Lost Opportunity in Tobacco Cessation Care: The Impact of Underbilling in a Large Health System

Derek J Baughman, MD[1]; Marcus Rauhut, MPS[2]; Edward Anselm, MD[3]

1. Telemedicine Physician, WellSpan Health | Dept. Biomedical Informatics, Vanderbilt University
   derek.j.baughman@vanderbilt.edu
2. Senior Specialist - Research & Development, WellSpan Health
   mrauhut@wellspan.org
3. Assistant Clinical Professor of Medicine, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai
   eanselm@msn.com

Manuscript Word count: **2832**
Abstract Word count: **238**

MeSH: Tobacco, Health Care Economics and Organizations, Primary Health Care, Clinical Coding, Public Health

Abstract

Introduction: Tobacco cessation remains a critical challenge in healthcare, with evidence-based interventions often under-utilized due to misaligned economic incentives and inadequate training. This study aims to quantify the economic impact of missed billing opportunities for tobacco cessation in a healthcare system, thereby assessing potential revenue loss and evaluating the effectiveness of systems-based approaches in enhancing tobacco cessation efforts.

Methods: A retrospective cohort study utilized aggregated de-identified patient health data from an 8-hospital regional health system across Pennsylvania and Maryland, spanning from 1/1/21 to 12/31/23. The analysis focused on primary care encounters eligible for smoking cessation counseling (CPT codes 99406 or 99407), with potential revenue calculated based on the Medicare reimbursement rate.

Results: Among 584,631 primary care patients, 75,115 were identified as smokers. Over three years, only 1,277 of encounters with smokers were billed for cessation services, representing a billing rate of 1.7%. The estimated potential revenue loss from eligible encounters totaled $5,947,018.13, with an average loss of $1,982,339.38 annual.

Conclusions: The study reveals a significant gap between the potential and actual billing for tobacco cessation services, highlighting not only the financial implications of missed opportunities but the validation of health system's public health impact. Underbilling contributes to considerable annual revenue loss and undermines primary prevention efforts against tobacco-related diseases. Our findings illuminate the need for enhanced billing practices and systemic changes, including policy improvements that influence proper billing to promote public health benefits through improved smoking cessation interventions.

Introduction

Despite the progress in reducing the prevalence of adult smoking in the United States which is now at 11.5%,[1] there are still over 28.3 million adult cigarette smokers who could benefit from quitting.[2] According to the recent Surgeon General's Report on Smoking Cessation (2020),[2] 77% of current smokers are interested in quitting, with 55.4% of smokers making a quit attempt in the previous year. Unfortunately, fewer than one-third of smokers attempting to quit utilize evidence-based interventions like FDA-approved cessation medications or behavioral counseling. This shortfall in use of interventions contributes to higher relapse rates, with successful quitters often needing up to 20 attempts in the absence of counseling and medications. Surveys show that from the patient's perspective, physicians are advising patients to quit smoking but not directing them to evidence-based treatment. Each year, the National Committee for Quality Assurance (NCQA) surveys members of every health plan to explore a variety of customer satisfaction measures.[3] NCQA surveys for 2021 reveal that 44% of Commercial HMO members don't receive counseling on how to quit, and fewer than 40% of patients have discussions about medications. Sadagna et al reported that In a large contemporary US registry, only 1 in 3 smokers presenting for a cardiology visits received smoking cessation assistance.[4]

Further, several reports looking at administrative data reveal significant variation and overall underperformance in the provision of tobacco cessation services,[5,6,7] which were attributed to barriers like time constraints and low reimbursement. In a Medicaid claims analysis across 37 states (where an average of 9.4% of smokers attempted to quit within the last year), cessation medication claims ranged from 0.2% to 32.9%, and an average of only 2.7% received cessation counseling (ranging from 0.1% to 5.6%).[7]

Advising a smoker to quit is a standard of care which is not usually captured in administrative data. Counseling smokers for three minutes or ten minutes is a billable service. Clinical practice guidelines support the delivery of a billable, evidence-based intervention at every clinical encounter.[8] Much of what is known about clinical performance in tobacco cessation is gleaned from survey data.[9] Aside from the known challenges with electronic medical records based claims and reimbursement,[10] the potential revenue lost due to poor service delivery and ineffective billing practices for cessation services remains underexplored. This gap indicates missed opportunities in quantifying the economic value of population health applications for tobacco cessation care.

Study Aim and Objective: This study aims to evaluate the potential revenue lost in tobacco cessation care due to inadequate service delivery and billing practices. By using lost revenue as a proxy, the study intends to measure the potential impact of applying systems-based approaches in population health for tobacco cessation. The objective is to increase awareness in billing practices, ultimately enhancing the effectiveness of smoking cessation interventions in healthcare.

Methods

Study Sample

In this cohort study, we used aggregated de-identified, patient-level health data to make population-level estimates of smokers across an 8-hospital health system, WellSpan Health. De-identified data from over 200 outpatient care locations across Pennsylvania and Maryland were mined to reveal the total number of primary care encounters eligible for smoking cessation counseling. Over a three year period, we examined patient's smoking status and whether

smoking cessation counseling was billed (CPT codes 99406 or 99407). Inclusion criteria are summarized in table 1.

Measures

1. We used custom data session within Epic's SlicerDicer similar data capture and analysis across varying Electronic Medical Record (EMR) systems. The objective of this study was to develop a framework that could be utilized in future research to analyze clinical data from multiple EMRs.**Data Mining and Inclusion Criteria**: Primary population filters in Epic's SlicerDicer were used toobtain comprehensive patient-level and visit-level data. The timeframe was three years. Smokers were identified using standard ICD-10 coding based on CMS standards.[12,13] Adults aged 18 and over, excluding those in hospice care, were identified through structured data elements indicating smoking status. This identification was derived from medical history records, active problem lists, or specific tobacco cessation billing codes. We used groupers to include sub-codes and decimal versions of ICD-10 codes for nicotine dependence (F17.*), tobacco use (Z72.0), and tobacco abuse (Z71.6). These details are in Appendix 1.
2. **Visit Types:** Outpatient and telemedicine visits in the primary care service line were used exclusively, and data was reported in terms of unique patients and individual visits . Inpatient encounters, emergency department visits and any visits by hospice patients were excluded.
3. **Prevalence Assessment**: The prevalence of smoking in our patient cohort, was calculated by dividing the number of identified smokers by the total population. This calculated prevalence was then compared to the state health department's smoking prevalence rates to ensure reliability.[11]
4. **Billing Rate Computation**: To determine the billing rate, we examined the subset of the smoking population that was billed for CPT codes 99406 or 99407 during the specified study period. This data was segmented to differentiate between telemedicine (including audio-only) versus office encounters. The billing rate for CPT codes 99406/99407 was computed by dividing the number of patients billed for these codes by the total identified smoking population.

5. **Unrealized Potential Revenue Loss Estimation**: To estimate the potential revenue loss, smokers who were not billed for CPT codes 99406 or 99407 were identified. The reimbursement was calculated based on insurance type. Medicare reimburses up to 8 cessation attempts in a 12-month period, and private plans must cover at least two quit attempts per year.[12] The resulting number was then multiplied by the payer-specified reimbursement rate for the lowest level of billable CPT codes, providing an estimation of the financial impact associated with unbilled smoking cessation counseling encounters. The standard Medicare reimbursement rate for the three-minute counselling cessation, 99406 was used for the calculation. The base rate of $14.97 was multiplied by 1.4 for commercial insurance and reduced by 70% for Medicaid.[13] Since the majority of billable visits were for patients with Medicare, Medicaid, and commercial insurance types, these were reported. Other types of insurance and uninsured patients were removed from the estimates of missed opportunities.
6. **Demographic data**: Data on five demographic variables from patients 18 years and older who had an office visit or video visit at a primary care office between January 1, 2021, and December 31, 2023 was reported. The data for race and ethnicity were aggregated based on standards set by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and Office of Management and Budget.[14] The sex of the patient was based on the legal sex documented in the patient's chart. Age categories were based on the patient's age at the time of the visit. Insurance data was based on the primary payer who covered the visit. Cumulative percentages of age group and insurance type exceed 100% because patients may have had multiple encounters at different ages or with different insurance coverage during the study period. After building demographic criteria, we then grouped patients into segments based on whether they had an office visit or video visit. Cumulative percentages for visit type exceed 100% because patients may have visits using both modalities during the study period.

The study was exempt from full Institutional Board Review (IRB: HE-2023-101) as the data mining activity was considered “non-human subjects research” (as defined by DHHS or FDA regulations, 45 CFR 46.102 and 21 CFR 50.3).

The WellSpan Health Institutional Review Board (IRB) waived full ethical review, categorizing the study as "non-human subjects research" (IRB: HE-2023-101) according to the regulations established by the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) and the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) under 45 CFR 46.102 and 21 CFR 50.3, respectively.

Results

A total of 584,631 unique patients who met the study inclusion criteria during the three-year sample period were identified. Demographics (Table 2) revealed a predominately white (83.4%) and non-Hispanic or Latino (88%) population. More than half (55.5%) were covered by commercial insurance, while Medicare accounted for 26.5% of patients and Medicaid 15.8%. The remaining 2.2 percent were uninsured or uncategorized. There was a slightly higher representation of females (54.6%). Patients were distributed among four age groups, with the majority being older adults (22.1% aged 18-29 years, 26.2% aged 30-44 years, 34.4% aged 45-64 years, and 26.9% aged 65 years and above). The primary visit modality was in-office (91.1% of patients had at least one office visit), while 13.6% of patients had at least one video visit (4.6% had both).

We identified 75,115 smokers over the study timeframe, or 12.8% of the patient population (Table 3). who had 507,656 total primary care visits) which could have received tobacco cessation counseling; To ensure reliability, we compared this figure with data from the Pennsylvania Department of Health, which found that 14% of Pennsylvania adults smoke.[11] We found only 1,277 patients, or 1.7% of eligible patients, received tobacco cessation counseling during the study period. The billing rate was higher among patients with office visits (1.7%) than telemedicine visits (0.5%). The overall billing rate declined over the three-year period from 1.4% in 2021 to 1.2% in 2022 and 0.5% in 2023.

Over the 3 year timeframe patients with Medicare, Medicaid and commercial insurance had a total of 402,498 eligible visits that were not billed for tobacco cessation counseling (Table 4). Of the elligible opportunities to provide and bill for tobacco cessation services, 97% appear to have been missed. The estimated reimbursement potential for this care was $5,947,018.13 over three years (Table 4).

Discussion

This study found a significant gap between smokers and billed encounters for tobacco cessation care. Leveraging a large health system's aggregated patient data, the unrealized revenue highlights two concerns in tobacco cessation care: underbilling (when billable care may have been rendered), and failure to provide care to eligible patients. The findings reveal a striking disparity in billing rates and potential revenue opportunity across different modes of care delivery, notably between telemedicine and office encounters. Given the prevalence of tobacco use the impact of missed opportunities to help patients quit smoking is profound.

Our reported billing rate—1.7 % overall, is consistent with other studies.[7] In a recent study of an EMR-enabled smoking treatment program, the pre-intervention baseline was 2.1%.[15] But survey data supports smokers' affirmation that their doctors are providing tobacco cessation services at a much higher rate.[16,9] This highlights the importance of improving billing practices, even in telemedicine, which has become increasingly common and can represent a significant proportion of the population (13.6% of our study's participants, as shown in table 2). The billing rates for relevant CPT codes (99406 or 99407) were considerably low, despite the significant portion of the eligible population that could benefit from cessation interventions,[17] as indicated by the overall visit-level billing rate of only 0.3% (table 3). Even if we exclude the uninsured and other unmeasured insurance types, over the three years the potential revenue lost is estimated at $5,947,018.13, demonstrating a substantial financial impact This translates to an average

$1,982,339.38 potential revenue loss per year. Moreover, this is potential revenue that is not reinvested into frontline clinicians and their patients—blunting the impact of primary prevention. There are many studies exploring the barriers to systemic implementation of tobacco cessation in detail,[18,19] but none have explored the perspective of reimbursement. The most frequently reported perceived barriers to providing cessation services were time constraints, high workload, lack of training, lack of reimbursement of smoking cessation interventions, and the physician's own smoking status. Low outcome expectancy, lack of self-efficacy, fear of losing patients, being uncomfortable discussing smoking hazards, and dissatisfaction with professional activity were also reported.[Error! Bookmark not defined.] Other studies have produced similar results in assessing effective smoking cessation intervention in primary care[20] and Tobacco Treatment Guideline Use and Predictors Among U.S. Physicians by Specialty.[21] Our study's results call for a strategic healthcare policy review by every system, tracking the prevention and screening opportunity from encounter to outcome and reimbursement. It also underscores the need for AI-driven clinical billing methods that can navigate the complexities of the US healthcare system and incentivize preventive services.[22] primary care practices can serve as a pilot model for effective healthcare delivery by optimizing medical billing and aligning with national quality priorities.

Specifically, the study highlights the necessity of raising awareness among medical providers and their leadership about the need to adopt systems-based solutions to tobacco cessation with attention to documentation and billing. Education and advocacy for appropriate reimbursement policies are vital steps in empowering providers to enhance their intervention efforts.[23] Through these actions, it is reasonable to presume improvement in smoking cessation interventions, increased revenue for medical practices, and a reduction in the burden of tobacco-related diseases.

Our study provides valuable insight to providers measuring the potential impact of applying value-based approaches in population health for tobacco cessation. Ultimately, this research emphasizes the critical need for systemic changes that not only foster financial efficiency but also prioritize and effectively deliver public health interventions. Implementing such changes could lead to a paradigm shift in healthcare delivery, aligning financial incentives with public health goals and elevating the quality of patient care.

Limitations

We acknowledge several limitations of our study. While we provide a general framework for providers to measure the impact of undelivered tobacco cessation, our results have limited generalizability to other parts of the country outside the northeast United States as they are from one health system. A second limitation is that the estimated revenue loss is conservative. In our study, we only considered primary care encounters. This means we excluded any other outpatient specialties that might also be offering smoking cessation counseling. Because we filtered our data by primary care, there may be a greater burden of unrealized potential that we did not measure.

Finally, our study is limited by the wide variation in payer reimbursement, even for the same CPT codes, along with the cautious estimates we employed when assessing the three payers. Actual reimbursement varies by region and contract, which should be considered when interpreting our findings. Some contracts with insurers may be based on capitation and the services may not be specifically reimbursable. However, the return on investment from smoking cessation is well established and the rate of reimbursement underestimates the future avoided medical expense.

Conclusion

This study provides evidence of the untapped potential revenue for conducting tobacco cessation care. The marked discrepancy between eligible and billed cessation services points to either a possible broader trend of underutilizing public health interventions, or a lack of adequate validation in tobacco cessation care delivery. This highlights an opportunity to significantly enhance the financial and health outcomes of frontline tobacco cessation interventions, especially in the primary care setting.

Table 1. Summary of Eligibility Parameters for Tobacco Cessation Care Billing

Criteria	Details[a]
Eligible Encounter Codes	Level 2-5 Evaluation and Management (E/M) codes, Qualifying Current Procedural Terminology (CPT) or Healthcare Common Procedure Coding System (HCPCS) codes
Tobacco Product Use	Use of any tobacco product, including but not limited to cigarettes, cigars, dissolvable, nicotine gels, hookah tobacco, pipe tobacco, roll-your-own tobacco, smokeless tobacco products, vapes, e-cigarettes, hookah pens, and other electronic nicotine delivery systems
Exclusion Criteria	Patients with limited life expectancy, including those receiving hospice services, and any patients with medical reasons that justify not screening for tobacco use or not providing tobacco cessation interventions.[b]

[a] List of CPT/HCPCS Codes | CMS. Accessed February 6, 2024. https://www.cms.gov/medicare/regulations-guidance/physician-self-referral/list-cpt/hcpcs-codes
[b] Explore Measures & Activities. Accessed February 6, 2024. https://qpp.cms.gov/mips/explore-measures

Note: Tobacco cessation intervention can be performed by any healthcare provider, not necessarily the same provider who conducted the tobacco use screening.[24]

Table 2. Patient Demographics by Visit Type, WellSpan Health (January 1, 2021 to December 31, 2023)

		Office	%	**Telemedicine**	%	**Total Patients** [a]	%
Race	White	444,142	83.4%	67,570	85.3%	487,617	83.4%
	Other	36,957	6.9%	5,419	6.8%	40,005	6.8%
	Black or African American	25,750	4.8%	3,920	4.9%	27,724	4.7%
	Unknown, declined, or not reported	18,301	3.4%	1,394	1.8%	21,115	3.6%
	Asian	6,276	1.2%	761	1.0%	7,059	1.2%
	American Indian, Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	1,018	0.2%	169	0.2%	1,111	0.2%
Ethnicity	Not Hispanic or Latino	469,761	88.2%	71,716	90.5%	514,657	88.0%
	Hispanic or Latino	38,485	7.2%	5,659	7.1%	41,633	7.1%
	Unknown, declined, or not reported	24,198	4.5%	1,858	2.3%	28,341	4.8%
Legal sex [b]	Female	292,413	54.9%	53,592	67.6%	319,039	54.6%
	Male	239,943	45.1%	25,619	32.3%	265,498	45.4%
Age [c]	18-29y	119,222	22.4%	18,305	23.1%	129,076	22.1%
	30-44y	141,613	26.6%	29,582	37.3%	153,093	26.2%
	45-64y	182,827	34.3%	29,394	37.1%	201,231	34.4%
	65+y	140,836	26.5%	13,097	16.5%	157,133	26.9%
Insurance type [d]	Commercial (Highmark, Blue Cross, etc.)	294,719	55.4%	48,078	60.7%	324,457	55.5%
	Medicare	140,399	26.4%	13,900	17.5%	155,162	26.5%
	Medicaid	87,684	16.5%	16,457	20.8%	92,285	15.8%
	Government/Tricare	9,189	1.7%	1,035	1.3%	10,042	1.7%
	Other	64,605	12.1%	3,488	4.4%	125,421	21.5%
Total		**532,444**	**91.1%**	**79,233**	**13.6%**	**584,631**	**100.0%**

[a] Cumulative percentages for visit types exceed 100% as patients may have both an office visit and video visit during the study period.

[b] Percentages are calculated based on tallies of patients' legal sex since these values remain consistent over time

[c] Age values can show discrepancies of approximately 5% between cohorts, primarily because some ages are recorded in months and may not be accurately accounted for in the EMR. Additionally, certain ages can change during the measurement time frame, so cumulative percentages exceed 100%.

[d] SlicerDicer can only measure proportions of encounters associated with the financial payer class, making them unavailable for regression analysis. Separating self-pay data from cost-sharing (co-pays and deductibles) can be challenging, resulting in imprecise measurements, as patients can switch payers within the study period. Notably, this challenge can be exacerbated in the blended group, where patients receive both types of care. In the case of Medicare and Medicaid, there might be overlap among patients with both payer types. The key insight from the payer data is the comparable distribution of percentages across exposure groups.

Table 3. Primary Care Tobacco Cessation Counseling by Year

	Category	2021 (%)	2022 (%)	2023 (%)	Total 2021-2023 (%)
Patients	Total	405,485	380,204	375,704	584,631
	Smokers	43,695 (10.8%)	44,285 (11.6%)	42,385 (11.3%)	75,115 (12.8%)
	Smokers billed for cessation	622 (1.4%)	545 (1.2%)	218 (0.5%)	1,277 (1.7%)
Visits	Smokers total primary care encounters	169,215	172,688	165,753	507,656
	Smokers encounters billed for cessation	731 (0.4%)	596 (0.3%)	230 (0.1%)	1,557 (0.3%)
	Encounters with other insurance type or no insurance	11,889	11,067	9,631	32,587
	Non-reimbursable encounters*	24,047	24,508	22,459	71,014
	Unbilled encounters	**132,548**	**136,517**	**133,433**	**402,498**

* This number reflects visits that exceed the maximum reimbursable visits for our 3 payers of interest. For example, Medicare covers up to 8 cessation attempts per year, so Medicare patients with more than 8 visits in a year will only count as having 8 eligible visits.

Table 4: Estimated Reimbursement Based on Payer Type

Payer	**2021** Eligible Visits (est. reimbursement)	2022 Eligible Visits (est. reimbursement)	2023 Eligible Visits (est. reimbursement)	Total Eligible Visits (est. reimbursement)
Commercial $20.96	35,864 ($751,637.71)	36,359 ($762,011.92)	35,471 ($743,401.22)	107,694 ($2,257,050.85)
Medicare $14.97	41,986 ($628,530.42)	44,995 ($673,575.15)	46,779 ($700,281.63)	133,760 ($2,002,387.20)
Medicaid $10.48	54,698 ($573,180.34)	55,163 ($578,053.08)	51,183 ($536,346.66)	161,044 ($1,687,580.08)
Total	**132,548 ($1,953,348.47)**	**136,517 ($2,013,640.15)**	**133,433 ($1,980,029.51)**	**402,498 ($5,947,018.13)**

References

[1] *Smoking Cessation: A Report of the Surgeon General*. 2020. *Publications and Reports of the Surgeon General*.

[2] Cornelius ME, Loretan CG, Jamal A, et al. Tobacco Product Use Among Adults - United States, 2021. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. May 5 2023;72(18):475-483. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7218a1

[3] NCQA. Medical Assistance with Smoking and Tobacco Use Cessation. Accessed 5/15/2023, 2023. https://www.ncqa.org/hedis/measures/medical-assistance-with-smoking-and-tobacco-use-cessation/

[4] Sardana M, Tang Y, Magnani JW, et al. Provider-Level Variation in Smoking Cessation Assistance Provided in the Cardiology Clinics: Insights From the NCDR PINNACLE Registry. *J Am Heart Assoc*. Jul 2 2019;8(13):e011412. doi:10.1161/JAHA.118.011307

[5] Hoel AW, Nolan BW, Goodney PP, et al. Variation in smoking cessation after vascular operations. *J Vasc Surg*. May 2013;57(5):1338-44; quiz 1344 e1-4. doi:10.1016/j.jvs.2012.10.130

[6] Goldstein MG, DePue JD, Monroe AD, et al. A population-based survey of physician smoking cessation counseling practices. *Prev Med*. Sep-Oct 1998;27(5 Pt 1):720-9. doi:10.1006/pmed.1998.0350

[7] Wang X, Babb S, Xu X, Ku L, Glover-Kudon R, Armour BS. Receipt of cessation treatments among Medicaid enrollees trying to quit smoking. *Nicotine and Tobacco Research*. 2021;23(6):1074-1078.

[8] Michael C. Fiore, Douglas E. Jorenby, Timothy B. Baker, Smoking cessation: Principles and practice based upon the AHCPR Guideline, 1996, *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, Volume 19, Issue 3, September 1997, Pages 213–219, https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02892286

[9] United States Public Health Service Office of the Surgeon General; National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion (US) Office on Smoking and Health. *Smoking Cessation: A Report of the Surgeon General*. Washington (DC): US Department of Health and Human Services; 2020.

[10] McCullough JM. Timing of Clinical Billing Reimbursement for a Local Health Department. *Public Health Rep*. 2016;131(2):283-289. doi:10.1177/003335491613100212

[11] PA Department of Health. Pennsylvania Tobacco Data. Department of Health. Accessed December 8, 2023. https://www.health.pa.gov:443/topics/programs/tobacco/Pages/Data.aspx

[12] Billing Guide for Tobacco Screening and Cessation. https://www.lung.org/getmedia/08ed3536-6bab-48a6-a4e4-e6dbccaea024/billing-guide-for-tobacco-1.pdf.pdf

[13] Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. Accessed January 1, 2024. https://www.cms.gov/medicare/physician-fee-schedule/search?Y=0&T=4&HT=1&CT=0&H1=99406&H2=99407&M=5

[14] Explanation of data standards for race, ethnicity, sex, primary language, and disability. Office of Minority Health. Accessed December 12, 2023. https://minorityhealth.hhs.gov/explanation-data-standards-race-ethnicity-sex-primary-language-and-disability.

[15] McCarthy DE, Baker TB, Zehner ME, et al. A comprehensive electronic health record-enabled smoking treatment program: Evaluating reach and effectiveness in primary care in a multiple baseline design. *Prev Med*. 2022;165(Pt B):107101. doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2022.107101

[16] Medical Assistance with Smoking and Tobacco Use Cessation. NCQA. Accessed January 16, 2024. https://www.ncqa.org/hedis/measures/medical-assistance-with-smoking-and-tobacco-use-cessation/

[17] Stead LF, Buitrago D, Preciado N, Sanchez G, Hartmann-Boyce J, Lancaster T. Physician advice for smoking cessation. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2013;2013(5):CD000165. Published 2013 May 31. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD000165.pub4

[18] Adams JM. Smoking Cessation—Progress, Barriers, and New Opportunities: The Surgeon General's Report on Smoking Cessation. *JAMA*. 2020;323(24):2470–2471. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.6647

[19] Pipe AL, Evans W, Papadakis S. Smoking cessation: health system challenges and opportunities. *Tob Control*. 2022;31(2):340-347. doi:10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2021-056575

[20] Kushnir V, Cunningham JA. Assessing effective smoking cessation intervention in primary care. *Preventive Medicine Reports*. 2015;2:181-182. doi:10.1016/j.pmedr.2015.03.001

[21] Schaer DA, Singh B, Steinberg MB, Delnevo CD. Tobacco Treatment Guideline Use and Predictors Among U.S. Physicians by Specialty. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*. 2021;61(6):882-889. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2021.05.014

[22] Kilanko V. The Transformative Potential of Artificial Intelligence in Medical Billing: A Global Perspective. 2023;4(3). doi:https://doi.org/10.51542/ijscia.v4i3.8

[23] Burks K, Shields J, Evans J, Plumley J, Gerlach J, Flesher S. A systematic review of outpatient billing practices. *SAGE Open Medicine*. 2022;10:205031212210990. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/20503121221099021

[24] Preventive Care and Screening: Tobacco Use: Screening and Cessation Intervention | eCQI Resource Center. Accessed December 8, 2023. https://ecqi.healthit.gov/ecqm/ec/2021/cms138v9#