medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.29.24304678; this version posted July 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Lost Opportunity in Tobacco Cessation Care: 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
baughman.derek@gmail.com
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: **2899**
Abstract Word count: **238**
Tables: **4**

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

All authors have contributed significantly to the work, meet ICMJE criteria, and approve the manuscript for submission. There are no conflicts of interest to disclose, financial or otherwise, and all study procedures were conducted under ethical standards. No funding was received for this study.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.29.24304678; this version posted July 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

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, from 1/1/21 to 12/31/23. The analysis focused on primary care encounters eligible for tobacco cessation counseling (CPT codes 99406 or 99407), with potential revenue calculated based on the Medicare reimbursement rate.

Results: Over three years, and 507,656 office visits, only 1,557 (0.3%) of encounters with persons using tobacco were billed for cessation services. The estimated total potential revenue gained if each person who was identified as using tobacco was billed consistently for tobacco cessation counseling was $5,947,018.13, and $1,982,339.38 annually.

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 tobacco cessation interventions.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.29.24304678; this version posted July 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Introduction

Despite the progress in reducing the prevalence of adult smoking in the United States, which is now at 11.5%, there are still over 28.3 million adult persons using cigarettes who could benefit from quitting.[1] The US prevalence of all forms of tobacco use combined is estimated at 18.7%.[1] According to the recent Surgeon General's Report on Smoking Cessation (2020),[2] 77% of people who smoke express interest in quitting, with 55.4% of persons who smoke making a quit attempt in the previous year. Unfortunately, fewer than one-third of persons using cigarettes attempting to quit utilize evidence-based interventions like FDA-approved cessation medications or behavioral counseling.[3] This shortfall in the use of interventions contributes to higher relapse rates, with successful quitters often needing up to 20 attempts in the absence of counseling and medications.[2] Surveys show that from the patient's perspective, physicians are advising patients to quit smoking routinely 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.[4] 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. These national survey data, repeated yearly, show that even when clinicians provide advice to quit, that intervention is often incomplete, lacking discussion of medication and cessation strategies. NCQA data may have significant response bias, which may lead to under-reporting of prevalence and overstatement of cessation interventions.[5] Another perspective on tobacco cessation interventions comes from the National Health Interview Surveys, which stated that 63% of smokers reported physician advice to quit, and 6.2% were given a prescription in the most recent year sampled.[6]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.29.24304678; this version posted July 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Sadagna, et. Al. reported that in a large contemporary US registry, only 1 in 3 persons using cigarettes presenting for cardiology visits received smoking cessation assistance.[7] Further, several reports looking at administrative data reveal significant variation and overall underperformance in the provision of smoking cessation services,[8,9,10] which were attributed to barriers like time constraints, lack of training, and low reimbursement. In a Medicaid claims analysis across 37 states (where an average of 9.4% of people who smoke 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%).[10] The majority of studies on tobacco cessation are focused specifically on smoking of cigarettes, but that literature can be applied to tobacco overall. The billing and coding of services for all forms of tobacco use are the same,**Error! Bookmark not defined.**,[21] and the FDA-approved medications containing nicotine can be used interchangeably for any treatment of nicotine dependence, and non-nicotine medications appear to be effective as well.[11]

Advising a tobacco user to quit is a standard of care[12] which is not usually captured in administrative data. Counseling persons using tobacco 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, regardless of a patient's readiness to change.[13] Much of what is known about clinical performance in tobacco cessation is gleaned from survey data.[14] Medical claims systems and EMR systems are likely to significantly under-report tobacco use status.[15,16] Aside from the known challenges with electronic medical records-based claims and reimbursement,[17] the potential revenue lost due to ineffective billing and underlying poor service delivery for cessation services remains largely unexplored. The lost revenue can be a marker for

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.29.24304678; this version posted July 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

indicating sub-optimal interventions in health systems and quantifying the economic impact of missed tobacco cessation care.

This study aims to evaluate the potential revenue lost in tobacco cessation care due to inadequate billing practices. Inadequate billing reflects a mix of services not provided and services provided but not billed. 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 develop an analysis framework for researching clinical data from multiple EMRs, increasing awareness in billing practices, and ultimately enhancing the effectiveness of tobacco cessation interventions.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.29.24304678; this version posted July 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Methods

Study Sample

In this cohort study, we used aggregated de-identified, patient-level health data to make population-level estimates of persons using tobacco 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 tobacco cessation counseling. Over a three-year period, we examined patient's tobacco use and whether tobacco cessation counseling was billed (CPT codes 99406 or 99407). Inclusion criteria are summarized in Table 1.

Tobacco use status in electronic medical records will reflect the inconsistencies of the practices that collect this data.[16] Despite best practices to screen for tobacco use at every visit and update the medical record accordingly,[18] we recognized that many practices do not routinely capture tobacco use and may miss some tobacco users, and recent quitters might continue to be listed as current users.

Measures

For data mining and inclusion criteria, we used custom data sessions within Epic's SlicerDicer to model similar data capture and analysis across varying Electronic Medical Record (EMR) systems. Primary population filters in Epic's SlicerDicer were used to obtain comprehensive patient-level and visit-level data. The timeframe was three years between January 1, 2021, and December 31, 2023. Persons using tobacco were identified using standard ICD-10 coding based

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.29.24304678; this version posted July 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

on CMS standards.[Error! Bookmark not defined.21] Adults aged 18 and over were identified through structured data elements in the EMR indicating tobacco use status (Table 1). Patients in hospice care were excluded as CMS does not pay for tobacco cessation for this population. 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 the appendix.

Regarding 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 to provide context to the patient-to-visit ratio. Inpatient encounters, emergency department visits, and any visits by hospice patients were excluded.

To assess the prevalence of tobacco use in our patient cohort, was calculated by dividing the number of identified persons using tobacco by the total population. This calculated prevalence was then compared to the state health department's tobacco use prevalence rates to ensure reliability.[19]

To determine and compute the billing rate, we examined the subset of the tobacco-using population billed for CPT codes 99406 or 99407 during the specified study period. Patients billed once or more (but less than eight) sessions per year proxied the frequency of cessation counseling. This data was segmented to differentiate between telemedicine (including audio-only) versus office encounters. To compare the revenue loss per patient and per visit, we

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.29.24304678; this version posted July 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

calculated both billing rates by dividing the number of patients or visits billed for CPT codes 99406 or 99407 by the total number of identified tobacco users (i.e., patients) or their total number of encounters (i.e., visits).

To estimate the unrealized potential revenue loss, we identified persons using tobacco who were not billed for CPT codes 99406 or 99407. The reimbursement was calculated based on insurance type. Medicare reimburses up to eight cessation attempts within a 12-month period, with private plans and Medicaid typically adhering to these guidelines.[20] Visits that were ineligible for reimbursement due to exceeding this limit or because of the patient's hospice status were excluded from our analysis. The resulting number was then multiplied by the payer-specified reimbursement rate to estimate the financial impact of underbilling for tobacco cessation counseling services. The standard Medicare reimbursement rate for the three-minute counseling visit, 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.[21] 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.

Regarding demographics, data on five 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.[22] The sex of the patient was based on the legal sex documented in the patient’s chart. Age

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.29.24304678; this version posted July 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

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 exceeded 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 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 DHHS and the 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. Over half (55.5%) were covered by commercial insurance, while Medicare accounted for 26.5% of patients and Medicaid 15.8%. 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).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.29.24304678; this version posted July 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

A total of 75,115 persons using tobacco were identified over the study timeframe, or 12.8% of the patient population (Table 3). This was comparable to the state-specific figures on tobacco use recorded at 14.4% for Maryland and 18.5% for Pennsylvania.[23] These patients had 507,656 total primary care encounters over the timeframe potentially eligible for receiving tobacco cessation counseling. We found only 1,277 patients, or 1.7% of eligible patients, were billed for tobacco cessation counseling during the study period.

In terms of encounters, tobacco users had 507,656 office visits (Table 2), and only 1,557 (0.3%) were billed for cessation services. Over the 3-year timeframe, patients with Medicare, Medicaid, and commercial insurance had a total of 402,498 potentially eligible visits that were not billed for tobacco cessation counseling (Table 4). Of the eligible opportunities to provide and bill for tobacco cessation services, 97% appear to have been missed. The estimated potential reimbursement for tobacco cessation care, if provided and billed consistently, was $5,947,018.13 over three years (Table 4).

Discussion

This study found a significant gap between persons using tobacco 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 highlight 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). Given the prevalence of tobacco use, the impact of missed opportunities to help patients quit the use of tobacco is profound.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.29.24304678; this version posted July 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Our reported billing rate—1.7 % overall, is consistent with other studies.[10] In a recent study of an EMR-enabled smoking treatment program, the pre-intervention baseline was 2.1%.[24] But survey data supports persons using cigarettes' affirmation that their doctors are providing tobacco cessation services at a much higher rate.[25,14] 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,[26] as indicated by the overall visit-level billing rate of only 0.3% (Table 3).

It is important to note in our analysis that eligibility for tobacco cessation services was not static. This reflects the reality that patients' smoking status changes over time, impacting their potential eligibility for cessation services within the study timeframe. Methodologically, if the EHR indicated the patient had quit, they would no longer trigger eligibility for cessation interventions in subsequent visits. However, our use of aggregate data does not allow for distinguishing between patients moving in and out of the health system from patients who drop off the eligibility threshold. Nonetheless, the billing rate remained consistently low at around 0.3% (Table 3) despite patient and visit numbers changing over the study timeframe. Additionally, by excluding uninsured and other unmeasured insurance from our calculations, over the three years, the potential revenue lost is still 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,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.29.24304678; this version posted July 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

this is potential revenue that is not reinvested into frontline clinicians and their patients—blunting the impact of primary prevention.

Many studies explore the barriers to systemic implementation of tobacco cessation in detail,[27,28] however, there is a notable gap in the literature concerning the reimbursement perspective. 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. **Error! Bookmark not defined.** 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.**,[29] Other studies have produced similar results in assessing effective smoking cessation intervention in primary care[30] and tobacco treatment guideline use and predictors among U.S. physicians by specialty.[31]

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. In seeking to optimize systems performance in identifying persons using tobacco, accurate documentation of a visit, shaping additional treatment and follow-up, and capturing appropriate billing, AI-driven clinical billing systems have a clear potential role.[32] Although there is a cost to systems change, the return on investment from tobacco cessation is well established.[33] Additionally, the study highlights the necessity of raising awareness among medical providers and their leadership about adopting systems-based solutions to tobacco cessation with attention to documentation and billing. Well-established paradigms for systems change have been developed and evaluated.[34]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.29.24304678; this version posted July 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

These include elements of EMR and claims system design, training, and program evaluation.[35,36,37] Through these actions, it is reasonable to presume improvement in tobacco cessation interventions, increased revenue for medical practices and reduced 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. First, 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. Tobacco use is not adequately captured in EHRs, and the reimbursement estimate was based on only the three-minute counseling visit (CPT 99406). Given the national prevalence of tobacco use is 18.7%,[1] the reported results of missed opportunities are likely understated. Third, we only considered primary care encounters. This means we excluded any other outpatient specialties that might also be offering tobacco cessation counseling. Because we filtered our data by primary care, there may be a greater burden of unrealized potential that we did not measure. The

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.29.24304678; this version posted July 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

current report is based entirely on EMR indicators of tobacco use and claims data and does not capture the full range of tobacco cessation services such as prescriptions and/or referral to quit lines. Future studies should attempt to capture this type of information to better distinguish between underbilling and opportunities completely missed. 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 consistent and systematic 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 apply systems-based approaches to tobacco cessation care to improve patient outcomes and economic returns.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.29.24304678; this version posted July 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

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.[38]

306

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.29.24304678; this version posted July 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

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.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.29.24304678; this version posted July 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 3. Primary Care Tobacco Cessation Counseling by Year

Category	2021 (%)	2022 (%)	2023 (%)	Total (%)	Average (%)
Patients					
Total	405,485	380,204	375,704	584,631	387,131
Persons using tobacco	43,695 (10.8%)	44,285 (11.6%)	42,385 (11.3%)	75,115 (12.8%)	43,455 (11.2%)
Persons using tobacco billed for cessation	622 (1.4%)	545 (1.2%)	218 (0.5%)	1,277 (1.7%)	462 (1.1%)
Visits					
Persons using tobacco, total primary care encounters	169,215	172,688	165,753	507,656	169,219
Persons using tobacco, encounters billed for cessation	731 (0.4%)	596 (0.3%)	230 (0.1%)	1,557 (0.3%)	519 (0.3%)
Encounters with other insurance type or no insurance	11,889	11,067	9,631	32,587	10,862
Non-reimbursable encounters*	24,047	24,508	22,459	71,014	23,671
Unbilled encounters	**132,548**	**136,517**	**133,433**	**402,498**	**134,166**

* 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)	Avg. 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)	35,898 ($752,350.28)
Medicare $14.97	41,986 ($628,530.42)	44,995 ($673,575.15)	46,779 ($700,281.63)	133,760 ($2,002,387.20)	44,587 ($667,462.40)
Medicaid $10.48	54,698 ($573,180.34)	55,163 ($578,053.08)	51,183 ($536,346.66)	161,044 ($1,687,580.08)	53,681 ($562,526.69)
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)**	**134,166 ($1,982,339.38)**

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.29.24304678; this version posted July 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

References

[1] 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

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

[3] New reference required Babb, S., et al. (2017). "Quitting smoking among adults—United States, 2000–2015." Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report **65**(52): 1457-1464.

[4] 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/

[5] Malloy, K., Proj, A., Battles, H., Juster, T., Ortega-Peluso, C., Wu, M., & Juster, H. (2018). Smoking cessation benefit utilization: comparing methodologies for measurement using New York State's Medicaid data. *Nicotine and Tobacco Research*, *20*(12), 1467-1473.)

[6] Tibuakuu, M., Okunrintemi, V., Jirru, E., Tcheugui, J. B. E., Orimoloye, O. A., Mehta, P. K., ... & Michos, E. D. (2019). National trends in cessation counseling, prescription medication use, and associated costs among US adult cigarette smokers. *JAMA network open*, *2*(5), e194585-e194585.

[7] 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

[8] 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

[9] 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

[10] 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.

[11] Huerne, K., & Eisenberg, M. J. (2023). Vaping Cessation Interventions in Former Smokers: A Review. *Canadian Journal of Cardiology*.

[12] Patnode CD, Henderson JT, Coppola EL, Melnikow J, Durbin S, Thomas RG. Interventions for Tobacco Cessation in Adults, Including Pregnant Persons: Updated Evidence Report and Systematic Review for the US Preventive Services Task Force. *JAMA*. 2021;325(3):280–298. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.23541

[13] 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

[14] 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.

[15] Malloy, K., Proj, A., Battles, H., Juster, T., Ortega-Peluso, C., Wu, M., & Juster, H. (2018). Smoking cessation benefit utilization: comparing methodologies for measurement using New York State's Medicaid data. *Nicotine and Tobacco Research*, *20*(12), 1467-1473.

[16] Patel, N., Miller Jr, D. P., Snavely, A. C., Bellinger, C., Foley, K. L., Case, D., ... & Dharod, A. (2020). A comparison of smoking history in the electronic health record with self-report. *American journal of preventive medicine*, *58*(4), 591-595.

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.29.24304678; this version posted July 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[18] Tobacco, T. C. P. G. T. (2008). A clinical practice guideline for treating tobacco use and dependence: 2008 update: a US public health service report. *American journal of preventive medicine*, *35*(2), 158-176.)

[19] 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

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

[21] 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

[22] 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.

[23] Cornelius, M. E., Wang, T. W., Jamal, A., Loretan, C. G., Willis, G., Graham-Glover, B., & Neff, L. (2023). Peer Reviewed: State-Specific Prevalence of Adult Tobacco Product Use and Cigarette Smoking Cessation Behaviors, United States, 2018–2019. *Preventing Chronic Disease*, *20*.

[24] 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

[25] 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/

[26] 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

[27] 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

[28] 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

[29] Berlin, I. (2008). Physicians' perceived barriers to promoting smoking cessation. *Journal of Smoking Cessation*, *3*(2), 92-100.

[30] 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

[31] 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

[32] 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

[33] Warner, K. E. (1997). Cost effectiveness of smoking-cessation therapies: interpretation of the evidence and implications for coverage. *Pharmacoeconomics*, *11*(6), 538-549.

[34] Systems Change: Treating Tobacco Use and Dependence. Content last reviewed December 2012. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, Rockville, MD. https://www.ahrq.gov/prevention/guidelines/tobacco/decisionmakers/systems/index.html

[35] 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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.29.24304678; this version posted July 26, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[36] Wright JS, Wall HK, Ritchey MD. Million Hearts 2022: small steps are needed for cardiovascular disease prevention. JAMA. 2018;320(18):1857-1858.

[37] American Academy of Family Physicians. Office Champions: A Systems Change Approach. Accessed May 5, 2024. https://www.aafp.org/family-physician/patient-care/care-resources/tobacco-and-nicotine/office-champions.html

[38] 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#