Non-Hispanic Black	8.6	10.1	
Hispanics	11.7	14.3	
Others	4.7	5.0	
Insurance Types			
Private Insurance	49.3	54.6	0.15
Public Insurance	47.3	40.0	
Self-pay	1.8	3.5	
Other	1.5	1.9	
Major reasons for this visit**			
New Problems	33.7	42.6	0.002
Chronic Problems	39.0	28.7	
Pre-/Post-Surgery	27.3	28.7	
Preventive Care	0.0	0.0	
Total Number of Chronic Diseases**	1.3	1.0	0.001

** statistical significant level at .05

Table 2. Practice Characteristics of Primary Care Physicians who Care for Patients with Rare Diseases using NAMCS, 2012-2014

	Patients with rare diseases	Patients without rare diseases	p-value
Practicing Area			
Urban	84.5	86.4	0.32
Rural	15.5	13.6	
Referral to Other Providers**			
Yes	14.3	9.0	0.01
No	85.7	91.0	
Time Spent with Providers (min)	22.4	21.3	0.09

** statistical significant level at .05

Table 3. Odds Ratios of Referral Using Unadjusted and Adjusted Logistic Regression Analyses using NAMCS, 2012-2014

	Unadjusted OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR (95% CI)
Not having a rare disease	Reference	Reference
Having a rare disease	0.59 (0.40-0.87)**	0.66 (0.44-0.99)**

*Controlled for age, gender, race/ethnicity, types of insurance, major reason for this visit, total number of chronic disease, having a rare disease and established vs. new patient.

** statistical significant level at .05

For peer review only

STROBE Statement—checklist of items that should be included in reports of observational studies

	Item No	Recommendation	Page
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2-3
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	4-5
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	4-5
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	5
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	n/a
Participants	6	(a) <i>Cohort study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up <i>Case-control study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale for the choice of cases and controls <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	5
		(b) <i>Cohort study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed <i>Case-control study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per case	n/a
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	5-6
Data sources/measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	5-6
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	n/a
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	5
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	n/a
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	6
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	6
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	n/a
		(d) <i>Cohort study</i> —If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed <i>Case-control study</i> —If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	5-6
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	

Results			Page
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	n/a
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	n/a
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	n/a
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	7
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	n/a
		(c) <i>Cohort study</i> —Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	n/a
Outcome data	15*	<i>Cohort study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	n/a
		<i>Case-control study</i> —Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure	n/a
		<i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	7-8, 14
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	7-8
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	n/a
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	n/a
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	n/a
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	8
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	9
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	8-9
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	8
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	9

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

BMJ Open

Prevalence and Practice for Rare diseases in Primary Care

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-027248.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	20-Dec-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Jo, Ara; University of Florida, Health Services Research, Management and Policy; Larson, Samantha; University of Florida Carek, Peter; University of Florida Peabody, Michael R; American Board of Family Medicine, Peterson, Lars E.; Amer Board Family Med Mainous III, Arch; University of Florida, Health Services Research, Management, and Policy
Primary Subject Heading:	General practice / Family practice
Secondary Subject Heading:	Health services research
Keywords:	PRIMARY CARE, PREVENTIVE MEDICINE, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Prevalence and Practice for Rare diseases in Primary Care

Ara Jo, PhD ¹, Samantha Larson, MPH ¹, Peter J. Carek, MD, MS ², Michael R. Peabody, PhD ³, Lars E. Peterson, MD, PhD ^{3,4}, Arch G. Mainous III, PhD ^{1,2}

1. Department of Health Services Research, Management and Policy, University of Florida

2. Department of Community Health and Family Medicine, University of Florida

3. The American Board of Family Medicine, Lexington, KY

4. Department of Family and Community Medicine, University of Kentucky

Corresponding Author:

Ara Jo, PhD

Department of Health Services Research, Management and Policy

University of Florida

Health Sciences Center, PO Box 100195

Gainesville, FL 32610 USA

Phone: 352-273-6539

Fax: 352-273-6075

ara13j@ufl.edu

Word count of the abstract: 289

Word count of the text: 1,717

Tables: 3

Keywords: Rare disease, primary care, scope of practice

Abstract

Objectives: There are more than 7,000 rare diseases in the US and they are prevalent in 8% of the population. Due to life-threatening risk and limited therapies, early detection and treatment are critical. The purpose of this study was to explore characteristics of visits for patients with rare diseases seen by primary care physicians (PCPs).

Design: The study used a cross sectional study using a national representative dataset, the National Ambulatory Medical Care Survey for the years 2012-2014.

Setting: Primary care setting

Participants: Visits to PCPs (n= 22,306 representing 354,507,772 office visits to PCPs).

Primary Outcome Measures: Prevalence of rare diseases in visits of PCPs was the primary outcome. Bivariate analyses and logistic regression analyses were used to compare patients with rare diseases and those without rare diseases and examined characteristics of PCP visits for rare diseases and practice pattern.

Results: Among outpatient visits to PCPs, rare diseases account for 1.6% of the visits. The majority of patients with rare diseases were established patients (93.0%) and almost half (49.0%) were enrolled in public insurance programs. The time spent in visits for rare diseases (22.4 minutes) and visits for more common diseases (21.3 minutes) was not significantly different (p=.09). In an adjusted model controlling for patient characteristics (age, sex, types of insurance, reason for this visit, total number of chronic disease, having a rare disease and established or new patient), patients with

1
2
3 rare diseases were 52% more likely to be referred to another provider (OR 1.52, 95%
4
5 CI, 1.01-2.28).
6
7

8 **Conclusions:** Visits for rare diseases are uncommon in primary care practice. Future
9
10 research may help to explain whether this low level of management of rare diseases in
11
12 primary care practice is consistent with a goal of a broad scope of care.
13
14
15

16 17 18 19 **Strengths and limitations of this study** 20

- 21
22 • This study is the first research to investigate characteristics of patients with rare
23
24 diseases seen in primary care practice and the association between physician
25
26 referral and rare disease diagnosis.
27
28
- 29 • The study used population-based national representative data allowing for
30
31 generalizability.
32
33
- 34 • Primary care physicians may play a vital role in providing continuous care and
35
36 managing patients with rare diseases effectively.
37
38
- 39 • The study is limited to the actions recorded in one visit due to study design.
40
41
- 42 • The study was unable to determine if that referral is for a consult or part of a
43
44 shared care relationship between primary care and specialty care
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Introduction

Primary Care Physicians (PCPs) are trained to provide care for a broad scope of conditions within their patient population. When PCPs maintain a broad scope of practice this safeguards access and quality of care for the general population. Some of these conditions are managed directly by the PCP and with others the PCP coordinates the care for the patient. One recent study indicated that in one year, family physicians typically manage about 1,700 diagnoses in office visits, with 100 diagnoses managed frequently.(1)

In addition to common, high prevalence diseases like diabetes, hypertension and arthritis, a substantial proportion of the general patient population, has a rare disease, or diseases. As of 2017, the National Institute of Health (NIH) Genetic and Rare Disease Information Center (GARD) had identified 7,000 rare diseases, affecting approximately 25-30 million people in the US population. (2) Rare diseases are categorized as life-threatening, with only few limited effective therapies available. In addition to the emotional and physical burden associated with diagnosis, patients with a rare disease often face financial burden due to the significant cost associated with drugs and therapies. As such, early detection and treatment are critical. For example, in one study, more than half of patients with rare diseases being seen at a PCP practice had been diagnosed with rare diseases at a PCP practice.(3)

However, to date there have been few studies investigating the role of PCPs in the management of patients with rare diseases. The purpose of this study was to

1
2
3 examine in a nationally representative sample of visits, the prevalence of rare diseases
4
5 cared for in primary care practice as well as characteristics of patients and providers.
6
7

8 **Methods**

9

10
11 This study used the National Ambulatory Medical Care Survey (NAMCS), a national
12
13 representative dataset, for the years 2012-2014. The NAMCS is a national probability
14
15 sample survey of ambulatory medical care visits to office-based physicians that allows
16
17 for national estimates regarding medical care in the US.(3) NAMCS data is collected
18
19 annually by the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS). The sample frame for
20
21 NAMCS data in the years 2012-2014 was composed of PCPs who specialize in primary
22
23 care (e.g., General and Family Practice, Internal medicine and Pediatrics), and who
24
25 identified themselves as the primary care physician (PCP) of the patient.(4) This list
26
27 conforms to the definition used by the NAMCS to categorize primary care. Diagnosis
28
29 was determined based upon the ICD-9 codes and the diagnosis made by a PCP at a
30
31 visit was electronically recorded in the patient record form. The patient report form
32
33 provided preexisting conditions, current diagnosis and new diagnosis. (5) Thus, more
34
35 than 30 diagnoses can be managed via this report form. (6) Furthermore, this report
36
37 form allows us to identify established patients who have visited before whereas it does
38
39 not allow us to estimate numbers of previous visits. The unweighted sample size was
40
41 22,306 representing 354,507,772 office visits to PCPs in the US from 2012-2014.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 **Rare disease**

50

51 A rare disease is defined as a disease or a disorder that affects fewer than 200,000
52
53 people in the US.(2, 7) For this study, diagnoses were identified as a rare disease using
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the list provided by the GARD Information Center.(2) Two independent researchers and
4
5 (i.e., Dr. Jo and Larson) and one family medicine physician (i.e., Dr. Carek) reviewed all
6
7 new diagnosis in designated study years and identified rare diseases by comparing the
8
9 list of GARD. With consensus agreements, rare diseases for the study were
10
11
12 determined.
13
14

15 Independent Variables

16
17 Demographics of patients seen by PCPs, such as age, gender and race/ethnicity, were
18
19 used. Gender and race/ethnicity (i.e., Non-Hispanic White, Non-Hispanic Black,
20
21 Hispanics and Others) were considered categorical variables whereas age was used as
22
23 a continuous variable. In addition, their form of health insurance, major reason for the
24
25 visit, and total number of diagnosed chronic diseases were included as categorical
26
27 variables. Health insurance was stratified into four categories: private insurance, public
28
29 insurance such as Medicaid and Medicare, self-pay, and others. Major reason for the
30
31 visit was also categorized into four groups: new problems, chronic problems, pre- or
32
33 post-surgery care and preventive care.
34
35
36
37
38

39 Providers' characteristics including practice location (i.e., urban or rural), referral to
40
41 other providers (i.e., yes or no) were examined. Time spent with providers in primary
42
43 care setting was compared between patients with rare diseases and those without rare
44
45 diseases.
46
47
48

49 Statistical Analysis

50
51 To account for the complex survey design used in the NAMCS, a weighted variable was
52
53 used to consider survey design effect. This allows for us to provide national estimates of
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 United States ambulatory health care visits to office-based physicians and community
4 health centers.(3) Also, it allows us to produce national estimates of the ambulatory
5 health care utilization in the US (3). The prevalence of rare disease seen in the primary
6 care office visit was estimated. Chi-square tests were used to compare characteristics
7 of PCPs who care for rare diseases against those who do not. Logistic regression was
8 also employed to examine the association between PCP referral to other providers and
9 patient diagnosis of a rare disease. All analyses were conducted in SAS version 9.4
10 (Cary, NC). This study was approved as exempt by the Institutional Review Board at the
11 University of Florida.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Patient and Public Involvement

25
26
27 Patients and/or public were not involved in this study.
28
29
30

31 Results

32
33
34 The final sample was 22,306 representing 354,507,772 office visits to PCPs in
35 the US from 2012-2014. A total of 1,508 PCPs participated to submit data for sample
36 patient visits. Of the total patient visits to a PCP, a rare disease was noted in 1.6% of
37 those visits. PCPs cared for 177 different rare diseases. Patients with rare diseases
38 were significantly older than those without rare diseases (age difference = 8.3 years,
39 $p < .01$), while no significant differences were found in the distribution of sex and
40 race/ethnicity (Table 1). The majority of patients with rare diseases were established
41 patients (93.0%), having been seen by the PCP more than one time, and almost half
42 (49.3%) were enrolled in private insurance programs. Of the visits for patients
43 diagnosed with a rare disease, 39.0% visited their PCPs with a comorbid chronic
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 problem. In addition, they had a higher total number of chronic diseases compared to
4
5 patients without rare diseases (Table 1).
6
7

8
9 Of visits by patients with rare disease, 14.3% were referred to other providers (Table 2).
10
11 While PCPs spent slightly more time with their patients who had rare diseases (22.4
12
13 min), compared to patients without rare diseases (21.3 min), it was not significantly
14
15 different (Table 2). The majority of visits for patients with rare diseases and more
16
17 common diseases who were seen by PCPs were located in urban areas. PCPs
18
19 practicing in rural areas (7.6%) were not significantly less likely than PCPs practicing in
20
21 urban areas (16.8%; $p=.06$) to refer patients with rare diseases to another physician. In
22
23 a bivariate analysis, care for rare disease was also not associated with rurality ($p=.32$)
24
25 (Table 2).
26
27
28
29

30
31 In an unadjusted regression model, patients with rare diseases were 69% more likely to
32
33 be referred to other providers than those without rare diseases. After controlling for
34
35 covariates, such as patients' characteristics (i.e., age, sex, race/ethnicity, types of
36
37 insurance, major reason for this visit, total number of chronic disease, having a rare
38
39 disease and established or new patient), patients with rare diseases were 52% more
40
41 likely to be referred to another provider than those without rare diseases (Table 3).
42
43
44

45 Discussion

46
47
48 This study found that few patients with a rare disease were identified as being managed
49
50 in primary care practice. Patients with rare diseases in the primary care setting show
51
52 significantly older and have more comorbidities compared to those without a rare
53
54 disease diagnosis whereas patients with rare diseases are comparable to those without
55
56
57

1
2
3 rare diseases in terms of sex distribution, race/ethnicity and types of health insurance.

4
5 Not surprisingly, visits in primary care for patients diagnosed with rare diseases are
6
7 more likely than patients without rare diseases to lead to referral to another provider.

8
9
10 To our knowledge, this is the first study to investigate characteristics of patients with
11
12 rare diseases seen in primary care practice and the association between physician
13
14 referral and rare disease diagnosis.
15

16
17
18 Much of medical practice and the corresponding comfort in diagnosing and treating
19
20 conditions is affected by the frequency of occurrence of the condition and pattern
21
22 recognition. Rare diseases are by their very nature uncommon and thus PCPs may not
23
24 always feel comfortable with the nuances of treatment and potential complications for a
25
26 disease that they encounter very infrequently. According to the National Academy of
27
28 Medicine, since rare diseases tend to accompany multiple common conditions, it
29
30 disrupts a clinician's ability to recognize clues of rare diseases.(8) In many of these
31
32 cases PCPs need more than a consult from a specialist, especially when the primary
33
34 care team does not have the specialized medical knowledge. Receiving all of their care
35
36 from specialists may not be the best situation for the patient. Patients with rare diseases
37
38 need to be managed in primary care or at least have shared care between primary care
39
40 and specialists in complementary roles to provide a more effective management of
41
42 these complex patients.
43
44
45
46
47

48
49 There are some limitations to this study. First, due to the design of the NAMCS we are
50
51 limited to the actions recorded in that one visit. The design does allow us to have an
52
53 understanding of the types of patients seen in primary care but it is not data on a cohort
54
55 of patients. Thus, we do not know what sort of care may have transpired between the
56
57

1
2
3 patient and the physician in previous visits. Also, it is not able to explore the linkage of
4 multiple consultations with specialists pre- or post-visit to PCPs. Second, we are able to
5 see if patients are referred in that one visit, we are unable to determine if that referral is
6 for a consult or part of a shared care relationship between primary care and specialty
7 care.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

15 Conclusion

16
17
18 This study identified characteristics of patients with rare diseases who are seen in
19 primary care practice and the delivery patterns of PCPs managing patients with rare
20 diseases. Findings from this study suggest that PCPs must possess a broad scope of
21 practice in order to deliver comprehensive, high-quality care. A better understanding of
22 the overall management of patients with rare diseases managed solely outside of
23 primary care would help to improve the care for these patients.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

61 Acknowledgements

62 Contributors:

63 Ara Jo, PhD led the entire research as the first and corresponding author from writing
64 the manuscript, analyzing the data and interpretation.

65 Samantha Larson, MPH, analyzed the data and contributed to writing the manuscript.

66 Peter J. Carek, MD, MS contributed to writing the manuscript.

1
2
3 Michael R. Peabody, PhD, contributed to writing the manuscript.
4
5

6 Lars E. Peterson, MD, PhD, contributed to writing the manuscript.
7
8

9 Arch G. Mainous III, PhD, contributed to writing the manuscript and guided the direction
10 of the study.
11
12
13

14
15
16
17
18 Conflict of Interest: Drs. Peterson and Peabody are employees of the American Board
19 of Family Medicine. No other authors have no declaration of conflict of interests.
20
21
22

23 Funding Statement: This work was supported by a grant from the American Board of
24 Family Medicine Foundation.
25
26
27

28 Ethics approval: This study was approved as exempt by the Institutional Review Board
29 at the University of Florida.
30
31
32

33
34 Data sharing statement: Data are available through the National Ambulatory Medical
35 Care Survey access from
36
37
38
39 https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/ahcd/datasets_documentation_related.htm.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

1. Peabody MR, O'Neill TR, Stelter KL, Puffer JC. Frequency and Criticality of Diagnoses in Family Medicine Practices: From the National Ambulatory Medical Care Survey (NAMCS). *The Journal of the American Board of Family Medicine*. 2018;31(1):126-38.
2. GARD. FAQs About Rare Diseases: National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences; 11/30/2017 [Available from: <https://rarediseases.info.nih.gov/diseases/pages/31/faqs-about-rare-diseases>].
3. Phillips WR. Zebras on the commons: rare conditions in family practice. *The Journal of the American Board of Family Practice*. 2004;17(4):283-6.
4. NCHS. NAMCS Scope and Sample Design: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; 11/6/2015 [Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/ahcd/ahcd_scope.htm].
5. NHCS. 2014 NAMCS micro-data file documentation. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; 2014.
6. NCHS. National Ambulatory Medical Care Survey 2018 Patient Record. Available from https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/ahcd/2018_NAMCS_Patient_Record_Sample_Card.pdf.

- 1
2
3 7. US Food & Drug Administration (FDA). Orphan Drug Act - Relevant Excerpts. August
4
5 2013 Available from
6
7
8 <https://www.fda.gov/forindustry/developingproductsforrareconditions/howto>
9
10 [applyfororphanproductdesignation/ucm364750.htm](https://www.fda.gov/forindustry/developingproductsforrareconditions/howto).
11
12
13
14
15
16 8. Boat TF, Field MJ. Rare diseases and orphan products: Accelerating research and
17
18 development: National Academies Press; 2011.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Characteristics of Patients with Rare Diseases in Primary Care, NAMCS 2012-2014 (unweighted N= 22,306, weighted N= 354,507,772)

	Patients with rare diseases (%)	Patients without rare diseases (%)	p-value
Unweighted Sample Size	363	21,943	
Weighted Sample Size	5,581,791	348,925,981	
Mean Age (year-old) **	47.7	39.4	<0.001
Sex			
Female	56.4	53.8	0.44
Race			
Non-Hispanic White	75.0	70.6	0.54
Non-Hispanic Black	8.6	10.1	
Hispanics	11.7	14.3	
Others	4.7	5.0	
Insurance Types			
Private Insurance	49.3	54.6	0.15
Public Insurance	47.3	40.0	
Self-pay	1.8	3.5	
Other	1.5	1.9	
Major reasons for this visit**			
New Problems	33.7	42.6	0.002
Chronic Problems	39.0	28.7	
Pre-/Post-Surgery	27.3	28.7	
Preventive Care	0.0	0.0	
Total Number of Chronic Diseases**	1.3	1.0	0.001

** statistical significant level at .05

Table 2. Practice Characteristics of Primary Care Physicians who Care for Patients with Rare Diseases using NAMCS, 2012-2014

	Patients with rare diseases	Patients without rare diseases	p-value
Practicing Area			
Urban	84.5	86.4	0.32
Rural	15.5	13.6	
Referral to Other Providers**			
Yes	14.3	9.0	0.01
No	85.7	91.0	
Time Spent with Providers (min)	22.4	21.3	0.09

** statistical significant level at .05

Table 3. Odds Ratios of Referral Using Unadjusted and Adjusted Logistic Regression Analyses using NAMCS, 2012-2014

	Unadjusted OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR (95% CI)
Not having a rare disease	Reference	Reference
Having a rare disease	1.69 (1.15-2.48)**	1.52 (1.01-2.28)**

*Controlled for age, gender, race/ethnicity, types of insurance, major reason for this visit, total number of chronic disease, having a rare disease and established vs. new patient.

** statistical significant level at .05

For peer review only

STROBE Statement—checklist of items that should be included in reports of observational studies

	Item No	Recommendation	Page
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2-3
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	4-5
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	4-5
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	5
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	n/a
Participants	6	(a) <i>Cohort study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up <i>Case-control study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale for the choice of cases and controls <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	5
		(b) <i>Cohort study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed <i>Case-control study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per case	n/a
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	5-6
Data sources/measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	5-6
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	n/a
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	5
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	n/a
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	6
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	6
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	n/a
		(d) <i>Cohort study</i> —If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed <i>Case-control study</i> —If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	5-6
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	

Results			Page
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	n/a
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	n/a
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	n/a
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	7
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	n/a
		(c) <i>Cohort study</i> —Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	n/a
Outcome data	15*	<i>Cohort study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	n/a
		<i>Case-control study</i> —Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure	n/a
		<i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	7-8, 14
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	7-8
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	n/a
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	n/a
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	n/a
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	8
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	9
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	8-9
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	8
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	9

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

BMJ Open

Prevalence and Practice for Rare diseases in Primary Care

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-027248.R2
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	28-Feb-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Jo, Ara; University of Florida, Health Services Research, Management and Policy; Larson, Samantha; University of Florida Carek, Peter; University of Florida Peabody, Michael R; American Board of Family Medicine, Peterson, Lars E.; Amer Board Family Med Mainous III, Arch; University of Florida, Health Services Research, Management, and Policy
Primary Subject Heading:	General practice / Family practice
Secondary Subject Heading:	Health services research
Keywords:	PRIMARY CARE, PREVENTIVE MEDICINE, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Prevalence and Practice for Rare diseases in Primary Care

Ara Jo, PhD ¹, Samantha Larson, MPH ¹, Peter J. Carek, MD, MS ², Michael R. Peabody, PhD ³, Lars E. Peterson, MD, PhD ^{3,4}, Arch G. Mainous III, PhD ^{1,2}

1. Department of Health Services Research, Management and Policy, University of Florida
2. Department of Community Health and Family Medicine, University of Florida
3. The American Board of Family Medicine, Lexington, KY
4. Department of Family and Community Medicine, University of Kentucky

Corresponding Author:

Ara Jo, PhD

Department of Health Services Research, Management and Policy

University of Florida

Health Sciences Center, PO Box 100195

Gainesville, FL 32610 USA

Phone: 352-273-6539

Fax: 352-273-6075

ara13j@ufl.edu

Word count of the abstract: 289

Word count of the text: 1,907

Tables: 3

Keywords: Rare disease, primary care, scope of practice

Abstract

Objectives: There are more than 7,000 rare diseases in the US and they are prevalent in 8% of the population. Due to life-threatening risk and limited therapies, early detection and treatment are critical. The purpose of this study was to explore characteristics of visits for patients with rare diseases seen by primary care physicians (PCPs).

Design: The study used a cross sectional study using a national representative dataset, the National Ambulatory Medical Care Survey for the years 2012-2014.

Setting: Primary care setting

Participants: Visits to PCPs (n= 22,306 representing 354,507,772 office visits to PCPs).

Primary Outcome Measures: Prevalence of rare diseases in visits of PCPs was the primary outcome. Bivariate analyses and logistic regression analyses were used to compare patients with rare diseases and those without rare diseases and examined characteristics of PCP visits for rare diseases and practice pattern.

Results: Among outpatient visits to PCPs, rare diseases account for 1.6% of the visits. The majority of patients with rare diseases were established patients (93.0%) and almost half (49.0%) were enrolled in public insurance programs. The time spent in visits for rare diseases (22.4 minutes) and visits for more common diseases (21.3 minutes) was not significantly different (p=.09). In an adjusted model controlling for patient characteristics (age, sex, types of insurance, reason for this visit, total number of chronic disease, having a rare disease and established or new patient), patients with

1
2
3 rare diseases were 52% more likely to be referred to another provider (OR 1.52, 95%
4
5 CI, 1.01-2.28).
6
7

8 **Conclusions:** Visits for rare diseases are uncommon in primary care practice. Future
9
10 research may help to explain whether this low level of management of rare diseases in
11
12 primary care practice is consistent with a goal of a broad scope of care.
13
14
15

16 17 18 19 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

- 20 • This study is the first research to investigate characteristics of patients with rare
21
22 diseases seen in primary care practice and the association between physician
23
24 referral and rare disease diagnosis.
25
26
- 27 • The study used population-based national representative data allowing for
28
29 generalizability.
30
31
- 32 • Primary care physicians may play a vital role in providing continuous care and
33
34 managing patients with rare diseases effectively.
35
36
- 37 • The study is limited to the actions recorded in one visit due to study design.
38
39
- 40 • The study was unable to determine if that referral is for a consult or part of a
41
42 shared care relationship between primary care and specialty care
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Introduction

Primary Care Physicians (PCPs) are trained to provide care for a broad scope of conditions within their patient population. When PCPs maintain a broad scope of practice this safeguards access and quality of care for the general population. Some of these conditions are managed directly by the PCP and with others the PCP coordinates the care for the patient. One recent study indicated that in one year, family physicians typically manage about 1,700 diagnoses in office visits, with 100 diagnoses managed frequently.(1)

In addition to common, high prevalence diseases like diabetes, hypertension and arthritis, a substantial proportion of the general patient population, has a rare disease, or diseases. As of 2017, the National Institute of Health (NIH) Genetic and Rare Disease Information Center (GARD) had identified 7,000 rare diseases, affecting approximately 25-30 million people in the US population. (2) Rare diseases are categorized as life-threatening, with only few limited effective therapies available. In addition to the emotional and physical burden associated with diagnosis, patients with a rare disease often face financial burden due to the significant cost associated with drugs and therapies. As such, early detection and treatment are critical. For example, in one study, more than half of patients with rare diseases being seen at a PCP practice had been diagnosed with rare diseases at a PCP practice.(3)

However, to date there have been few studies investigating the role of PCPs in the management of patients with rare diseases. The purpose of this study was to

1
2
3 examine in a nationally representative sample of visits, the prevalence of rare diseases
4
5 cared for in primary care practice as well as characteristics of patients and providers.
6
7

8 **Methods**

9

10
11 This study used the National Ambulatory Medical Care Survey (NAMCS), a national
12 representative dataset, for the years 2012-2014. The NAMCS is a national probability
13 sample survey of ambulatory medical care visits to office-based physicians that allows
14 for national estimates regarding medical care in the US. (3) Nonfederally employed
15 physicians defined by the American Medical Association and the American Osteopathic
16 Association who were principally engaged in patient care activities and who are not
17 specialized in anesthesiology, pathology and radiology were eligible. Also physicians
18 who are younger than 85 years of age at the time of the survey were eligible. Based on
19 multistage probability design, eligible PCPs were selected and informed about the
20 survey and those who agreed to participate to the survey were included in the data. (3)
21 NAMCS data is collected annually by the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS).
22 It is electronic record collected by the Census Bureau in the US and multiple steps were
23 implemented to process and review the data based on the NCHS protocol. The data
24 estimates to be reliable met two criteria, 1) sample records should be at least 30, and 2)
25 a relative standard error should be 30 percent or less. (3) The sample frame for NAMCS
26 data in the years 2012-2014 was composed of PCPs who specialize in primary care
27 (e.g., General and Family Practice, Internal medicine and Pediatrics), and who identified
28 themselves as the primary care physician (PCP) of the patient.(4) This list conforms to
29 the definition used by the NAMCS to categorize primary care. Diagnosis was
30 determined based upon the ICD-9 codes and the diagnosis made by a PCP at a visit
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 was electronically recorded in the patient record form. The patient report form provided
4 preexisting conditions, current diagnosis and new diagnosis. (5) Thus, more than 30
5
6 diagnoses can be managed via this report form. (6) Furthermore, this report form allows
7
8 us to identify established patients who have visited before whereas it does not allow us
9
10 to estimate numbers of previous visits. The unweighted sample size was 22,306
11
12 representing 354,507,772 office visits to PCPs in the US from 2012-2014.
13
14

15 16 17 18 Rare disease

19
20 A rare disease is defined as a disease or a disorder that affects fewer than 200,000
21
22 people in the US.(2, 7) For this study, diagnoses were identified as a rare disease using
23
24 the list provided by the GARD Information Center.(2) Two independent researchers and
25
26 (i.e., Dr. Jo and Larson) and one family medicine physician (i.e., Dr. Carek) reviewed all
27
28 new diagnosis in designated study years and identified rare diseases by comparing the
29
30 list of GARD. With consensus agreements, rare diseases for the study were
31
32 determined.
33
34
35

36 37 Independent Variables

38
39 Demographics of patients seen by PCPs, such as age, gender and race/ethnicity, were
40
41 used. Gender and race/ethnicity (i.e., Non-Hispanic White, Non-Hispanic Black,
42
43 Hispanics and Others) were considered categorical variables whereas age was used as
44
45 a continuous variable. In addition, their form of health insurance, major reason for the
46
47 visit, and total number of diagnosed chronic diseases were included as categorical
48
49 variables. Health insurance was stratified into four categories: private insurance, public
50
51 insurance such as Medicaid and Medicare, self-pay, and others. Major reason for the
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 visit was also categorized into four groups: new problems, chronic problems, pre- or
4
5 post-surgery care and preventive care.
6
7

8
9 Providers' characteristics including practice location (i.e., urban or rural), referral to
10
11 other providers (i.e., yes or no) were examined. Time spent with providers in primary
12
13 care setting was compared between patients with rare diseases and those without rare
14
15 diseases. Time spent with providers in primary care is the length of the time the provider
16
17 spent with the patient at the office and patient's waiting time to see the provider, receive
18
19 care from providers and prepare for a patient such as reviewing medical chart or
20
21 physical examination were excluded. (3)
22
23
24

25 26 Statistical Analysis

27
28 To account for the complex survey design used in the NAMCS, a weighted variable was
29
30 used to consider survey design effect. This allows for us to provide national estimates of
31
32 United States ambulatory health care visits to office-based physicians and community
33
34 health centers.(3) Also, it allows us to produce national estimates of the ambulatory
35
36 health care utilization in the US (3). The prevalence of rare disease seen in the primary
37
38 care office visit was estimated. Chi-square tests were used to compare characteristics
39
40 of PCPs who care for rare diseases against those who do not. Logistic regression was
41
42 also employed to examine the association between PCP referral to other providers and
43
44 patient diagnosis of a rare disease. All analyses were conducted in SAS version 9.4
45
46 (Cary, NC). This study was approved as exempt by the Institutional Review Board at the
47
48 University of Florida.
49
50
51

52 53 Patient and Public Involvement

1
2
3 Patients and/or public were not involved in this study.
4
5

6 Results 7

8
9 The final sample was 22,306 representing 354,507,772 office visits to PCPs in
10 the US from 2012-2014. A total of 1,508 PCPs participated to submit data for sample
11 patient visits. Of the total patient visits to a PCP, a rare disease was noted in 1.6% of
12 those visits. PCPs cared for 177 different rare diseases. Patients with rare diseases
13 were significantly older than those without rare diseases (age difference = 8.3 years,
14 $p < .01$), while no significant differences were found in the distribution of sex and
15 race/ethnicity (Table 1). The majority of patients with rare diseases were established
16 patients (93.0%), having been seen by the PCP more than one time, and almost half
17 (49.3%) were enrolled in private insurance programs. Of the visits for patients
18 diagnosed with a rare disease, 39.0% visited their PCPs with a comorbid chronic
19 problem. In addition, they had a higher total number of chronic diseases compared to
20 patients without rare diseases (Table 1).
21
22

23
24 Of visits by patients with rare disease, 14.3% were referred to other providers (Table 2).
25
26 While PCPs spent slightly more time with their patients who had rare diseases (22.4
27 min), compared to patients without rare diseases (21.3 min), it was not significantly
28 different (Table 2). The majority of visits for patients with rare diseases and more
29 common diseases who were seen by PCPs were located in urban areas. PCPs
30 practicing in rural areas (7.6%) were not significantly less likely than PCPs practicing in
31 urban areas (16.8%; $p = .06$) to refer patients with rare diseases to another physician. In
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 a bivariate analysis, care for rare disease was also not associated with rurality ($p=.32$)
4
5 (Table 2).
6
7

8 In an unadjusted regression model, patients with rare diseases were 69% more likely to
9
10 be referred to other providers than those without rare diseases. After controlling for
11
12 covariates, such as patients' characteristics (i.e., age, sex, race/ethnicity, types of
13
14 insurance, major reason for this visit, total number of chronic disease, having a rare
15
16 disease and established or new patient), patients with rare diseases were 52% more
17
18 likely to be referred to another provider than those without rare diseases (Table 3).
19
20
21
22

23 Discussion

24
25
26 This study found that few patients with a rare disease were identified as being managed
27
28 in primary care practice. Patients with rare diseases in the primary care setting show
29
30 significantly older and have more comorbidities compared to those without a rare
31
32 disease diagnosis whereas patients with rare diseases are comparable to those without
33
34 rare diseases in terms of sex distribution, race/ethnicity and types of health insurance.
35
36 Not surprisingly, visits in primary care for patients diagnosed with rare diseases are
37
38 more likely than patients without rare diseases to lead to referral to another provider.
39
40 To our knowledge, this is the first study to investigate characteristics of patients with
41
42 rare diseases seen in primary care practice and the association between physician
43
44 referral and rare disease diagnosis.
45
46
47
48
49

50 Much of medical practice and the corresponding comfort in diagnosing and treating
51
52 conditions is affected by the frequency of occurrence of the condition and pattern
53
54 recognition. Rare diseases are by their very nature uncommon and thus PCPs may not
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 always feel comfortable with the nuances of treatment and potential complications for a
4 disease that they encounter very infrequently. According to the National Academy of
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

always feel comfortable with the nuances of treatment and potential complications for a disease that they encounter very infrequently. According to the National Academy of Medicine, since rare diseases tend to accompany multiple common conditions, it disrupts a clinician's ability to recognize clues of rare diseases.(8) In many of these cases PCPs need more than a consult from a specialist, especially when the primary care team does not have the specialized medical knowledge. Receiving all of their care from specialists may not be the best situation for the patient. Patients with rare diseases need to be managed in primary care or at least have shared care between primary care and specialists in complementary roles to provide a more effective management of these complex patients.

There are some limitations to this study. First, due to the design of the NAMCS we are limited to the actions recorded in that one visit. The design does allow us to have an understanding of the types of patients seen in primary care but it is not data on a cohort of patients. Thus, we do not know what sort of care may have transpired between the patient and the physician in previous visits. Also, it is not able to explore the linkage of multiple consultations with specialists pre- or post-visit to PCPs. Second, we are able to see if patients are referred in that one visit, we are unable to determine if that referral is for a consult or part of a shared care relationship between primary care and specialty care.

Conclusion

This study identified characteristics of patients with rare diseases who are seen in primary care practice and the delivery patterns of PCPs managing patients with rare

1
2
3 diseases. Findings from this study suggest that PCPs must possess a broad scope of
4
5 practice in order to deliver comprehensive, high-quality care. A better understanding of
6
7 the overall management of patients with rare diseases managed solely outside of
8
9 primary care would help to improve the care for these patients.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

Acknowledgements

Contributors:

Ara Jo, PhD led the entire research as the first and corresponding author from writing the manuscript, analyzing the data and interpretation.

Samantha Larson, MPH, analyzed the data and contributed to writing the manuscript.

Peter J. Carek, MD, MS contributed to writing the manuscript.

Michael R. Peabody, PhD, contributed to writing the manuscript.

Lars E. Peterson, MD, PhD, contributed to writing the manuscript.

Arch G. Mainous III, PhD, contributed to writing the manuscript and guided the direction of the study.

Competing Interests Statement: Drs. Peterson and Peabody are employees of the American Board of Family Medicine. No other authors have no declaration of conflict of interests.

Funding Statement: This work was supported by a grant from the American Board of Family Medicine Foundation.

Ethics approval: This study was approved as exempt by the Institutional Review Board at the University of Florida.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Data availability statement: Data are available through the National Ambulatory Medical
Care Survey access from
https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/ahcd/datasets_documentation_related.htm.

For peer review only

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2018-027248 on 1 April 2019. Downloaded from <http://bmjopen.bmj.com/> on July 2, 2023 by guest. Protected by copyright.

References

1. Peabody MR, O'Neill TR, Stelter KL, Puffer JC. Frequency and Criticality of Diagnoses in Family Medicine Practices: From the National Ambulatory Medical Care Survey (NAMCS). *The Journal of the American Board of Family Medicine*. 2018;31(1):126-38.
2. GARD. FAQs About Rare Diseases: National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences; 11/30/2017 [Available from: <https://rarediseases.info.nih.gov/diseases/pages/31/faqs-about-rare-diseases>].
3. Phillips WR. Zebras on the commons: rare conditions in family practice. *The Journal of the American Board of Family Practice*. 2004;17(4):283-6.
4. NCHS. NAMCS Scope and Sample Design: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; 11/6/2015 [Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/ahcd/ahcd_scope.htm].
5. NHCS. 2014 NAMCS micro-data file documentation. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; 2014.
6. NCHS. National Ambulatory Medical Care Survey 2018 Patient Record. Available from https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/ahcd/2018_NAMCS_Patient_Record_Sample_Card.pdf.

- 1
2
3 7. US Food & Drug Administration (FDA). Orphan Drug Act - Relevant Excerpts. August
4
5 2013 Available from
6
7
8 <https://www.fda.gov/forindustry/developingproductsforrareconditions/howto>
9
10 [applyfororphanproductdesignation/ucm364750.htm](https://www.fda.gov/forindustry/developingproductsforrareconditions/howto).
11
12
13
14
15
16 8. Boat TF, Field MJ. Rare diseases and orphan products: Accelerating research and
17
18 development: National Academies Press; 2011.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Characteristics of Patients with Rare Diseases in Primary Care, NAMCS 2012-2014 (unweighted N= 22,306, weighted N= 354,507,772)

	Patients with rare diseases (%)	Patients without rare diseases (%)	p-value
Unweighted Sample Size	363	21,943	
Weighted Sample Size	5,581,791	348,925,981	
Mean Age (year-old) **	47.7	39.4	<0.001
Sex			
Female	56.4	53.8	0.44
Race			
Non-Hispanic White	75.0	70.6	0.54
Non-Hispanic Black	8.6	10.1	
Hispanics	11.7	14.3	
Others	4.7	5.0	
Insurance Types			
Private Insurance	49.3	54.6	0.15
Public Insurance	47.3	40.0	
Self-pay	1.8	3.5	
Other	1.5	1.9	
Major reasons for this visit**			
New Problems	33.7	42.6	0.002
Chronic Problems	39.0	28.7	
Pre-/Post-Surgery	27.3	28.7	
Preventive Care	0.0	0.0	
Total Number of Chronic Diseases**	1.3	1.0	0.001

** statistical significant level at .05

Table 2. Practice Characteristics of Primary Care Physicians who Care for Patients with Rare Diseases using NAMCS, 2012-2014

	Patients with rare diseases	Patients without rare diseases	p-value
Practicing Area			
Urban	84.5	86.4	0.32
Rural	15.5	13.6	
Referral to Other Providers**			
Yes	14.3	9.0	0.01
No	85.7	91.0	
Time Spent with Providers (min)	22.4	21.3	0.09

** statistical significant level at .05

Table 3. Odds Ratios of Referral Using Unadjusted and Adjusted Logistic Regression Analyses using NAMCS, 2012-2014

	Unadjusted OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR (95% CI)
Not having a rare disease	Reference	Reference
Having a rare disease	1.69 (1.15-2.48)**	1.52 (1.01-2.28)**

*Controlled for age, gender, race/ethnicity, types of insurance, major reason for this visit, total number of chronic disease, having a rare disease and established vs. new patient.

** statistical significant level at .05

For peer review only

STROBE Statement—checklist of items that should be included in reports of observational studies

	Item No	Recommendation	Page
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2-3
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	4-5
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	4-5
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	5
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	n/a
Participants	6	(a) <i>Cohort study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up <i>Case-control study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale for the choice of cases and controls <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	5
		(b) <i>Cohort study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed <i>Case-control study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per case	n/a
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	5-6
Data sources/measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	5-6
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	n/a
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	5
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	n/a
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	6
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	6
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	n/a
		(d) <i>Cohort study</i> —If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed <i>Case-control study</i> —If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	5-6
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	

Results			Page
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	n/a
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	n/a
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	n/a
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	7
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	n/a
		(c) <i>Cohort study</i> —Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	n/a
Outcome data	15*	<i>Cohort study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	n/a
		<i>Case-control study</i> —Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure	n/a
		<i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	7-8, 14
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	7-8
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	n/a
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	n/a
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	n/a
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	8
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	9
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	8-9
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	8
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	9

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

BMJ Open

Prevalence and Practice for Rare diseases in Primary Care: a national cross-sectional study in the United States

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-027248.R3
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	01-Mar-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Jo, Ara; University of Florida, Health Services Research, Management and Policy; Larson, Samantha; University of Florida Carek, Peter; University of Florida Peabody, Michael R; American Board of Family Medicine, Peterson, Lars E.; Amer Board Family Med Mainous III, Arch; University of Florida, Health Services Research, Management, and Policy
Primary Subject Heading:	General practice / Family practice
Secondary Subject Heading:	Health services research
Keywords:	PRIMARY CARE, PREVENTIVE MEDICINE, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Prevalence and Practice for Rare diseases in Primary Care: a national cross-sectional study in the United States

Ara Jo, PhD ¹, Samantha Larson, MPH ¹, Peter J. Carek, MD, MS ², Michael R. Peabody, PhD ³, Lars E. Peterson, MD, PhD ^{3,4}, Arch G. Mainous III, PhD ^{1,2}

1. Department of Health Services Research, Management and Policy, University of Florida

2. Department of Community Health and Family Medicine, University of Florida

3. The American Board of Family Medicine, Lexington, KY

4. Department of Family and Community Medicine, University of Kentucky

Corresponding Author:

Ara Jo, PhD

Department of Health Services Research, Management and Policy

University of Florida

Health Sciences Center, PO Box 100195

Gainesville, FL 32610 USA

Phone: 352-273-6539

Fax: 352-273-6075

ara13j@ufl.edu

Word count of the abstract: 289

Word count of the text: 1,907

Tables: 3

Keywords: Rare disease, primary care, scope of practice

Abstract

Objectives: There are more than 7,000 rare diseases in the US and they are prevalent in 8% of the population. Due to life-threatening risk and limited therapies, early detection and treatment are critical. The purpose of this study was to explore characteristics of visits for patients with rare diseases seen by primary care physicians (PCPs).

Design: The study used a cross sectional study using a national representative dataset, the National Ambulatory Medical Care Survey for the years 2012-2014.

Setting: Primary care setting

Participants: Visits to PCPs (n= 22,306 representing 354,507,772 office visits to PCPs).

Primary Outcome Measures: Prevalence of rare diseases in visits of PCPs was the primary outcome. Bivariate analyses and logistic regression analyses were used to compare patients with rare diseases and those without rare diseases and examined characteristics of PCP visits for rare diseases and practice pattern.

Results: Among outpatient visits to PCPs, rare diseases account for 1.6% of the visits. The majority of patients with rare diseases were established patients (93.0%) and almost half (49.0%) were enrolled in public insurance programs. The time spent in visits for rare diseases (22.4 minutes) and visits for more common diseases (21.3 minutes) was not significantly different (p=.09). In an adjusted model controlling for patient characteristics (age, sex, types of insurance, reason for this visit, total number of chronic disease, having a rare disease and established or new patient), patients with

1
2
3 rare diseases were 52% more likely to be referred to another provider (OR 1.52, 95%
4
5 CI, 1.01-2.28).
6
7

8 **Conclusions:** Visits for rare diseases are uncommon in primary care practice. Future
9
10 research may help to explain whether this low level of management of rare diseases in
11
12 primary care practice is consistent with a goal of a broad scope of care.
13
14
15

16 17 18 19 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

- 20 • This study is the first research to investigate characteristics of patients with rare
21
22 diseases seen in primary care practice and the association between physician
23
24 referral and rare disease diagnosis.
25
26
- 27 • The study used population-based national representative data allowing for
28
29 generalizability.
30
31
- 32 • Primary care physicians may play a vital role in providing continuous care and
33
34 managing patients with rare diseases effectively.
35
36
- 37 • The study is limited to the actions recorded in one visit due to study design.
38
39
- 40 • The study was unable to determine if that referral is for a consult or part of a
41
42 shared care relationship between primary care and specialty care
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Introduction

Primary Care Physicians (PCPs) are trained to provide care for a broad scope of conditions within their patient population. When PCPs maintain a broad scope of practice this safeguards access and quality of care for the general population. Some of these conditions are managed directly by the PCP and with others the PCP coordinates the care for the patient. One recent study indicated that in one year, family physicians typically manage about 1,700 diagnoses in office visits, with 100 diagnoses managed frequently.(1)

In addition to common, high prevalence diseases like diabetes, hypertension and arthritis, a substantial proportion of the general patient population, has a rare disease, or diseases. As of 2017, the National Institute of Health (NIH) Genetic and Rare Disease Information Center (GARD) had identified 7,000 rare diseases, affecting approximately 25-30 million people in the US population. (2) Rare diseases are categorized as life-threatening, with only few limited effective therapies available. In addition to the emotional and physical burden associated with diagnosis, patients with a rare disease often face financial burden due to the significant cost associated with drugs and therapies. As such, early detection and treatment are critical. For example, in one study, more than half of patients with rare diseases being seen at a PCP practice had been diagnosed with rare diseases at a PCP practice.(3)

However, to date there have been few studies investigating the role of PCPs in the management of patients with rare diseases. The purpose of this study was to

1
2
3 examine in a nationally representative sample of visits, the prevalence of rare diseases
4
5 cared for in primary care practice as well as characteristics of patients and providers.
6
7

8 **Methods**

9
10
11 This study used the National Ambulatory Medical Care Survey (NAMCS), a national
12
13 representative dataset, for the years 2012-2014. The NAMCS is a national probability
14
15 sample survey of ambulatory medical care visits to office-based physicians that allows
16
17 for national estimates regarding medical care in the US. (3) Nonfederally employed
18
19 physicians defined by the American Medical Association and the American Osteopathic
20
21 Association who were principally engaged in patient care activities and who are not
22
23 specialized in anesthesiology, pathology and radiology were eligible. Also physicians
24
25 who are younger than 85 years of age at the time of the survey were eligible. Based on
26
27 multistage probability design, eligible PCPs were selected and informed about the
28
29 survey and those who agreed to participate to the survey were included in the data. (3)
30
31 NAMCS data is collected annually by the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS).
32
33 It is electronic record collected by the Census Bureau in the US and multiple steps were
34
35 implemented to process and review the data based on the NCHS protocol. The data
36
37 estimates to be reliable met two criteria, 1) sample records should be at least 30, and 2)
38
39 a relative standard error should be 30 percent or less. (3) The sample frame for NAMCS
40
41 data in the years 2012-2014 was composed of PCPs who specialize in primary care
42
43 (e.g., General and Family Practice, Internal medicine and Pediatrics), and who identified
44
45 themselves as the primary care physician (PCP) of the patient.(4) This list conforms to
46
47 the definition used by the NAMCS to categorize primary care. Diagnosis was
48
49 determined based upon the ICD-9 codes and the diagnosis made by a PCP at a visit
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 was electronically recorded in the patient record form. The patient report form provided
4 preexisting conditions, current diagnosis and new diagnosis. (5) Thus, more than 30
5
6 diagnoses can be managed via this report form. (6) Furthermore, this report form allows
7
8 us to identify established patients who have visited before whereas it does not allow us
9
10 to estimate numbers of previous visits. The unweighted sample size was 22,306
11
12 representing 354,507,772 office visits to PCPs in the US from 2012-2014.
13
14

15 16 17 18 Rare disease

19
20 A rare disease is defined as a disease or a disorder that affects fewer than 200,000
21
22 people in the US.(2, 7) For this study, diagnoses were identified as a rare disease using
23
24 the list provided by the GARD Information Center.(2) Two independent researchers and
25
26 (i.e., Dr. Jo and Larson) and one family medicine physician (i.e., Dr. Carek) reviewed all
27
28 new diagnosis in designated study years and identified rare diseases by comparing the
29
30 list of GARD. With consensus agreements, rare diseases for the study were
31
32 determined.
33
34
35

36 37 Independent Variables

38
39 Demographics of patients seen by PCPs, such as age, gender and race/ethnicity, were
40
41 used. Gender and race/ethnicity (i.e., Non-Hispanic White, Non-Hispanic Black,
42
43 Hispanics and Others) were considered categorical variables whereas age was used as
44
45 a continuous variable. In addition, their form of health insurance, major reason for the
46
47 visit, and total number of diagnosed chronic diseases were included as categorical
48
49 variables. Health insurance was stratified into four categories: private insurance, public
50
51 insurance such as Medicaid and Medicare, self-pay, and others. Major reason for the
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 visit was also categorized into four groups: new problems, chronic problems, pre- or
4
5 post-surgery care and preventive care.
6
7

8
9 Providers' characteristics including practice location (i.e., urban or rural), referral to
10
11 other providers (i.e., yes or no) were examined. Time spent with providers in primary
12
13 care setting was compared between patients with rare diseases and those without rare
14
15 diseases. Time spent with providers in primary care is the length of the time the provider
16
17 spent with the patient at the office and patient's waiting time to see the provider, receive
18
19 care from providers and prepare for a patient such as reviewing medical chart or
20
21 physical examination were excluded. (3)
22
23
24

25 26 Statistical Analysis

27
28 To account for the complex survey design used in the NAMCS, a weighted variable was
29
30 used to consider survey design effect. This allows for us to provide national estimates of
31
32 United States ambulatory health care visits to office-based physicians and community
33
34 health centers.(3) Also, it allows us to produce national estimates of the ambulatory
35
36 health care utilization in the US (3). The prevalence of rare disease seen in the primary
37
38 care office visit was estimated. Chi-square tests were used to compare characteristics
39
40 of PCPs who care for rare diseases against those who do not. Logistic regression was
41
42 also employed to examine the association between PCP referral to other providers and
43
44 patient diagnosis of a rare disease. All analyses were conducted in SAS version 9.4
45
46 (Cary, NC). This study was approved as exempt by the Institutional Review Board at the
47
48 University of Florida.
49
50
51

52 53 54 Patient and Public Involvement

55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Patients and/or public were not involved in this study.
4
5

6 Results 7

8
9 The final sample was 22,306 representing 354,507,772 office visits to PCPs in
10 the US from 2012-2014. A total of 1,508 PCPs participated to submit data for sample
11 patient visits. Of the total patient visits to a PCP, a rare disease was noted in 1.6% of
12 those visits. PCPs cared for 177 different rare diseases. Patients with rare diseases
13 were significantly older than those without rare diseases (age difference = 8.3 years,
14 $p < .01$), while no significant differences were found in the distribution of sex and
15 race/ethnicity (Table 1). The majority of patients with rare diseases were established
16 patients (93.0%), having been seen by the PCP more than one time, and almost half
17 (49.3%) were enrolled in private insurance programs. Of the visits for patients
18 diagnosed with a rare disease, 39.0% visited their PCPs with a comorbid chronic
19 problem. In addition, they had a higher total number of chronic diseases compared to
20 patients without rare diseases (Table 1).
21
22

23
24 Of visits by patients with rare disease, 14.3% were referred to other providers (Table 2).
25
26 While PCPs spent slightly more time with their patients who had rare diseases (22.4
27 min), compared to patients without rare diseases (21.3 min), it was not significantly
28 different (Table 2). The majority of visits for patients with rare diseases and more
29 common diseases who were seen by PCPs were located in urban areas. PCPs
30 practicing in rural areas (7.6%) were not significantly less likely than PCPs practicing in
31 urban areas (16.8%; $p = .06$) to refer patients with rare diseases to another physician. In
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 a bivariate analysis, care for rare disease was also not associated with rurality ($p=.32$)
4
5 (Table 2).
6
7

8 In an unadjusted regression model, patients with rare diseases were 69% more likely to
9
10 be referred to other providers than those without rare diseases. After controlling for
11
12 covariates, such as patients' characteristics (i.e., age, sex, race/ethnicity, types of
13
14 insurance, major reason for this visit, total number of chronic disease, having a rare
15
16 disease and established or new patient), patients with rare diseases were 52% more
17
18 likely to be referred to another provider than those without rare diseases (Table 3).
19
20
21
22

23 Discussion

24
25
26 This study found that few patients with a rare disease were identified as being managed
27
28 in primary care practice. Patients with rare diseases in the primary care setting show
29
30 significantly older and have more comorbidities compared to those without a rare
31
32 disease diagnosis whereas patients with rare diseases are comparable to those without
33
34 rare diseases in terms of sex distribution, race/ethnicity and types of health insurance.
35
36 Not surprisingly, visits in primary care for patients diagnosed with rare diseases are
37
38 more likely than patients without rare diseases to lead to referral to another provider.
39
40 To our knowledge, this is the first study to investigate characteristics of patients with
41
42 rare diseases seen in primary care practice and the association between physician
43
44 referral and rare disease diagnosis.
45
46
47
48
49

50 Much of medical practice and the corresponding comfort in diagnosing and treating
51
52 conditions is affected by the frequency of occurrence of the condition and pattern
53
54 recognition. Rare diseases are by their very nature uncommon and thus PCPs may not
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 always feel comfortable with the nuances of treatment and potential complications for a
4 disease that they encounter very infrequently. According to the National Academy of
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

always feel comfortable with the nuances of treatment and potential complications for a disease that they encounter very infrequently. According to the National Academy of Medicine, since rare diseases tend to accompany multiple common conditions, it disrupts a clinician's ability to recognize clues of rare diseases.⁽⁸⁾ In many of these cases PCPs need more than a consult from a specialist, especially when the primary care team does not have the specialized medical knowledge. Receiving all of their care from specialists may not be the best situation for the patient. Patients with rare diseases need to be managed in primary care or at least have shared care between primary care and specialists in complementary roles to provide a more effective management of these complex patients.

There are some limitations to this study. First, due to the design of the NAMCS we are limited to the actions recorded in that one visit. The design does allow us to have an understanding of the types of patients seen in primary care but it is not data on a cohort of patients. Thus, we do not know what sort of care may have transpired between the patient and the physician in previous visits. Also, it is not able to explore the linkage of multiple consultations with specialists pre- or post-visit to PCPs. Second, we are able to see if patients are referred in that one visit, we are unable to determine if that referral is for a consult or part of a shared care relationship between primary care and specialty care.

Conclusion

This study identified characteristics of patients with rare diseases who are seen in primary care practice and the delivery patterns of PCPs managing patients with rare

1
2
3 diseases. Findings from this study suggest that PCPs must possess a broad scope of
4
5 practice in order to deliver comprehensive, high-quality care. A better understanding of
6
7 the overall management of patients with rare diseases managed solely outside of
8
9 primary care would help to improve the care for these patients.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

Acknowledgements

Contributors:

Ara Jo, PhD led the entire research as the first and corresponding author from writing the manuscript, analyzing the data and interpretation.

Samantha Larson, MPH, analyzed the data and contributed to writing the manuscript.

Peter J. Carek, MD, MS contributed to writing the manuscript.

Michael R. Peabody, PhD, contributed to writing the manuscript.

Lars E. Peterson, MD, PhD, contributed to writing the manuscript.

Arch G. Mainous III, PhD, contributed to writing the manuscript and guided the direction of the study.

Competing Interests Statement: Drs. Peterson and Peabody are employees of the American Board of Family Medicine. No other authors have no declaration of conflict of interests.

Funding Statement: This work was supported by a grant from the American Board of Family Medicine Foundation.

Ethics approval: This study was approved as exempt by the Institutional Review Board at the University of Florida.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Data availability statement: Data are available through the National Ambulatory Medical
Care Survey access from
https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/ahcd/datasets_documentation_related.htm.

For peer review only

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2018-027248 on 1 April 2019. Downloaded from <http://bmjopen.bmj.com/> on July 2, 2023 by guest. Protected by copyright.

References

1. Peabody MR, O'Neill TR, Stelter KL, Puffer JC. Frequency and Criticality of Diagnoses in Family Medicine Practices: From the National Ambulatory Medical Care Survey (NAMCS). *The Journal of the American Board of Family Medicine*. 2018;31(1):126-38.
2. GARD. FAQs About Rare Diseases: National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences; 11/30/2017 [Available from: <https://rarediseases.info.nih.gov/diseases/pages/31/faqs-about-rare-diseases>].
3. Phillips WR. Zebras on the commons: rare conditions in family practice. *The Journal of the American Board of Family Practice*. 2004;17(4):283-6.
4. NCHS. NAMCS Scope and Sample Design: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; 11/6/2015 [Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/ahcd/ahcd_scope.htm].
5. NHCS. 2014 NAMCS micro-data file documentation. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; 2014.
6. NCHS. National Ambulatory Medical Care Survey 2018 Patient Record. Available from https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/ahcd/2018_NAMCS_Patient_Record_Sample_Card.pdf.

- 1
2
3 7. US Food & Drug Administration (FDA). Orphan Drug Act - Relevant Excerpts. August
4
5 2013 Available from
6
7
8 <https://www.fda.gov/forindustry/developingproductsforrareconditions/howto>
9
10 [applyfororphanproductdesignation/ucm364750.htm](https://www.fda.gov/forindustry/developingproductsforrareconditions/howto).
11
12
13
14
15
- 16 8. Boat TF, Field MJ. Rare diseases and orphan products: Accelerating research and
17
18 development: National Academies Press; 2011.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Characteristics of Patients with Rare Diseases in Primary Care, NAMCS 2012-2014 (unweighted N= 22,306, weighted N= 354,507,772)

	Patients with rare diseases (%)	Patients without rare diseases (%)	p-value
Unweighted Sample Size	363	21,943	
Weighted Sample Size	5,581,791	348,925,981	
Mean Age (year-old) **	47.7	39.4	<0.001
Sex			
Female	56.4	53.8	0.44
Race			
Non-Hispanic White	75.0	70.6	0.54
Non-Hispanic Black	8.6	10.1	
Hispanics	11.7	14.3	
Others	4.7	5.0	
Insurance Types			
Private Insurance	49.3	54.6	0.15
Public Insurance	47.3	40.0	
Self-pay	1.8	3.5	
Other	1.5	1.9	
Major reasons for this visit**			
New Problems	33.7	42.6	0.002
Chronic Problems	39.0	28.7	
Pre-/Post-Surgery	27.3	28.7	
Preventive Care	0.0	0.0	
Total Number of Chronic Diseases**	1.3	1.0	0.001

** statistical significant level at .05

Table 2. Practice Characteristics of Primary Care Physicians who Care for Patients with Rare Diseases using NAMCS, 2012-2014

	Patients with rare diseases	Patients without rare diseases	p-value
Practicing Area			
Urban	84.5	86.4	0.32
Rural	15.5	13.6	
Referral to Other Providers**			
Yes	14.3	9.0	0.01
No	85.7	91.0	
Time Spent with Providers (min)	22.4	21.3	0.09

** statistical significant level at .05

Table 3. Odds Ratios of Referral Using Unadjusted and Adjusted Logistic Regression Analyses using NAMCS, 2012-2014

	Unadjusted OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR (95% CI)
Not having a rare disease	Reference	Reference
Having a rare disease	1.69 (1.15-2.48)**	1.52 (1.01-2.28)**

*Controlled for age, gender, race/ethnicity, types of insurance, major reason for this visit, total number of chronic disease, having a rare disease and established vs. new patient.

** statistical significant level at .05

For peer review only

STROBE Statement—checklist of items that should be included in reports of observational studies

	Item No	Recommendation	Page
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2-3
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	4-5
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	4-5
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	5
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	n/a
Participants	6	(a) <i>Cohort study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up <i>Case-control study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale for the choice of cases and controls <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	5
		(b) <i>Cohort study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed <i>Case-control study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per case	n/a
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	5-6
Data sources/measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	5-6
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	n/a
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	5
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	n/a
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	6
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	6
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	n/a
		(d) <i>Cohort study</i> —If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed <i>Case-control study</i> —If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed <i>Cross-sectional study</i> —If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	5-6
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	

Results			Page
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	n/a
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	n/a
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	n/a
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	7
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	n/a
		(c) <i>Cohort study</i> —Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	n/a
Outcome data	15*	<i>Cohort study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	n/a
		<i>Case-control study</i> —Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure	n/a
		<i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	7-8, 14
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	7-8
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	n/a
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	n/a
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	n/a
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	8
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	9
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	8-9
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	8
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	9

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.