Perspectives and Recommendations from Hospitalized Patients with Substance Use Disorders: A Qualitative Study

Evan A. Balmuth, BS[1], Sonali Iyer, BA[1], David A. Scales, MD, PhD[2], and Jonathan Avery, MD[3]

1 Weill Cornell Medical College, New York, NY, USA
2 Department of Medicine, Division of General Internal Medicine, NewYork-Presbyterian Hospital/Weill Cornell Medical College, New York, NY, USA
3 Department of Psychiatry, NewYork-Presbyterian Hospital/Weill Cornell Medical College, New York, NY, USA

Corresponding author: Evan A. Balmuth (email: eab4002@med.cornell.edu)

ABSTRACT

BACKGROUND: Patients with substance use disorders (SUDs) are hospitalized in growing numbers. Stigma is pervasive among their hospital providers, and SUD management during medical admissions is often inadequate. However, little is known about how these patients perceive their care quality. In particular, few studies have explored their positive care perceptions or recommendations for improvement.
OBJECTIVE: To explore perspectives on positive aspects, negative aspects, and consequences of care, as well as recommendations for improvement among hospitalized patients with SUDs.
DESIGN AND PARTICIPANTS: We conducted semi-structured, in-depth bedside interviews (*n* = 15) with patients who have been diagnosed with a SUD and were admitted to medical or surgical floors of an urban academic medical center.
APPROACH: Interviews explored patients' hospital experiences and recommendations for improvement. The interviews were audio-recorded, transcribed verbatim, and imported into NVivo software. Two reviewers independently coded the transcripts using interpretative phenomenological analysis and inductive thematic analysis according to grounded theory, and recurring themes were identified from the data. Patients' demographic and clinical data were analyzed with descriptive statistics.
KEY RESULTS: Perceived clinical and emotional proficiency were the most important components of positive experiences, whereas perceived bias and stigmatized attitudes, clinical improficiency, and inhumane treatment were characteristic of negative experiences. Such care components were most consequential for patients' emotional wellbeing, trust, and care quality. Recommendations for improving care included specific suggestions for initiating and promoting continued recovery, educating, and partnering in compassionate care.
CONCLUSIONS: Hospitalized patients with SUDs often experience lower quality and less compassionate care linked to pervasive stigma and poor outcomes. Our study highlights under-recognized perspectives from this patient population, including socioemotional consequences of care and recommendations grounded in lived experiences. By striving to advance our care in accordance with patients' viewpoints, we can turn hospitalizations into opportunities for engagement and promoting recovery.

INTRODUCTION

The United States faces a worsening epidemic of substance use-associated morbidity and mortality. Over 46 million people had a substance use disorder (SUD) in 2021,[1] and over 109,000 people died from overdoses in that year.[2] Furthermore, an estimated 1 in 7 hospital admissions are for patients with SUDs – and this proportion appears to be increasing over time.[3] Despite the substantial number of patients with SUDs in hospitals, little is known about how they perceive the quality of their care.

Research on clinician attitudes and prescribing suggests that patients with SUDs face tremendous barriers to quality care in the hospital. First, stigma surrounding substance use is pervasive among their providers.[4-8] Although this stigma is coming into greater focus through research on clinician attitudes – often led by physicians from the growing fields of addiction medicine and harm reduction[9] – providers nonetheless tend to reject the brain disease model of addiction in favor of the belief that addiction is an individual's choice, or even that it represents a moral lapse. Strikingly, a recent survey of 301 internists and psychiatrists revealed that 69% believed individuals with SUDs had a choice about their substance use – including five percent who indicated that addiction reflects a deficit of self-control, and two percent who explicitly indicated that addiction reflects a moral failure.[6] Moreover, negative attitudes toward patients with SUDs tend to worsen over the course of medical training.[7,8] Second, largely due to a lack of knowledge and teaching, many hospital providers are uncomfortable treating SUDs – including opioid use disorder (OUD) and alcohol use disorder (AUD), for which evidence-based treatments are widely available.[4,10,11] Together, these factors likely contribute to an established under-treatment of these SUDs in hospital settings, in addition to lower provider engagement, patient-provider collaboration, and treatment adherence.[11-18]

Considering this predominant stigma and discomfort in managing SUDs, it is not surprising that patients with SUDs have reported negative experiences and mistrust in inpatient settings.[5,19-21] Patients with SUDs have indicated that experiences of discrimination and stigma surrounding their SUDs, as well as undertreated withdrawal and ongoing cravings to use, are core drivers of their decisions to pursue patient-directed discharge (PDD) from internal medicine wards.[21] Additional studies have revealed mutual mistrust between patients with SUDs and their hospital internal medicine providers, also influenced by stigma and negative preconceptions.[5,20,22] This poses a substantial threat to the quality of their care, as mistrust has been shown to jeopardize engagement in care and treatment adherence.[23]

In light of the unique challenges faced by the growing number of hospitalized patients with SUDs, a greater understanding of their perspectives and recommendations is urgently needed. Only a small number of studies have explored these patients' perspectives regarding their hospital experiences – and among these, even fewer have gathered their opinions on how care can be improved. Efforts to address these patients' concerns and consider novel interventions can increase satisfaction, engagement, trust in the therapeutic alliance, and overall care quality.[5,11,13-18,20,21,23] Furthermore, coordinating patient engagement in the evaluation, design and delivery of health services can lead to enhanced care delivery and education development.[24]

In this qualitative study, we explore perspectives and recommendations among hospitalized patients with SUDs through semi-structured interviews. Our approach is unique in assessing both positive and negative aspects, as well as consequences of care. In addition, we prioritize patients' voices by highlighting their recommendations for improvement. Ultimately, greater appreciation of these often

marginalized viewpoints can lead to more humane, higher-quality care for patients with SUDs – including novel interventions born out of their lived experiences.

METHODS

Study Design

This is a qualitative, descriptive study. We conducted semi-structured, in-depth interviews with 15 patients during their hospital admissions at NewYork-Presbyterian/Weill Cornell Medical Center (NYP/WC), an urban academic hospital New York City. The study was approved by the Weill Cornell Institutional Review Board.

Study Participants

Potential participants were drawn by convenience sampling from primary medical or surgical teams consulting the hospital's addiction consult service (ACS). Eligible patients were 18 years or older and had a documented SUD diagnosis confirmed by chart review. Ineligible patients were those unwilling or unable to independently provide informed consent. All eligible patients were approached at bedside by a male medical student interviewer (EAB) trained in qualitative interview methods, SUD treatment, harm reduction principles, and anti-stigma patient-centered communication who had no prior relationship with the participants and was not involved in their care. The interviewer conceptualized this study for a dedicated research component of his medical studies, informed by interests in addiction medicine and internal medicine. The interviewer clarified that he was a medical student but was not part of the patient's care team, explained the study's purpose and confidentiality procedures (including a statement that all responses would remain anonymous and would not be relayed to the participant's medical team or impact their care), and

requested verbal consent for participation in an approximately 30- to 60-minute audio-recorded interview. While some patients agreed to participate upon initial visit by the interviewer, others deferred their decision to a later time or day, eventually agreeing to participate upon repeat visit. In total, we approached 18 patients and interviewed 15. The three patients who were approached but not interviewed had all expressed interest in participating, but deferred their decision to a later day and were ultimately discharged before an interview could be conducted. All participants received a $25 Amazon gift card.

Data Collection

We obtained pertinent demographic and clinical characteristics (**Table 1**) by chart review. We conducted, audio-recorded, and transcribed 15 bedside in-depth interviews. Interviews were conducted privately, except for a patient roommate present behind a separation curtain for some interviews, as well as occasional brief interruptions for routine medical care by the treatment team. No repeat interviews were conducted, and no field notes were made. Our semi-structured interview guide was informed by prior studies involving patients with SUDs[20-22] and incorporated novel questions to explore both positive and negative aspects, as well as consequences of care on patients' experiences and their recommendations for improvement (**Supplemental Table 1**). Questions were open-ended and asked patients to reflect upon care in their present admission, as well as prior admissions in any hospital. All patient demographic and clinical characteristics, audio recordings, and transcripts were stored in REDCap, a secure data management system and web platform.[25,26]

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were calculated as medians, ranges, counts and percentages in Microsoft Excel 16.73.[27] An analyst (EAB) trained in qualitative methods transcribed the interviews verbatim into

text documents which were uploaded into NVivo 12 Plus.[28] Due to limitations in contacting patients post-discharge, transcripts and findings were not returned to participants for comment. Two analysts (EAB and SI), both medical students trained in qualitative methods who had experience caring for individuals with SUDs, systematically coded the transcripts in NVivo 12 Plus[28] through interpretative phenomenological analysis[29] and thematic analysis,[30] employing an inductive approach based on grounded theory to derive all themes from the data.[31] Briefly, the analysts assigned codes to all new ideas identified in the transcripts; each code was applied to all recurrences of the same idea identified throughout its original transcript and in all subsequent transcripts. The analysts cross-coded the first five transcripts, independently coding each transcript and meeting regularly to compare codes, ultimately achieving consensus on a preliminary codebook. All subsequent interviews were coded separately. The analysts met regularly to discuss new codes, and through a consensus-based discursive approach, iteratively reorganized and expanded the codebook. The analysts returned to previous transcripts and identified any instances of new codes. After every five new transcripts had been analyzed, the analysts reviewed their shared codebook to identify major themes; minor themes were identified as those within a major theme's category which recurred across multiple transcripts. Major themes comprised sets of codes representing most, if not all, transcripts; minor themes generally comprised codes that recurred across at least five transcripts, though analysts did not use strict frequency cutoffs. Interviews were conducted in parallel to analysis, which continued until theoretical saturation – the point at which no new themes emerged from additional transcripts.[31-34]

Our methods are reported according to the COREQ checklist for qualitative research.[35]

RESULTS

Demographic and Clinical Characteristics

Table 1 shows the participants' demographic and clinical characteristics (*n* = 15). Where available, characteristics of the New York City general population are also provided. The median age was 58 years (range 25-74). Sex was 73% male and 27% female. Fifty-three percent identified as White, 33% as Black or African American, 7% as Asian, and 7% as Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin. The median number of prior non-psychiatric hospital admissions was 5 (range 0-27). Participants' SUD diagnoses included: AUD (53%), OUD (53%), stimulant use disorder (27%), tobacco use disorder (20%), and benzodiazepine use disorder (BUD) (7%); 40% of participants carried more than one SUD diagnosis. The median admission duration at time of interview was 7 days (range 3-23). The median interview duration was 20 minutes (range 6-53).

Perceived Aspects of Care

Table 2 lists the recurring themes of patients' perceived positive aspects, negative aspects, and consequences of care. Notably, nearly all participants discussed both positive and negative perceptions; interviews tended to be neither overwhelmingly positive nor overwhelmingly negative. In the following sections, positive and negative aspects are presented separately, with consequences interwoven throughout. Participants are identified by initials representing pseudonyms to preserve confidentiality.

Perceived Positive Aspects of Care

Clinical Proficiency: Partnership, Knowledgeability, Ethics, and Adequate Care Delivery

Within the domain of clinical skills, a provider's ability to partner with their patient was seen as especially important. For example, most patients appreciated when their providers listened to them, valued their input, and responded to their concerns. A.Z. – a woman with OUD and BUD – described how happy and trusting she felt when the team took her opinion into account and changed her withdrawal treatment:

> I said, "actually, this feels more like it's opioid withdrawal-related. So instead of the Librium which is to taper off of benzos, I think that I actually need more Suboxone …" And I was shocked. Less than an hour later, she came back, she said, "I have more Suboxone for you." … I was very happy … I'm like, "I'm happy that you listened, and you took my opinion into account." Because, I clearly have knowledge in this area … Listening to what I'm telling you is going on in my body is important to me. I know that I trust that the people who are taking care of me trust me.

Individualized care was seen as another crucial aspect of partnership. B.Y. – a woman with OUD – explained how she felt treated as an individual person, rather than stereotyped as an "addict" with all the associated stigma: "They actually treat you as the patient first, and being the addict as a secondary factor." Similarly, C.X. – a man with AUD – expressed how motivated he felt when his team communicated in the way that worked best for him: "Everything that was told here, really is … exactly what *I* wanted to hear. And how they make you feel when they see you pushing yourself, makes you want to push yourself more and more." Several patients also appreciated when providers took a thorough substance use history to inform their care – such as D.W., a man with OUD who felt accommodated when asked about his non-prescribed methadone dose: "I let them know that I was

using in the street, and they asked me what was the dosage I was using. And I told them, and they accommodated me."

Many patients also praised their providers' knowledgeability – especially with regard to managing SUDs. E.V. – a man with AUD – stated: "They know their stuff – they're specialists in the field, you know. Especially the addiction specialists." B.Y. felt most trusting of a provider whose knowledge was informed by personal experiences with addiction: "They had been there … Sometimes – unless you've experienced it either firsthand or through watching a family member go through it – there are certain things you just don't understand."

In addition, patients tended to emphasize how their providers upheld an ethical code of conduct. Most praised their teams for providing equal care regardless of substance use history, and for giving their best effort. For example, F.T. – a man with OUD – stated: "They don't treat you any different here. If you're an addict here, they do everything they can to make you comfortable." Many patients, including F.T., also believed their providers had good intentions and cared deeply: "I truly believe that they have the best interests of their patients at heart." Some, including E.V., appreciated when their providers not only intended to treat their most immediate concern, but also lead them on a path to long-term recovery: "I think they're very sympathetic and want to help you – they want you to quit." "They're hoping that their advice leaves a lasting impression on you."

Perceptions of adequate pain control and SUD treatment were also key to a positive experience. For example, F.T. appreciated how he received analgesics as needed, without any question of his intentions: "If I woke up at two in the morning hurting, and I called and needed pain medication, I

got it, no questions asked. There was none of that, 'are you drug seeking right now?'" G.S. – a man with a history of OUD and stimulant use disorder – explained how he achieved his goal of abstinence after a prior hospital team helped him start medications for OUD:

> I said … "when I leave this hospital, I don't want to be on none of that stuff." Sure enough, they worked with me, and gave me all the proper medicines and medication, and – me being motivated physically, spiritually, mentally – I kicked all that heavy drug stuff.

Lastly, efficiency and speediness were seen as key elements of care delivery. As G.S. expressed:

> I really love the way everyone works here so efficiently … When you ask something – not that it be right away, but … as soon as possible, and it's usually less than five minutes or something like that, or 10… They always come through here.

Emotional Proficiency: Compassion and Investment in Relationships

Alongside components of clinical aptitude, perceived emotional proficiency was also a core contributor to patients' positive experiences. Specifically, patients emphasized the importance of treating with kindness and compassion. For example, B.Y. remarked: "It's been wonderful. The teams here have always been so nice to me;" H.R. – a woman with a history of OUD – stated: "Kindness is the biggest thing."

Beyond spending time to discuss clinical matters, many appreciated when their providers invested in building a relationship. I.Q. – a man with AUD – experienced that trust improved when providers got to know him on a personal level: "The better they get to know me, the better the trust." J.P. –

also a man with AUD – explained that humor and small talk can lead to more openness, trust, and even friendship through a prolonged admission:

> [The provider] will make a joke with me. Maybe she said something about her family for example, or, vacation … and then open up a little bit. I say, "oh, yeah, I was there…" And you build the trust, and then you can, [over the course of] four months, [build] the friendship.

Some patients developed particularly strong relationships with their providers. For example, F.T. was especially moved by the encouragement he received from an addiction medicine physician:

> Dr. X was the first person in my lifetime … to sit across from me and look me in my eyes and tell me that she believed in me … and that she – as of knowing me for a couple weeks now and talking to me every day – she fully believed in me 100 percent that I could … get past the withdrawal and … not only can I get sober, but that I can maintain my sobriety for my lifetime … That meant a lot to me.

Perceived Negative Aspects of Care

Bias and Stigmatized Attitudes: Assumptions, Judgment, and Labeling

Most patients had experienced stigma in hospitals, and perceived that this often took the form of assumptions based on their substance use history. B.Y. described how people with SUDs are often assumed to be "drug-seeking," leading to lower quality care, neglect – and sometimes, unnecessary worsening of illness and death: "A lot of times, a lot of people get really sick and die because they were treated with subpar care or weren't treated with care at all, because they think that we're drug-seeking." She elaborated further that many providers seem reluctant to provide pain medication

based on the assumption that this will worsen the SUD. However, without adequate pain control, she might be inclined to pursue PDD:

> I think it's like, they think that because I've done drugs, if they give me something for pain that it's gonna trigger me to do something worse. When in reality … if I'm not being medicated to a point that I'm comfortable, it makes me want to leave.

K.O. – a woman with AUD – explained how she has felt labeled by her diagnosis, which follows her across hospitalizations and leads to perceived judgment:

> I think you get labeled. I think it's kind of like – you know as a kid they would tell you, "that's going on your permanent record!" That's how you feel. Like, this is gonna follow you. Everywhere you go … I think people view you differently. I think that there is judgment.

Clinical Improficiency: Lack of Partnership, Poor Knowledge, and Inadequate Care Delivery

A lack of partnership was often seen as detrimental to care quality. Several patients described a sense that they were being treated with a uniform approach for all people with their SUD – even if it was not the right fit for them. For example, K.O. remarked: "Everybody's very different. We're all individuals, so our problems are gonna be individual … It just seems like there's just this one blanket answer for everything." She elaborated that teams too often pushed for abstinence, without asking patients what *they* were ready for and what the implications of that change would be. As a result, she felt blamed for what she considered to be an important part of her identity:

> I think it's a personal choice, and to be made to feel almost like you're a failure… But you're not a failure … it's a part of your life … it's part of who you are. And if it's, "you're sick! You're sick!" But it *is* who you are.

Such "one-size-fits-all" approaches also impeded trust. As A.Z. explained: "If a doctor comes in and this is … the, 'you're ok, trust me, I've seen a hundred cases like this' doctor; you can't trust a doctor like that, because every human is an individual."

Partnership was also hampered when patients felt their personal experiences with substance use were not respected. For example, K.O. felt distrusted when the team did not seem to believe her own explanation for her anxiety symptoms, which she found most consistent with a panic attack; instead, the team insisted it was withdrawal – despite the patient's extensive experience with both conditions. Furthermore, she felt frustrated with her medical team's apparent knowledge gap – she knew it was unlikely for withdrawal to play a major role after one week in the hospital:

> They were like, "well, are you sure that you're having an anxiety attack? Or is this withdrawal?" I was like, "no, I'm not – I know anxiety attacks, I have them. And I'm having an anxiety attack, this is not withdrawal" … Can't you just believe me? … I'm not lying to you … I've been drinking a very long time. I've done the withdrawal on my own. I know what withdrawal is … We all know after a week I'm not really gonna have … like a seizure or a whatever.

Perceived inadequate care delivery was another primary concern among patients. Many felt that they simply did not have enough time or familiarity with their providers. F.T. explained how this impeded

trust-building: “I don’t know them well enough. They haven’t spent enough time with me for me to turn around and say I trust them.” Waiting to receive care was also seen as a common problem. E.V. expressed how frustrating it can be to wait for medication when experiencing withdrawal: “In a condition when … you’re going through withdrawals, and you expect to get immediate medication … sometimes it takes a while for them to order it, or get it and so forth, and it sort of irritates you.” Inadequate pain and withdrawal management were also common concerns. G.S. described how he was not discharged with enough pain medication after surgery – and this almost triggered a return to use:

> When I got home I realized … I’m in so much pain … with all the staples, and with only like a week’s supply – not even – of the oxys … I’m in pain now, and I’m already down to a few of these things … That was the scariest moment of my life … because the fact of just going home, what’s gonna happen – especially people like myself – you know, ex-addicts, it’s easy for us to just go pick up a bag of heroin.

L.N. – a man with OUD – described a time when he was hospitalized after an opioid overdose, but was not treated to prevent withdrawal: “Before, when I overdosed in the past, I’d be in the hospital and then … you’d be there for a day and then you can get withdrawals while you’re there.”

Inhumane Treatment: Discrimination, Neglect, and Disrespect

Treatment was frequently perceived to cross a line from low quality to inhumane. For instance, patients described numerous experiences of discrimination based on their substance use history. This often centered on the issue of pain control; F.T. explained that revealing an SUD diagnosis often results in inadequate pain management:

> A lot of times, when you're an addict and you come into the hospital, they're not liberal with pain medication when you tell them you're an addict. It doesn't benefit to be truthful with them about those things in hospitals, unfortunately, when it should.

Discrimination was also perceived in the form of dismissing medical concerns. B.Y. described an experience with a physician who she felt was judgmental and did not take her complaints seriously, nearly leading to a missed diagnosis: "I actually had a severe underlying condition that would've gone completely unnoticed if I had stuck with the original physician put on me because he basically writes off … anybody who has addiction issues." Notably, the dismissiveness she perceived led her to request a different provider. B.Y. also perceived that patients with AUD may be treated better than those with OUD:

> I feel like they take alcohol use way more serious. They care way more about it. Like if you have a history of alcohol use, they're gonna make sure that you're more comfortable than an opioid user because there's more clinical evidence that alcohol withdrawal can kill you.

Several patients also reported experiencing complete neglect. F.T. described an experience when he sought withdrawal treatment, but never received care:

> I told them the situation, the actual situation, that I have money, I just can't find anything, and I'm really getting sick and desperate, and I need help. And they let me sit in that waiting room – I'd still be sitting there now if I didn't just get up and leave. They never called me again … They just pretended and acted like I just straight up did not exist.

In addition, patients reported frequent experiences of blatant disrespect from providers and other hospital staff. This took many forms, from rude comments to taunting and even physical aggression. A.Z. described the experience of a man with the same condition who she had accompanied to another hospital:

> They treated him disrespectfully, they … handcuffed him when they didn't know what to do with him. They were physically violent with him, they spoke to him disrespectfully, and, first and foremost, they didn't help him. And they kind of made fun of him and taunted him, like, "oh, he's doing that thing again." And it was very upsetting.

B.Y. explained that she sometimes feels blamed for her own medical conditions because of her SUD history:

> At another hospital, they would have just told me to shut up and that I'm just a big baby and that I did it to myself. And that if I didn't want to feel this way then I shouldn't have done drugs. Nobody deserves to be treated like crap just because they got high.

Patient Recommendations for Improvement

Table 3 lists the recurring themes of patients' recommendations for improving care, alongside examples of specific initiatives they proposed and supporting quotations. One recurring theme among patients' recommendations was to initiate and promote continued recovery; specific suggestions included psychotherapy, publicizing and offering to initiate SUD treatment, helping patients prepare for exposure to substance-related cues post-discharge, and establishing post-discharge pain management plans. Another recurring theme centered on education – specifically, augmenting education about SUDs for both patients and providers. A third recurring theme was

promoting partnership in compassionate care; suggested approaches included treating with compassion, individualizing care, prioritizing patient viewpoints and increasing accountability through satisfaction surveys, and listening to both patients and their advocates.

DISCUSSION

This qualitative study presents key perspectives from hospitalized patients with SUDs, placing unique emphasis on such under-explored domains as perceived positive aspects and consequences of care, as well as patients' own recommendations for improvement. Whether expressed through positive or negative experiences, patients overwhelmingly underscored elements of partnership – with providers valuing their input and choices – as core components of their expectations for clinical proficiency. Meeting these expectations is key to helping patients onto a path of recovery. Hospitalized patients with SUDs have previously highlighted the importance of choice and patient-centered, compassionate, non-judgmental care for building trust and readiness to change.[20-22,36] Our findings elaborate upon prior work by describing how patients often feel treated with a "one-size-fits all" approach, and emphasizing the importance of individualized care informed by the patient's readiness to change. Effective partnership in this setting undoubtedly requires knowledgeability and practice on the part of providers. Previous studies have demonstrated key roles for provider knowledgeability and expertise in managing SUDs, as perceived by their patients; these have been shown to influence patients' trust and readiness to engage in treatment.[20,22] Our study expands upon this work by highlighting that personal experience with addiction can put certain team members in a unique position to build trust. This is consistent with research suggesting that peer mentors – individuals currently in recovery who offer to share their lived experiences – hold great potential for improving hospital care.[36]

Our patients also perceived stigma to be pervasive in hospital settings, yielding profound repercussions. Specifically, patients reported feeling stereotyped based on the "label" of SUD in their medical history, as well as stigmatized assumptions that they were "drug-seeking" or that treating pain could precipitate relapse, all of which have been previously described.[21,37,38] In addition, our findings support a body of work showing that hospitalized patients with SUDs also experience bias and discrimination in their care – often manifesting with inadequate pain and withdrawal management.[5,20-22] One patient perceived that opioid withdrawal was taken less seriously than alcohol withdrawal; this may reflect prior work which demonstrated more negative resident attitudes toward patients with OUD than patients with AUD,[39] though further study is warranted to better understand how experiences vary among patients with different SUDs. Regardless of the specific SUD diagnosis, experiences with stigma, bias, and discrimination have far-reaching consequences for the patient-physician relationship and downstream outcomes. For our patients, trust in their providers, as well as the degree of openness and honesty in the therapeutic alliance, were especially dependent on their perceptions of the care they received. In addition, some aspects of care – such as patients feeling that their medical concerns were dismissed – affected patients' own sense of trustworthiness. Our participants also provided unique insights into emotional consequences of their care; often illuminating the fear and despair that can result from poor treatment, they also highlighted the inspiration and positive outlooks that can result from compassionate care. Our findings build upon prior work which has demonstrated lower treatment adherence and engagement in care among patients with SUDs who experience stigma and discrimination.[4,12,13,15] Furthermore, pain and withdrawal management have previously been identified as important contributors to trust, readiness to change, and – when inadequately addressed – decisions to pursue PDD.[21,22,37] Prior

studies have also shown that hospital providers tend to lack knowledge and comfort in managing SUDs, and that withdrawal tends to be undertreated for hospitalized patients with OUD.[11,18] Moreover, persistent pain has been associated with relapse and poor outcomes in outpatient SUD treatment,[40,41] though a role for undertreated pain following medical hospitalizations remains under-appreciated; further study is urgently needed to understand providers' biases and challenges regarding pain control for hospitalized patients with SUDs, and to fully characterize the extent and impact of under-treated pain toward evidence-based care improvements.

Patients imparted salient recommendations for improving their hospital care which are substantiated in existing literature and warrant further investigation. For example, many of their recommendations aimed to facilitate partnership in compassionate care, with a focus on individualization and listening. This approach parallels principles of motivational interviewing: an evidence-based, patient-centered method for enhancing intrinsic motivation and guiding care based on the patient's values and readiness to change[42] which requires further study in inpatient settings. Psychosocial interventions, including group and individual psychotherapy, were also recommended. Various approaches to psychotherapy have an established evidence basis in outpatient and psychiatric inpatient settings.[43,44] A small body of work suggests that psychotherapy can reduce readmission rates after medical hospitalizations;[45] however, future studies will be needed to determine which types of interventions will be most effective in hospital settings. Our participants also recommended key interventions – such as ensuring a post-discharge pain management plan and connecting patients with timely post-discharge SUD follow-up – that could improve patient safety during the days following hospital discharge, which represent a high-risk period for return to use and overdose.[46] Finally, patients recommended augmenting SUD education. Given the established knowledge gaps among hospital

providers, there remains a substantial need to expand SUD education at all levels of medical training.[10,11] Some initiatives have demonstrated effectiveness in improving knowledge and confidence managing SUDs, as well as reducing stigma among residents;[39,47,48] however, such programs are not widely implemented. Participants also recommended more in-hospital SUD education for patients, especially surrounding substance use-related health consequences and treatment options. During medical admissions, SUD management is often deferred to outpatient follow-up; however, studies have established the feasibility of initiating treatment for AUD and OUD prior to discharge.[49-51] Our study builds upon this work by emphasizing that many patients with SUDs are eager to learn about, initiate, or resume treatment during their medical admissions; for those who are not yet ready for treatment, the admission is an opportune time to provide education as an initial step toward recovery.

Our findings should be considered in the context of important limitations. First, this study was conducted in a single urban academic medical center in New York City and utilized convenience sampling. Although patients drew upon experiences in numerous hospitals, the generalizability of our findings remains limited. Furthermore, since the interviewer was a medical student, some participants could have been less inclined to convey negative perceptions about other providers (being his colleagues in the same institution) for fear of offending them, which could theoretically impact their care. We aimed to mitigate this potential courtesy bias[52] by emphasizing to each potential participant that the interviewer was not involved in their care, and that their responses would remain anonymous and would not be shared with their care team. We also intentionally encouraged participants to reflect upon both present and prior admissions, recognizing that discussion of admissions at other hospitals could represent an avenue for patients to discuss negative

experiences without concern for offending their current providers. However, this open-ended interview structure did now allow for discrimination of more or less positive experiences in specific hospital settings or with specific providers. In addition, our sample size was small. While participants shared their personal experiences as well as observations of other patients' care, our sample size was insufficient to identify differences based on SUD sub-type, demographic background, admitting diagnosis, or treatment service. Relatedly, women and individuals identifying as Asian or of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin were under-represented.[53] Moreover, all potential participants were English-speaking; this could reflect a possible bias affecting consults to the ACS which warrants further evaluation. It is imperative that future studies seek perspectives and recommendations in different settings (e.g., community hospitals, obstetric units, intensive care units) and among patients from underrepresented backgrounds.

Amidst pervasive stigma and a growing burden of substance use-associated morbidity and mortality, hospitalized patients with SUDs often experience lower quality and less compassionate care linked to poor outcomes. Despite evidence that patient engagement in evaluating and designing health services can lead to enhanced care delivery,[24] our study is one of the first to engage individuals with SUDs in assessing their hospital care and producing recommendations for improvement. By amplifying patients' voices, we aim to raise awareness of important care inequalities and their consequences alongside novel recommendations for improvement grounded in patients' lived experiences; these should inform future studies and novel interventions toward improving care for hospitalized patients with SUDs. Our findings suggest that ensuring patients feel heard by meeting their expectations for clinical and emotional proficiency should yield great potential for improving outcomes; future studies are needed to further explore these expectations, approaches to meeting

them, and resultant outcomes. Ultimately, by striving to advance our care in accordance with patients' viewpoints, we can turn hospitalizations into opportunities for engagement and promoting recovery.

Acknowledgements: The authors thank the Weill Cornell ACS for helping us identify potential participants and providing exceptional care to hospitalized patients with SUDs; the Weill Cornell Area of Concentration (AOC) Program for providing opportunities for mentorship in research; the Cornell Center for Social Sciences for assistance with NVivo software; and all the patients who offered their time and insights for this study.

Funding Information: This study was supported by Weill Cornell Fund 61500693.

Compliance with Ethical Standards: This study was approved by the Weill Cornell Institutional Review Board (22-08025196).

Conflicts of Interest: The authors report no conflicts of interest.

REFERENCES

1. National survey on drug use and health (NSDUH). Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. 2021 (https://www.samhsa.gov/data/release/2021-national-survey-drug-use-and-health-nsduh-releases).
2. Provisional drug overdose death counts. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2022 (https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nvss/vsrr/drug-overdose-data.htm).
3. Suen LW, Makam AN, Snyder HR, et al. National prevalence of alcohol and other substance use disorders among emergency department visits and hospitalizations: NHAMCS 2014-2018. J Gen Intern Med 2022;37(10):2420-2428.

4. Van Boekel LC, Brouwers EP, Van Weeghel J, Garretsen HF. Stigma among health professionals towards patients with substance use disorders and its consequences for healthcare delivery: systematic review. Drug Alcohol Depend 2013;131(1-2):23-35.
5. Merrill JO, Rhodes LA, Deyo RA, Marlatt GA, Bradley KA. Mutual mistrust in the medical care of drug users: the keys to the "narc" cabinet. J Gen Intern Med 2002;17(5):327-33.
6. Avery JJ, Avery JD, Mouallem J, Demner AR, Cooper J. Physicians' and attorneys' beliefs and attitudes related to the brain disease model of addiction. Am J Addict 2020;29(4):305-312.
7. Avery JD, Taylor KE, Kast KA, et al. Attitudes toward individuals with mental illness and substance use disorders among resident physicians. Prim Care Companion CNS Disord 2019;21(1):18m02382.
8. Avery J, Han BH, Zerbo E, et al. Changes in psychiatry residents' attitudes towards individuals with substance use disorders over the course of residency training. Am J Addict 2017;26(1):75-79.
9. Bielenberg J, Swisher G, Lembke A, Haug NA. A systematic review of stigma interventions for providers who treat patients with substance use disorders. J Subst Abuse Treat 2021;131:108486.
10. Cotter TG, Ayoub F, King AC, Reddy KG, Charlton M. Practice habits, knowledge, and attitudes of hepatologists to alcohol use disorder medication: sobering gaps and opportunities. Transplant Direct 2020;6(10):e603.
11. Jakubowski A, Singh-Tan S, Torres-Lockhart K, et al. Hospital-based clinicians lack knowledge and comfort in initiating medications for opioid use disorder: opportunities for training innovation. Addict Sci Clin Pract 2023;18(1):31.
12. Kamaradova D, Latalova K, Prasko J, et al. Connection between self-stigma, adherence to treatment, and discontinuation of medication. Patient Prefer Adherence 2016;10:1289-1298.
13. Crapanzano KA, Hammarlund R, Ahmad B, Hunsinger N, Kullar R. The association between perceived stigma and substance use disorder treatment outcomes: a review. Subst Abuse Rehabil 2018;10:1-12.
14. Peckover S, Chidlaw RG. Too frightened to care? Accounts by district nurses working with clients who misuse substances. Health Soc Care Community 2007;15(3):238-245.
15. Curtis J, Harrison L. Beneath the surface: collaboration in alcohol and other drug treatment. An analysis using Foucault’s three modes of objectification. J Adv Nurs 2001;34(6):737-744.
16. Kirchoff RW, Mohammed NM, McHugh J, et al. Naltrexone initiation in the inpatient setting for alcohol use disorder: a systematic review of clinical outcomes. Mayo Clin Proc Innov Qual Outcomes 2021;5(2):495-501.
17. Englander H, King C, Nicolaidis C, et al. Predictors of opioid and alcohol pharmacotherapy initiation at hospital discharge among patients seen by an inpatient addiction consult service. J Addict Med 2020;14(5):415.
18. Priest KC, Lovejoy TI, Englander H, Shull S, McCarty D. Opioid agonist therapy during hospitalization within the Veterans Health Administration: a pragmatic retrospective cohort analysis. J Gen Intern Med 2020;35(8):2365-2374.
19. Buchman DZ, Ho A, Illes J. You present like a drug addict: patient and clinician perspectives on trust and trustworthiness in chronic pain management. Pain Med 2016;17(8):1394-1406.
20. King C, Collins D, Patten A, Nicolaidis C, Englander H. Trust in hospital physicians among patients with substance use disorder referred to an addiction consult service: a mixed-methods study. J Addict Med 2022;16(1):41-48.

21. Simon R, Snow R, Wakeman S. Understanding why patients with substance use disorders leave the hospital against medical advice: a qualitative study. Subst Abus 2020;41(4):519-525.
22. Velez CM, Nicolaidis C, Korthuis PT, Englander H. "It's been an experience, a life learning experience": a qualitative study of hospitalized patients with substance use disorders. J Gen Intern Med 2017;32(3):296-303.
23. Thom DH, Hall MA, Pawlson LG. Measuring patients' trust in physicians when assessing quality of care. Health Aff (Millwood) 2004;23(4):124-32.
24. Bombard Y, Baker GR, Orlando E, et al. Engaging patients to improve quality of care: A systematic review. Implement Sci 2018;13:1-22.
25. Harris PA, Taylor R, Minor BL, et al. The REDCap consortium: building an international community of software platform partners. J Biomed Inform 2019;95:103208.
26. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic data capture (REDCap)—a metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support. J Biomed Inform 2009;42(2):377-381.
27. Excel 16.73. Microsoft; 2023.
28. NVivo 12 Plus. QSR International Pty Ltd.; 2018.
29. Smith JA, Osborn M. Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis. In: Smith JA, ed. Qualitative Psychology: A Practical Guide to Research Methods. 3 ed. London: SAGE Publications Ltd; 2015:25-52.
30. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qual Res Psychol 2006;3(2):77-101.
31. Glaser BG, Strauss AL. Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research. New York: Routledge, 2017.
32. Guest G, Bunce A, Johnson L. How many interviews are enough? An experiment with data saturation and variability. Field Methods 2006;18(1):59-82.
33. O'Reilly M, Parker N. 'Unsatisfactory saturation': a critical exploration of the notion of saturated sample sizes in qualitative research. Qual Res 2013;13(2):190-197.
34. Thorogood N, Green J. Qualitative Methods for Health Research. London: SAGE Publications Ltd, 2018.
35. Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): A 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. Int J Qual Health Care 2007;19(6):349-357.
36. Collins D, Alla J, Nicolaidis C, et al. "If it wasn't for him, I wouldn't have talked to them": qualitative study of addiction peer mentorship in the hospital. J Gen Intern Med 2019;Epub ahead of print.
37. McNeil R, Small W, Wood E, Kerr T. Hospitals as a 'risk environment': an ethno-epidemiological study of voluntary and involuntary discharge from hospital against medical advice among people who inject drugs. Soc Sci Med 2014;105:59-66.
38. Alford DP, Compton P, Samet JH. Acute pain management for patients receiving maintenance methadone or buprenorphine therapy. Ann Intern Med 2006;144(2):127-134.
39. Avery J, Knoepflmacher D, Mauer E, et al. Improvement in residents' attitudes toward individuals with substance use disorders following an online training module on stigma. HSS J 2019;15(1):31-36.
40. Caldeiro RM, Malte CA, Calsyn DA, et al. The association of persistent pain with out-patient addiction treatment outcomes and service utilization. Addiction 2008;103(12):1996-2005.

41. Witkiewitz K, Vowles KE, McCallion E, Frohe T, Kirouac M, Maisto SA. Pain as a predictor of heavy drinking and any drinking lapses in the COMBINE study and the UK Alcohol Treatment Trial. Addiction 2015;110(8):1262-1271.
42. Smedslund G, Berg RC, Hammerstrøm KT, et al. Motivational interviewing for substance abuse. Campbell Syst Rev 2011;7(1):1-126.
43. Coco GL, Melchiori F, Oieni V, et al. Group treatment for substance use disorder in adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized-controlled trials. J Subst Abuse Treat 2019;99:104-116.
44. Dutra L, Stathopoulou G, Basden SL, Leyro TM, Powers MB, Otto MW. A meta-analytic review of psychosocial interventions for substance use disorders. Am J Psychiatry 2008;165(2):179-187.
45. Benjenk I, Chen J. Effective mental health interventions to reduce hospital readmission rates: a systematic review. J Hosp Manag Health Policy 2018;2:45.
46. Lewer D, Eastwood B, White M, et al. Fatal opioid overdoses during and shortly after hospital admissions in England: a case-crossover study. PLoS Med 2021;18(10):e1003759.
47. Alford DP, Bridden C, Jackson AH, et al. Promoting substance use education among generalist physicians: an evaluation of the Chief Resident Immersion Training (CRIT) program. J Gen Intern Med 2009;24:40-47.
48. Livingston JD, Milne T, Fang ML, Amari E. The effectiveness of interventions for reducing stigma related to substance use disorders: a systematic review. Addiction 2012;107(1):39-50.
49. Wei J, Defries T, Lozada M, Young N, Huen W, Tulsky J. An inpatient treatment and discharge planning protocol for alcohol dependence: efficacy in reducing 30-day readmissions and emergency department visits. J Gen Intern Med 2015;30:365-370.
50. Liebschutz JM, Crooks D, Herman D, et al. Buprenorphine treatment for hospitalized, opioid-dependent patients: a randomized clinical trial. JAMA Intern Med 2014;174(8):1369-1376.
51. Shanahan CW, Beers D, Alford DP, Brigandi E, Samet JH. A transitional opioid program to engage hospitalized drug users. J Gen Intern Med 2010;25:803-808.
52. Camfield L, Duvendack M, Palmer□Jones R. Things you wanted to know about bias in evaluations but never dared to think. IDS Bull 2014;45(6):49-64.
53. QuickFacts: New York City, New York. United States Census Bureau. 2023 (https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/newyorkcitynewyork).

Table 1. Demographic and clinical characteristics of study participants (n = 15).

	Median	*Range*	*n*	*Sample %*	*General population %*[53]
Age (years)	58	25-74			
20-29			3	20	
30-39			1	7	
40-49			2	13	
50-59			4	27	
60-69			2	13	
70-79			3	20	
Legal sex*					
Male			11	73	
Female			4	27	52
Gender identity*					
Not specified			10	67	
Male			3	20	
Female			2	13	
Race/ethnicity*					
White			8	53	38
Black or African American			5	33	23
Asian			1	7	15
Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin			1	7	29
Preferred language*					
English			15	100	
Housing status					
Housed			11	73	
Unhoused			4	27	
# prior hospital admissions†	5	0-27			
0-5			8	53	
6-10			2	13	
11-15			3	20	
16-20			1	7	
$\geq$ 21			1	7	
Primary SUD					
Alcohol use disorder			7	47	
Opioid use disorder			6	40	
Stimulant use disorder			2	13	
SUDs represented					
Alcohol use disorder			8	53	
Opioid use disorder			8	53	
Stimulant use disorder			4	27	
Tobacco use disorder			3	20	
Benzodiazepine use disorder			1	7	
Multiple SUDs			6	40	
Admitting diagnoses represented‡					
Trauma			4	27	
Withdrawal			4	27	
Cardiovascular problem			4	27	
Alcohol-related liver injury			2	13	
Infection			1	7	
Primary hospital service§					
Internal medicine			11	73	
Surgery			3	20	
MOTS			1	7	
Day of admission at time of interview	7	3-23			
0-5			6	40	

6-10	7	47
11-15	1	7
16-20	0	0
≥ 21	1	7

[*]Designations specified in participants' electronic medical record.
[†]Not including admissions to inpatient psychiatric units.
[‡]Trauma = 3 falls, 1 burn. Withdrawal = 3 alcohol-related, 1 benzodiazepine-relate. Cardiovascular problem = 2 congestive heart failure, 1 hypertension, 1 peripheral vascular disease. Infection = bacteremia.
[§]Internal medicine = 6 general medicine service, 5 hepatobiliary service. Surgery = 1 vascular service, 1 cardiothoracic service, 1 burn service.
MOTS = Medical-Orthopedic Trauma Service.

Table 2. Recurring themes: patients' perceived positive aspects, negative aspects, and consequences of hospital care.[*]

Perceived positive aspects of care
Clinical proficiency
Partnership[†]
Knowledgeability
Ethics[‡]
Adequate care delivery[†]
Emotional proficiency
Compassion[†]
Investment in relationships[†]
Perceived negative aspects of care
Bias and stigmatized attitudes
Assumptions based on substance use history[†]
Judgment based on substance use history
Labeling
Clinical improficiency
Lack of partnership[†]
Poor knowledge
Inadequate care delivery[‡]
Inhumane treatment
Discrimination based on substance use history[†]
Neglect
Disrespect[†]
Perceived consequences of care
Emotional wellbeing
Interpersonal connectedness
Emotional state[†]
Trust
Trust in medical teams[‡]
Feeling trusted by medical teams[‡]
Openness[†]
Care quality
Confidence in care
Objective care outcomes[†]

[*]Minor themes are indented and listed beneath their corresponding major themes.
[†]Minor theme comprising codes that recurred across five or more transcripts (a third or more of transcripts).
[‡]Minor theme comprising codes that recurred across eight or more transcripts (more than half of transcripts).

Table 3. Recurring themes: patients' recommendations for improving hospital care.

Recommendation	*Example initiatives*	*Example supporting quotations*[*]
Initiate and promote continued recovery	Offer group therapy (inpatient and outpatient) Offer individual psychotherapy Post flyers publicizing compassionate SUD treatment Practice "real-world" re-immersion Offer to connect with post-discharge SUD treatment Make a post-discharge pain management plan	*A couple of times they had group talks … The people that went got something from it. Maybe if you promoted that a little more, and just let people chat it out … [Before going] to the AA meetings, I was like, "man, my life sucks." And then you go to AA meetings and you're like, "oh my God, people are a lot worse" … When the meeting was over … you start a conversation with an addict, and then, if you become friends with an addict and they both want to stay together, then you figure out ways to do it. (M.U.)* *I think there should be papers in [patient rooms] saying, "are you having trouble with a struggle with substances that you're scared to bring up? This is a number that's a safe place to call. You will not get in trouble for calling. If you just want to know what detoxing would look like, just call this center." (A.Z.)*
Educate	Teach patients about SUD and its consequences Augment addiction medicine training for providers	*So much of suicidal attempts start out as just being so hooked on drugs that the road to recovery looks too difficult … It needs to be publicized that there are ways to make withdrawal easier, that detoxing is not going to be as hard as you think, and there are a lot of people who have walked this path before you – and they'll light the way for you. (A.Z.)* *I think that [medical trainees] really need to know more about it … Is there a chapter in a book somewhere about this? You know, I think they should have to deal with people for a while – with a problem … I think it should be part of a rotation for them … Somewhere in their training there, they need to know more. (K.O.)*
Partner in compassionate care	Treat with compassion Individualize care Distribute patient satisfaction surveys Listen to patients and their advocates	*By just being kind, you know. Addiction is a disease … A lot of people … they're doing drugs to escape a feeling of being abused … Yes, kindness is the biggest thing. (H.R.)* *They have a questionnaire that you fill out, asking … how was you treated from 1 to 5 … It matters because that survey is taken by everybody … it makes a difference for the staff. Because they know that they're gonna be viewed by it, so they want to do a good job … So I know that I'm gonna have a better off experience, because they don't want to be reprimanded for the way I was experienced. (D.W.)*

[*]Initials representing the quoted participant's pseudonym are included in parentheses after each quotation.

SUPPLEMENTARY APPENDIX

Supplemental Table 1. Semi-structured interview guide.

Questions	*Probes*
1. Could you tell me about your experience in the hospital?	Could you tell me about a memorable experience or interaction you've had during your time in the hospital?
2. What have your interactions been like with the medical team taking care of you in the hospital?	Could you tell me about a memorable interaction you had with your medical team? Could you tell me about a particularly good interaction you had with your medical team in the hospital? Could you tell me about an experience that made you have a more positive outlook in the hospital? Could you tell be about a particularly bad interaction you had with your medical team in the hospital? Could you tell me about an experience that made you have a more negative outlook in the hospital?
3. How has your history of alcohol or drug use affected your experience in the hospital?	Could you tell me about an experience or interaction in the hospital that was affected by your history of alcohol or drug use?
4. How has your history of alcohol or drug use affected your experience when you've been in the hospital before?	Could you tell me about a past hospital experience or interaction that was affected by your history of alcohol or drug use?
5. How do you think medical teams in the hospital take care of people who have a history of alcohol or drug use?	How does a person's history of alcohol or drug use affect the way they are treated in the hospital? Could you tell me about a specific experience or interaction that made you feel this way?
6. How do you think the hospital experiences of people with a history of alcohol or drug use compare to the experiences of people who do not have a history of alcohol or drug use?	Could you tell me about a specific experience or interaction that made you feel this way?
7. From your perspective, what does it mean to trust your medical team in the hospital?	How has your medical team made you feel like you can trust them? Could you tell me about an interaction with your medical team that made you feel more trusting of them?

	In general, what is one way that medical teams can build more trust with their patients who have a history of alcohol or drug use? How has your medical team made you feel less trusting of them? Could you tell me about an interaction with your medical team that made you feel less trusting of them? In general, what is one way that medical teams make themselves less trustworthy to their patients who have a history of alcohol or drug use?
8. From your perspective, what does it mean for your medical team to trust you in the hospital?	How has your medical team made you feel more trustworthy? Could you tell me about an interaction with your medical team that made you feel more trustworthy? In general, what is one way that medical teams can make their patients who have a history of alcohol or drug use feel more trustworthy? How has your medical team made you feel less trustworthy? Could you tell me about an interaction with your medical team that made you feel less trustworthy? In general, what is one way that medical teams make their patients who have a history of alcohol or drug use feel less trustworthy?
9. How can medical teams take better care of people in the hospital who have a history of alcohol or drug use?	What is one thing that medical teams could do to take better care of people in the hospital who have a history of alcohol or drug use? What is one thing you've experienced in the hospital before that you think should be done more often when caring for people who have a history of alcohol or drug use?